

## 846. IHS, Meaning of

SOURCE: Thomas Albert Stafford, *Christian Symbolism in the Evangelical Churches* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1942), p. 58. Copyright 1942 by Whitmore & Stone. Used by permission.

A Gothic form of *IHC* ... came into use in the Middle Ages when Greek was not understood by priests and monks. Because of this, it was variously interpreted, and it is believed that a Franciscan monk, Saint Bernardine of Siena (A.D. 1380–1444), was responsible for the unauthentic interpretation, “*Jesus Hominum Salvator*” (Jesus the Savior of Mankind).<sup>4</sup> [Note 4: Other interpretations may be heard, among them the following: English: I have suffered; German: *Jesus, Heiland, Seligmacher*; Latin: *In hoc signo (vinces)*; Greek: *Iesous, Hiereus, Soter*.]

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The monogram *IHS* has often been erroneously interpreted. It is an abbreviation of the Greek name of Jesus and derived from *IΗΣ*, which is composed of the Greek letters *iota, eta,* and *sigma*. These letters occur in Jesus’ Greek name thus: *IΗΣΟΥΣ*, transliterated *IĒSOUS*. *Eta* (H) is not an *h* but a long vowel transliterated *ē* and pronounced like *a* in ale. There is no letter *h* in the Greek alphabet. A word beginning with the *h* sound has its first letter a vowel, over which a rough breathing sign ( *̑* ) has been placed to indicate the aspirate. This fact renders invalid another fanciful interpretation of the monogram as a supposed Christian substitute for the initials of the Egyptian deities Isis, Horus, Seb, or Isis, Horus, Serapis. Worshipers of these gods would not see such a substitute in this monogram, for the initial letter of the Greek form of Horus is not *eta* (H) but *omega* (Ω) thus: *ΩΡΟΣ*; it has no *eta*.]

## 847. Images—a Medieval Catholic Layman’s Protest

SOURCE: Eustache Deschamps, *Balade* (Vol. 8, p. 201), trans. in G. G. Coulton, ed. and trans., *Life in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928), Vol. 1, p. 188. Used by permission.

[Translator’s Note:] Eustache Deschamps, Chaucer’s French contemporary and panegyrist, is a voluminous poet who, without much inspiration, gives many vivid pictures of contemporary life. This *balade* is all the more significant because Deschamps represents ordinary orthodox lay opinion, and his murmured complaint was repeated a generation later by the great Gerson. The edition quoted is that of the *Société des Anciens Textes Français*.

*That we should set up no graven images in the churches, save only the Crucifix and the Virgin, for fear of idolatry.*

Take no gods of silver or gold, of stocks or stones or brass, which make men fall into idolatry; for it is man’s handiwork wherein the heathen vainly believed, adoring false idols from whose mouths the devils gave them doubtful answers by parables; warned by their false beliefs, we will have no such images.

For the work is pleasing to the eye; their paintings (of which I complain), and the beauty of glittering gold, make many wavering folk believe that these are gods for certain; and fond thoughts are stirred by such images which stand around like dancers in the minsters, where we set up too many of them; which indeed is very ill done, for ... we will have no such images.

The Cross, the representation of Jesus Christ, with that of the Virgin alone, sufficeth fully in church for the sanest folk, without this leaven of wickedness, without believing in so many puppets and grinning figures and niches, where with we too often commit idolatry against God’s commandments; we will have no such images.

## 848. Images, Veneration of

SOURCE: Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. by Neil Buchanan, Vol. 4 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1898), pp. 318, 319.

[p. 318] Pictures of Christ, Mary, and the saints, had been already worshipped from the fifth [p. 319] (fourth) century with greetings, kisses, prostration, a renewal of ancient pagan practices. In the naive and confident conviction that Christians no longer ran any risk of idolatry, the Church not only tolerated, but promoted, the entrance of paganism. It was certainly the intention to worship the divine in the material; for the incarnation of deity had deified nature (φύσις). A brisk trade was carried on in the seventh and beginning of the eighth century in images, especially by monks; churches, and chapels were crowded with pictures and relics; the practice of heathen times was revived.

### **849. Images, “Worship” of**

SOURCE: Richard Frederick Littledale, *Plain Reasons Against Joining the Church of Rome* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1905), pp. 37–39.

[p. 37] Next, let us take the worship of images and pictures. Here it must first be said (a) that the Roman Church in terms denies that any such act as can be strictly called *worship* is done to pictures and images, even by the most ignorant, since no one believes that these representations can see, hear, or help of themselves; (b) that there is no question as to the lawfulness of making some such images and representations, if not intended to receive homage, as even the Jews had the brazen serpent, and the figures of the cherubim in the Holy of Holies, where, however, only one man ever saw them, and that only once a year; and the early Christians set up pictures of our Lord in the catacombs, still to be seen there. But, on the other hand, there is a very suspicious fact which meets us at the outset of the inquiry as to the actual Roman practice, [p. 38] as distinguished from any finespun theories in books, namely, that many Roman Catechisms omit the Second Commandment, while no Roman catechism teaches that there is either danger or sin in any making or using of images for religious honour, short of actual paganism. The point is . . . whether in practice one Roman Catholic in a million ever knows that image-worship can be abused or sinful without virtual apostasy from Christianity. The Shorter Lutheran Catechism cuts down the First and Second Commandments just in the same way as many Roman ones do; but, then, on the one hand, Lutherans have free access to the Bible in [p. 39] their own language, and, on the other, nothing of the nature of image worship has ever been practised amongst them.

Intelligent and shrewd heathens, when arguing in favour of idols, say exactly what Roman Catholic controversialists do in defence of their practice, namely, that they do not believe in any sentient power as residing in the mere stone, wood, or metal, of which their idols are made, but regard them as representing visibly certain attributes of Deity, to bring them home to the minds of worshippers; and that homage addressed to these idols on that ground is acceptable to the unseen spiritual Powers, who will listen to and answer prayers so made indirectly to themselves.

### **850. Immortality, Conditional, John Milton on**

SOURCE: John Milton, “The Christian Doctrine,” bk. 1, chap. 7, in his *Prose Works*, trans. by Charles R. Sumner (London: George Bell and Sons, 1887), Vol. 4, pp. 187–195.

[p. 187] THE VISIBLE CREATION comprises the material universe, and all that is contained therein; and more especially the human race.

The creation of the world in general, and of its individual parts, is related Gen. i. It is also described Job xxvi. 7, &c. and xxxviii. and in various passages of the Psalms and Prophets. Psal. xxxiii. 6–9. civ. cxlviii. 5. Prov. viii. 26, &c. Amos iv. 13. 2 Pet. iii. 5.

Previously, however, to the creation of man, as if to intimate the superior importance of the work, the Deity speaks like to a man deliberating: Gen. i. 26. "God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness." So that it was not the body alone that was then made, but the soul of man also (in which our likeness to God principally consists); which precludes us from attributing pre-existence to the soul which was then formed,—a groundless notion sometimes entertained, but refuted by Gen. ii. 7. "God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; thus man became a living soul." Job xxxii. 8. "there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." Nor did God merely breathe that spirit into man, but moulded it in each individual, and infused it throughout, enduing and embellishing it with its proper faculties. Zech. xii. 1. "he formeth the spirit of man within him."

We may understand from other passages of Scripture, that when God infused the breath of life into man, what man thereby received was not a portion of God's essence, or a participation of the divine nature, but that measure of the divine virtue or influence, which was commensurate to the capabilities of the recipient. For it appears from Psal. civ. 29, 30. that [p. 188] he infused the breath of life into other living beings also;—"thou takest away their breath, they die... thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created;" whence we learn that every living thing receives animation from one and the same source of life and breath; inasmuch as when God takes back to himself that spirit or breath of life, they cease to exist. Eccles. iii. 19. "they have all one breath." Nor has the word *spirit* any other meaning in the sacred writings, but that breath of life which we inspire, or the vital, or sensitive, or rational faculty, or some action or affection belonging to those faculties.

Man having been created after this manner, it is said, as a consequence, that *man became a living soul*; whence it may be inferred (unless we had rather take the heathen writers for our teachers respecting the nature of the soul) that man is a living being, intrinsically and properly one and individual, not compound or separable, not, according to the common opinion, made up and framed of two distinct and different natures, as of soul and body,—but that the whole man is soul, and the soul man, that is to say, a body, or substance individual, animated, sensitive, and rational; and that the breath of life was neither a part of the divine essence, nor the soul itself, but as it were an inspiration of some divine virtue fitted for the exercise of life and reason, and infused into the organic body; for man himself, the whole man, when finally created, is called in express terms *a living soul*. Hence the word used in Genesis to signify *soul*, is interpreted by the apostle, 1 Cor. xv. 45. "animal." Again, all the attributes of the body are [p. 189] assigned in common to the soul: the touch, Lev. v. 2, &c. "if a soul touch any unclean thing,"—the act of eating, vii. 18. "the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity;" v. 20. "the soul that eateth of the flesh," and in other places:—hunger, Prov. xiii. 25. xxvii. 7.—thirst, xxv. 25. "as cold waters to a thirsty soul." Isai. xxix. 8.—capture, 1 Sam. xxiv. 11. "thou huntest my soul to take it." Psal. vii. 5. "let the enemy persecute my soul, and take it."

Where, however, we speak of the body as of a mere senseless stock, there the soul must be understood as signifying either the spirit, or its secondary faculties, the vital or sensitive faculty for instance.—Thus it is as often distinguished from the spirit, as from the body itself. Luke i. 46, 47. 1 Thess. v. 23. "your whole spirit and soul and body." Heb. iv. 12. "to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit." But that the spirit of man should be separate from the body, so as to have a perfect and intelligent existence independently

of it, is nowhere said in Scripture, and the doctrine is evidently at variance both with nature and reason, as will be shewn more fully hereafter. For the word *soul* is also applied to every kind of living being; Gen. i. 30. “to every beast of the earth,” &c. “wherein there is life” (*anima vivens*, Tremell.) vii. 22. “all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died;” yet it is never inferred from these expressions that the soul exists separate from the body in any of the brute creation.

On the seventh day, God ceased from his work, and ended the whole business of creation: Gen. ii. 2, 3.

It would seem, therefore, that the human soul is not created daily by the immediate act of God, but propagated from father to son in a natural order; which was considered as the more [p. 190] probable opinion by Tertullian and Apollinarius, as well as by Augustine, and the whole western church in the time of Jerome, as he himself testifies, Tom. II. Epist. 82. and Gregory of Nyssa in his treatise on the soul. God would in fact have left his creation imperfect, and a vast, not to say a servile task would yet remain to be performed, without even allowing time for rest on each successive Sabbath, if he still continued to create as many souls daily as there are bodies multiplied throughout the whole world, at the bidding of what is not seldom the flagitious wantonness of man. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the influence of the divine blessing is less efficacious in imparting to man the power of producing after his kind, than to the other parts of animated nature; [p. 191] Gen. i. 22, 28. Thus it was from one of the ribs of the man that God made the mother of all mankind, without the necessity of infusing the breath of life a second time, Gen. ii. 22. and Adam himself begat a son in his own likeness after his image, v. 3. Thus 1 Cor. xv. 49. “as we have borne the image of the earthy;” and this not only in the body, but in the soul, as it was chiefly with respect to the soul that Adam was made in the divine image. So Gen. xlvi. 26. “all the souls which came with Jacob out of Egypt, which came out of his loins.” Heb. vii. 10. “Levi was in the loins of Abraham.” whence in Scripture an offspring is called *seed*, and Christ is denominated *the seed of the woman*. Gen. xvii. 7. “I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.” 1 Cor. xv. 44. “it is sown a natural body.” v. 46. “that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural.”

But besides the testimony of revelation, some arguments from reason may be alleged in confirmation of this doctrine. Whoever is born, or shapen and conceived in sin, (as we all are, not David only, Psal. li. 5.) if he receive his soul immediately from God, cannot but receive it from him shapen in sin; for to be generated and conceived, means nothing else than to receive a soul in conjunction with the body. If we [p. 192] receive the soul immediately from God, it must be pure, for who in such case will venture to call it impure? But if it be pure, how are we conceived in sin in consequence of receiving a pure soul, which would rather have the effect of cleansing the impurities of the body; or with what justice is the pure soul charged with the sin of the body? But, it is contended, God does not create souls impure, but only impaired in their nature, and destitute of original righteousness; I answer that to create pure souls, destitute of original righteousness,—to send them into contaminated and corrupt bodies,—to deliver them up in their innocence and helplessness to the prison house of the body, as to an enemy, with understanding blinded and with will enslaved,—in other words, wholly deprived of sufficient strength for resisting the vicious propensities of the body—to create souls thus circumstanced, would argue as much injustice, as to have created them impure would have argued

impurity; it would have argued as much injustice, as to have created the first man Adam himself impaired in his nature, and destitute of original righteousness.

Again, if sin be communicated by generation, and transmitted from father to son, it follows that what is the *πρῶτον δεχτικὸν* or original subject of sin, namely, the rational soul, must be propagated in the same manner; for that it is from the soul that all sin in the first instance proceeds, will not be denied. Lastly, on what principle of justice can sin be imputed through Adam to that soul, which was never either in Adam, or derived from Adam? In confirmation of which Aristotle's argument may be added, the truth of which in my opinion is indisputable. If the soul be equally diffused [p. 193] throughout any given whole, and throughout every part of that whole, how can the human seed, the noblest and most intimate part of all the body, be imagined destitute and devoid of the soul of the parents, or at least of the father, when communicated to the son by the laws of generation? It is acknowledged by the common consent of almost all philosophers, that every *form*, to which class the human soul must be considered as belonging, is produced by the power of matter.

It was probably by some such considerations as these that Augustine was led to confess that he could neither discover by study, nor prayer, nor any process of reasoning, how the doctrine of original sin could be defended on the supposition of the creation of souls. The texts which are usually advanced, Eccles. xii. 7. Isai. lvii. 16. Zech. xii. 1. certainly indicate that nobler origin of the soul implied in its being breathed from the mouth of God; but they no more prove that each soul is severally and immediately created by the Deity, than certain other texts, which might be quoted, prove that each individual body is formed in the womb by the immediate hand of God. Job x. 8–10. "thine hands have made me... hast thou not poured me out as milk?" Psal. xxxiii. 15. "he fashioneth their hearts alike." Job xxxi. 15. "did not he that made me in the womb make him?" Isai. xlv. 24. "thus saith Jehovah... he that formed thee from the womb." Acts xvii. 26. "he hath made of one blood all nations of men." We are not to infer from these passages, that natural causes do not contribute their ordinary efficacy for the propagation of the body; nor on the other hand that the soul is not received by traduction from the father, because at the time of death it again betakes itself to different elements than the body, in conformity with its own origin.

With regard to the passage, Heb. xii. 9. where *the fathers of the flesh* are opposed to *the Father of spirits*, I answer, that it is to be understood in a theological, not in a physical sense, as if the father of the body were opposed to the father of the soul; for *flesh* is taken neither in this passage, nor probably any where else, for the body without the soul; nor *the father of spirits* for the father of the soul, in respect of the work of generation; but *the father of the flesh* here means nothing else than the earthly or natural father, whose offspring are begotten in sin; *the father of spirits* is either the heavenly father, who in the beginning created all spirits, angels as well as the human race, or the spiritual father, who bestows a second birth on the faithful; according to John iii. 6. "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which [p. 195] is born of the Spirit is spirit." The argument, too, will proceed better, if the whole be understood as referring to edification and correction, not to generation; for the point in question is not, from what source each individual originated, or what part of him thence originated, but who had proved most successful in employing chastisement and instruction. By parity of reasoning, the apostle might exhort the converts to bear with his rebuke, on the ground

that he was their spiritual father. God indeed is as truly the father of the flesh as of *the spirits of flesh*, Numb. xvi. 22. but this is not the sense intended here, and all arguments are weak which are deduced from passages of Scripture originally relating to a different subject.

### **851. Immortality, Conditional, Not Inherent**

SOURCE: Edward White, *Life in Christ* (London: Elliot Stock, 1875), p. 248.

The introduction of the anti-Christian figment of man's Immortality has given a wrench to the whole of Christianity,—and rendered it difficult for logical minds to hold some of the plainest gospel doctrines. The recovery of the truth respecting Christ, as the only source of immortal life to mankind, will bring out into fresh beauty the whole facade of the evangelical theology.

For this truth places in a new light all that the New Testament teaches on the Church's Union with Christ. As descendants of Adam, we possess no inherent principle of eternal life. We must be 'born again,' i.e., united by regeneration to Christ, the Incarnate life of God, the second head of the human race. And this union by the Holy Spirit personally dwelling in us is no legal fiction, no dream, or mere imagination, or figure of speech. It is the deepest reality in human existence.

### **852. Immortality, of the Soul, a Greek Idea**

SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, *The Bible Speaks to You* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955), pp. 221, 222. Copyright 1955 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 221] *Why not "immortality of the soul"?* One other inadequate answer must be examined before we look at the Biblical view. And be forewarned, this one is hard to understand, particularly because many people confuse it with the Christian answer.

This is called "immortality of the soul." It comes from the Greeks, and when Greek thought and Hebrew-Christian thought came into contact in the Early Church, the Greek view often seemed to predominate. This view says, in effect, that there is a portion of me, my soul, that will continue to exist. During my lifetime here on earth this immortal soul is lodged in my mortal body. What happens at death is that my body dies and turns to dust, while my immortal soul is released and made free so that it can continue its immortal existence without being hamstrung by confinement in a body.

Sounds pretty good, doesn't it? But wait a minute. This means that my body is a nuisance to my soul, something that confines it, limits it, hampers it, subjects it to temptation. As the Greeks themselves put it, "the body is the prison house of the soul." This means that life on earth in the body is a waste [p. 222] of time, an unpleasant interlude in the life of the soul, something to be over and done with as quickly as possible. The whole aim of life is to escape from life, get rid of the pesky body, in order to resume a free and unfettered existence in eternity. Human life on earth has no final significance.

### **853. Immortality, of the Soul Incompatible With General Tenor of Scripture**

SOURCE: George S. Hendry, *The Westminster Confession for Today* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1960), pp. 65, 66. Copyright 1960 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

[p. 65] The idea that the soul is immortal presents some difficulty; it cannot be securely founded on the passages of Scripture which are adduced in support of it; and if the term be taken in its strictly literal sense of "not liable to death," the idea would seem to be incompatible with the general tenor of Scripture, as it is expressed in the emphatic declaration that God alone has immortality. (I Tim. 6:16). It is an unbiblical way of trying

to express the great Biblical truth that God's purpose with man [p. 66] is not completed with his death; God has created man for an eternal destiny.

#### **854. Immortality, of the Soul—Luther Classes Concept With “Monstrous Fictions”**

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Assertio Omnium Articulorum M. Lutheri per Bullam Leonis X. Novissamam Damnatorum* (“Assertion of all the Articles of M. Luther Condemned by the Newest Bull of Leo X”), Art. 27, in his *Works*, Vol. 7 (Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1897), pp. 131, 132. Latin.

[p. 131] However I permit the Pope to establish articles of faith for himself and for his own faithful—such are: that the bread and wine are transubstantiated in the sacrament, that the Essence of God [p. 132] neither generates nor is generated, that the soul is the substantial form of the human body; that he [the pope] is emperor of the world and king of heaven, and earthly god; that the soul is immortal, and all these endless monstrous fictions [*portenta*] in the Roman rubbish heap of decretals—in order that such as his faith is, such may be his gospel, such also his faithful, and such his church, and that the lips may have similar lettuce and the lid may be worthy of the dish.

#### **855. Immortality, of the Soul, Silence of Scripture on**

SOURCE: Edward White, *Life in Christ* (London: Elliot Stock, 1875), pp. 85–87.

[p. 85] That the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul is never once explicitly delivered throughout the whole range of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures is a fact of which every reader may satisfy himself by examination; and it is a fact which long ago has drawn the attention of thoughtful and exact inquirers...

[p. 86] In every other instance we obtain from the Prophets and Apostles clear and frequent expressions of the doctrines which they were commissioned to deliver; even of those which unaided reason was able to discover, as the existence of God and the difference between good and evil. But in this instance nearly a hundred writers have by some astonishing fatality omitted, with one consent, all reference to the Immortality of the Soul; no sentence of the Bible containing that brief declaration ‘from God,’ or even a passing reference, which would have set the controversy for ever at rest. In our own times scarcely a religious work issues from the press addressed to sinful men, scarcely is a public exhortation directed to them, without a distinct exhibition of the doctrine of Immortality, of deathless being in the nature of man, as the basis of the whole theological superstructure. Now, how shall we explain the remarkable fact that neither Apostles nor Prophets have ever once employed this argument in dealing with the wicked:—‘You have immortal souls, and must live for ever in joy or woe, therefore repent!’—an argument of almost irresistible force, if it be true? How, otherwise than by concluding that this was not their philosophy, that this doctrine [p. 87] formed no part of the ‘wisdom of God,’ and that they were withheld from proposing it to the world by Him who has declared that the eternal life of the righteous is the gift of His grace, and that ‘all the wicked He will destroy’?

#### **856. Immortality—Opposition to Teaching of Nonimmortality of the Soul Not Based on Exegetical Arguments**

SOURCE: Oscar Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?* (New York: Macmillan, 1958), pp. 5–7. © 1958 by Oscar Cullmann. Used with the permission of The Macmillan Company and The Epworth Press, London.

[p. 5] My critics belong to the most varied camps. The [p. 6] contrast, which out of concern for the truth I have found it necessary to draw between the courageous and joyful primitive Christian hope of the resurrection of the dead and the serene philosophic expectation of the survival of the immortal soul, has displeased not only many sincere Christians in all Communion and of all theological outlooks, but also those whose convictions, while not outwardly alienated from Christianity, are more strongly moulded by philosophical considerations. So far, no critic of either kind has attempted to refute me by exegesis, that being the basis of our study.

This remarkable agreement seems to me to show how widespread is the mistake of attributing to primitive Christianity the Greek belief in the immortality of the soul. Further, people with such different attitudes as those I have mentioned are united in a common inability to *listen* with complete objectivity to what the texts teach us about the faith and hope of primitive Christianity, without mixing their own opinions and the views that are so dear to them with their interpretation of the texts. This inability to listen is equally surprising on the part of intelligent people committed to the principles of sound, scientific exegesis and on the part of believers who profess to rely on the revelation in Holy Scripture.

The attacks provoked by my work would impress me more if they were based on exegetical arguments. Instead, I am attacked with very general considerations of a philosophical, psychological, and above all sentimental kind. It has been said against me, 'I can accept [p. 7] the immortality of the soul, but not the resurrection of the body', or 'I cannot believe that our loved ones merely sleep for an indeterminate period, and that I myself, when I die, shall merely sleep while awaiting the resurrection'.

Is it really necessary today to remind intelligent people, whether Christians or not, that there is a difference between recognizing that such a view was held by Socrates and accepting it, between recognizing a hope as primitive Christian and sharing it oneself?

### **857. Independent Churches**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 733, 734.

[p. 733] *History*. Under this head are presented those single churches which are not identified with any ecclesiastical body and have not even such affiliation as would entitle them to inclusion under a special name. Although any general classification is impracticable, through the several censuses certain distinct types have persisted.

The first class embraces those churches variously called union, community, nondenominational, and interdenominational. These represent the growing movement toward nonsectarian unity and the consolidation of church work to eliminate weak churches and the waste of duplicated effort in over-churched localities, and they also show a trend toward churches which serve the religious and social needs of the entire community, regardless of its specific creedal beliefs, and emphasize social righteousness rather than individual salvation. In the current census all churches of this class which have any ecclesiastical affiliation [p. 734] are shown with their respective denominations, while the federated churches, formerly included with the independent churches, are presented as a separate group. Community churches and non-denominational churches together comprise nearly one-half of the number of so-called independent churches, while about one-fifth of the whole report themselves as union or interdenominational churches. Of these latter, "Union" may be simply a part of the name and have no other significance, or the term may be historic and suggest a former denominational connection.



Interdenominational churches, as included in this group, are those having organic unity in which the several denominations represented have fully merged their individuality.

The second class includes churches which use a denominational name, but for one reason or another are not included in denominational lists and are not reported by the denominational officers. In the past a number of Lutheran churches were so listed because not included in the synodical returns, but the Lutheran bodies, as a part of the larger movement toward union, now report both synodical and nonsynodical churches. Among other bodies it occasionally happens that a Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, Methodist, Reformed, or other church, for some reason—doctrinal, ecclesiastical, or geographical—is not included in the lists of any association, presbytery, classis, or other body. In some cases these have simply grown up dissociated from the ecclesiastical bodies, and have preserved their independent status from habit rather than from difference of opinion. Not being included in the denominational returns, however, they are classed as independent.

The third class includes churches which were organized by individuals independent of any denominational status, some that originally had denominational connection, and some which are the result of holiness or evangelistic movements.

With regard to all these classes it is to be noted that they represent a constantly shifting number. In each class, occasionally, a church which is one year reported as independent will in another year be reported as identified with some ecclesiastical body. Others, lacking the support of some general body, drop out of existence entirely or become consolidated with other churches. Classified with the Independent Churches are several Christian Churches which did not join the Congregational and Christian merger and now have no denominational affiliation.

*Doctrine and Organization.* The withdrawal from the list of Independent Churches of the denominational federated churches has left a group for which no special features either of doctrine or polity can be definitely stated. Each of the organizations included in this report draws up its own creed, adopts its own form of organization, chooses its own officers, makes its own conditions of membership, and conducts its own worship as it chooses, and no general statement is practicable, except that the union and interdenominational churches accord more or less closely to the customs of the denominations represented in their organizations.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1936), 40,276 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 255). That *Yearbook* also lists on the same page two other independent groups, the Independent Fundamental Churches of America (organized 1930) with a fundamentalist statement of faith and a membership (1959) of 90,000; and Independent Negro Churches, membership (1936), 12,337.]

### **858. Indulgences, the Catholic doctrine of**

SOURCE: *This We Believe* (rev. ed. of the *Baltimore Catechism No. 3*), pp. 332–340. Copyright 1957 by Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington. Used by permission. [p. 332] 435. *What is an indulgence?*

An indulgence is the remission granted by the Church of the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven.

- (a) An indulgence does not take away sin. Neither does it take away the eternal punishment due to mortal sins. An indulgence can produce its effects in the soul only after sins are forgiven and, in the case of mortal sins, only after their eternal punishment is taken away. Many who are not Catholic wrongly understand an indulgence to be a permission to commit sin, or a pardon for future sin, or a guarantee against temptation.

By an indulgence the Church merely wipes out or lessens the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven...

- (b) The Church from the beginning has granted indulgences. Up to the sixth century indulgences generally took the form of a lessening of the public pen- [p. 333] ances imposed for sins. In the early centuries it was customary for those who were to be martyred to ask that indulgences be granted to certain individuals.

*Scripture*

“And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven” (Matthew 16:19–20). Also, read II Kings 24:1–20.

436. *How many kinds of indulgences are there?*

There two kinds of indulgences, plenary and partial.

437. *What is a plenary indulgence?*

A plenary indulgence is the remission of all the temporal punishment due to our sins.

- (a) A plenary indulgence is understood to be so granted that if a person should be unable to gain it fully, he will nevertheless gain it partially, in keeping with the disposition that he has.
- (b) A plenary indulgence, unless it be otherwise expressly stated, can be gained only once a day, even though the prescribed work be performed several times.
- (c) The conditions ordinarily prescribed for gaining the plenary indulgence and designated by the familiar phrase, “under [p. 334] the usual conditions,” are the following: confession, Communion, a visit to a church or public oratory, or even a semi-public oratory in certain cases, and prayer for the intentions of the Supreme Pontiff.
- (d) The confession which may be required for gaining any particular indulgences can be made within the eight days which immediately precede the day to which the indulgences are appointed; and the Communion may take place on the previous day; or both conditions may be satisfied on the day itself or within the following octave.
- (e) The following are several examples of plenary indulgences that can be gained by all the faithful:

Those who piously recite a third part of the Rosary (five decades) in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament, publicly exposed or even reserved in the tabernacle, may gain a plenary indulgence, on condition of confession and Communion (*The Raccolta*, No. 395, c.)

The faithful who with at least a contrite heart, whether singly or in company, perform the pious exercises of the Way of the Cross, when the latter has been legitimately erected according to the prescrip- [p. 335] tions of the Holy See, may gain a plenary indulgence as often as they perform the same, and another plenary indulgence if they receive Holy Communion on the same day, or even within a month after having made the Stations ten times (*The Raccolta*, No. 194).

The faithful who recite devoutly the prayer, “Behold, O good and sweetest Jesus,” before an image of Jesus Christ Crucified, may gain a plenary indulgence under the usual conditions (*The Raccolta*, No. 201).

438. *What is a partial indulgence?*

A partial indulgence is the remission of part of the temporal punishment due to our sins.

- (a) A partial indulgence, unless the contrary be expressly stated, can be gained frequently throughout the day, whenever the prescribed work is repeated.

- (b) To say that an indulgence of so many days or years is granted means that the amount of temporal punishment is remitted which, in the sight of God, would have been remitted by so many days or years of penance in the early Church.
- (c) God alone knows exactly how much of the temporal punishment is actually taken away by an indulgence.

[p. 336] (d) The following are some ejaculations and invocations to which partial indulgences are attached:

An indulgence of 500 days for saying the ejaculation: “Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts: the heavens and the earth are full of Thy glory!” (*The Raccolta*, No. 2).

An indulgence of 300 days for saying the ejaculation: “My God and my All!” (*The Raccolta*, No. 5).

An indulgence of 500 days for saying the ejaculation: “O God, be merciful to me, the sinner” (*The Raccolta*, No. 14).

An indulgence of 300 days; a plenary indulgence under the usual conditions, if this invocation is devoutly recited every day for a month: “My Jesus, mercy!” (*The Raccolta*, No. 70).

An indulgence of 300 days; a plenary indulgence once a month under the usual conditions, for the daily repetition of: “O Sacrament most holy, O Sacrament divine! All praise and all thanksgiving be every moment Thine!” (*The Raccolta*, No. 136).

An indulgence 300 days; a plenary once a month on the usual conditions, if this invocation is devoutly re- [p. 337] peated daily: “O Mary, conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to thee!” (*The Raccolta*, No. 357).

439. *How does the Church by means of indulgences remit the temporal punishment due to sin?*

The Church by means of indulgences remits the temporal punishment due to sin by applying to us from her spiritual treasury part of the infinite satisfaction of Jesus Christ and of the superabundant satisfaction of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the saints.

- (a) In granting indulgences the Church exercises the power of the keys given to her by Christ.
- (b) When the Church, by means of an indulgence, remits the temporal punishment due to sin, this action is ratified in heaven.

*Scripture*

“But not like the offense is the gift. For if by the offense of the one the many died, much more has the grace of God, and the gift in the grace of the one man Jesus Christ, abounded unto the many. Nor is the gift as it was in the case of one man’s sin, for the judgment was from one man unto condemnation, but grace is from many offenses unto justification. For if by reason of the one man’s offense death reigned through the one man, much more will they who receive the abundance of the grace and of the gift of justice reign in life through the one Jesus Christ. Therefore as from the offense of the one man the result was unto condemnation to all men, so from the justice of the [p. 338] one the result is unto justification of life to all men. For just as by the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinners, so also by the obedience of the one the many will be constituted just. Now the Law intervened that the offense might abound. But where the offense has abounded, grace has abounded yet more; so that as sin has reigned unto death, so also grace may reign by justice unto life everlasting through Jesus Christ our Lord” (*Romans 5:15–21*).

“For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, bearing witness in his own time” (*I Timothy 2:5–6*).

“But if anyone sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just; and he is a propitiation for our sins, not for ours only but also for those of the whole world” (*I John 2:1–2*).

See Scripture, question 435, *Matthew 16:19–20*.

440. *What is the superabundant satisfaction of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the saints?*

The superabundant satisfaction of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the saints is that which they gained during their lifetime but did not need, and which the Church applies to their fellow members of the communion of saints.

441. *What must we do to gain an indulgence for ourselves?*

To gain an indulgence for ourselves we must be in the state of grace, have at least a general intention of gaining the indulgence, and perform the works required by the Church.

[p. 339] (a) Only baptized persons are capable of gaining indulgences.

(b) The state of grace is required for gaining an indulgence at least at the moment when the prescribed work is finished. Even a person in mortal sin, therefore, can begin to gain an indulgence, unless the prescribed work demands the state of grace, for example, Holy Communion.

(c) Since a general intention is sufficient to gain indulgences, it is well to express from time to time, especially in our morning prayer, the desire to gain all the indulgences attached to the prayers we shall say and to the good works we shall perform.

(d) To gain an indulgence the work required by the Church must be performed fully and according to the prescribed time, place, and manner.

442. *Can we gain indulgences for others?*

We cannot gain indulgences for other living persons, but we can gain them for the souls in purgatory, since the Church makes most indulgences applicable to them.

*Scripture*

“Then they all blessed the just judgment of the Lord, who had discovered the things that were hidden. And so betaking themselves to prayers they besought him that the sin which had been [p. 340] committed might be forgotten. But the most valiant Judas exhorted the people to keep themselves from sin, forasmuch as they saw before their eyes what had happened because of the sins of those that were slain.

“And making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection.

“(For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.)

“And because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness had great grace laid up for them.

“It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins” (II Maccabees 12:41–45).

### **859. Indulgences, for the Dead—Uncertainty as to Degree of Benefit**

SOURCE: T. Lincoln Bouscaren and Adam C. Ellis, *Canon Law: A Text and Commentary*, pp. 325, 326. Copyright 1946 by The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee. Used by permission.

[p. 325] *Indulgences Defined*. An indulgence is the remission before God of the temporal punishment due for sins whose guilt has already been forgiven, granted by ecclesiastical authority from the treasury of the Church, by way of absolution for the living and by way of suffrage for the departed (cf. c. 911)...

[p. 326] 5. *By way of suffrage for the departed*. These have passed out of the Church’s jurisdiction, but if they died in the state of grace they are still her suffering members through the Communion of Saints. Hence, though she cannot juridically determine the application of it, she implores God to accept a designated share of her treasury and apply it to the departed soul. Is the effect in this case infallible? Many hold

that, since the Church represents Christ, *some* effect is infallible, that is, that God will certainly accept the satisfaction so offered and apply it to some soul, not necessarily to the soul designated nor in the measure specified. Others hold that all rests in the inscrutable dominion and mercy of God. If not infallible, how does such an application of indulgences by the Church differ from the ordinary prayers of the faithful? To ask this question is to answer it. In one case it is the Church herself imploring God and offering the merits of Christ; in the other it is mere man offering a supernatural prayer more or less imperfect. Their manner of operation is similar (both are suffrages or intercession); but their power is unequal, that of the Church is far more effective.

### **860. Indulgences, Sale of (1512), by Tetzel**

SOURCE: Oswald Myconius, trans. in Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 338–340. Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1933 Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[p. 338] Abuses in the Sale of Indulgences, 1512.

Fr. Myconius, *Geschichte der Reformation*.

[Translator's introduction:] Cardinal Raymond, papal legate in 1503, complained that the agents who sold indulgences were actuated only by the basest motives of gain and were thoroughly dishonest.

Myconius (his German name was Mecum) was a Franciscan monk who became a Protestant...

[p. 339] Anno 1512. Tetzel gained by his preaching in Germany an immense sum of money which he sent to Rome. A very large sum was collected at the new mining works at St. Annaberg, where I heard him for two years. It is incredible what this ignorant and impudent monk used to say... He declared that if they contributed readily and bought grace and indulgence, all the hills of St. Annaberg would become pure massive silver. Also, that, as soon as the coin clinked in the chest, the soul for whom the money was paid would go straight to heaven... The indulgence was so highly prized that when the agent came to a city the bull was carried on a satin or gold cloth, and all the priests and monks, the town council, school-master, scholars, men, women, girls, and children went out in procession to meet it with banners, candles, and songs. All the bells were rung and organs played. He was conducted into the church, a red cross was erected in the centre of the church, and the pope's banner displayed...

Anno 1517. It is incredible what this ignorant monk said and preached. He gave sealed letters stating that even the sins which a man was intending to commit would be forgiven. [p. 340] He said the pope had more power than all the apostles, all the angels and saints, even than the Virgin Mary herself. For these were all subject to Christ, but the pope was equal to Christ. After his ascension into heaven Christ had nothing more to do with the management of the church until the judgment day, but had committed all that to the pope as his vicar and vicegerent.

### **861. Indulgences, Sale of (1517)—Instructions From Tetzel's Archbishop**

SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 2, No. 6 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189-]), pp. 4–9.

[Translator's introduction; p. 4] The Archbishop of Mainz arranged with the Pope in 1515 to conduct the sale of indulgences in his own vast archiepiscopal provinces, Mainz and Magdeburg, for one-half the proceeds. The plan was not carried out until 1517 when, we may infer, the undated Instructions to Subcommissioners were drawn up, a portion of which is given below. These instructions, Cardinal Hergenröther observes, "corresponding with the teaching of the church, cannot be a source of reproach to the Elector" (*Conciliengeschichte*, IX, II)...

Archbishop Albert's instructions to the sub-commissioners.

Gerdes: *Introductio in Historiam Evangelii Seculo XVI Renovati*, Supplement to Vol. I, pp. 90, *sqq.*

\*\*\* Here follow the four principal graces and privileges, which are granted by the apostolic bull, of which each may be obtained without the other. In the matter of these four privileges preachers shall take pains to commend each to believers with the greatest care, and, in-so-far as in their power lies, to explain the same.

The first grace is the complete remission of all sins; and nothing greater than this can be named, since man who lives in sin and forfeits the favor of God, obtains complete remission by these means and once more enjoys God's favor: moreover, through this remission of sins the punishment which one is obliged to undergo in Purgatory on account of the affront to the divine Majesty, is all remitted, and the pains of Purgatory completely blotted out. And although nothing is precious enough to be given in exchange for such a grace,—since it is the free gift of God and a grace beyond price,—yet in order that Christian believers may be the more easily induced to procure the same, we establish the following rules, to wit:

In the first place every one who is contrite in heart, and has made oral confession, or at all events has the intention of confessing at a suitable time, shall visit at least the seven churches indicated for this purpose, that is to say, those in which the papal arms are displayed, and in each church shall say devoutly five Paternosters and five Ave Marias in honor of the five wounds of our Lord Jesus Christ, whereby our salvation is won, or one *Miserere*, which Psalm is particularly well adapted for obtaining forgiveness of sins...

[p. 5] *Respecting, now, the contribution to the chest*, for the building of the said church of the chief of the apostles [the present St. Peter's church in Rome], the penitentiaries and confessors, after they have explained to those making confession the full remission and privileges, shall ask of them, for how much money or other temporal goods they would conscientiously go without the said most complete remission and privileges; and this shall be done in order that hereafter they may be brought the more easily to contribute. And because the conditions and occupations of men are so manifold and diverse that we cannot consider them individually, and impose specific rates accordingly, we have therefore concluded that the rates should be determined according to the recognized classes of persons. [The rates here follow.] ...

[p. 6] And those that have no money, they shall supply their contribution with prayer and fasting; for the Kingdom of Heaven should be open to the poor not less than to the rich...

The second signal grace is a confessional letter containing the most extraordinarily comforting and hitherto unheard of privileges... [p. 7] There will be granted in the confessional letter, to those who buy: first, the power to choose a qualified confessor, even a monk from the mendicant orders, who shall absolve them first and foremost, with the consent of the persons involved, from all censures by whomsoever imposed; in the second place, from each and every crime, even the greatest, and as well from those reserved to the apostolic see, once in a lifetime and in the hour of death; third, in those cases which are not reserved, as often as necessary; fourth, the chosen confessor may grant him complete forgiveness of all sins once in life, and at the hour of death, as often as it may seem at hand, although death ensue not; and, fifth, transform all kinds of vows, excepting alone those solemnly taken, into other works of piety (as when one has vowed to perform the journey to the Holy Land, or to visit the holy Apostles at Rome, to make a

pilgrimage to St. James at Compostella, to become a monk, or to take a vow of chastity); sixth, the confessor may administer to him the sacrament of the altar at all seasons, except on Easter day, and in the hour of death.

We furthermore ordain that one of these confessional letters shall be given and imparted for the quarter of a Rhenish gold guilder, in order that the poor shall not thereby be shut out from the manifold graces therein contained; it may however happen that nobles and other wealthy persons may, out of devotion and liberality, be disposed to give more. . .

[p. 8] The third most important grace is . . . that contributors toward the said building, together with their deceased relations, who have departed this world in a state of grace, shall from now and for eternity, be partakers in all petitions, intercessions, alms, fastings, prayers, in each and every pilgrimage, even those to the Holy Land; furthermore, in the stations at Rome, in the masses, canonical hours, flagellations, and all other spiritual goods which have been brought forth or which shall be brought forth by the universal, most holy church militant or by any of its members. Believers will become participants in all these things who purchase confessional letters. Preachers and confessors must insist with great perseverance upon these advantages, and persuade believers that they should not neglect to acquire these along with their confessional letter.

We also declare that in order to acquire these two most important graces, it is not necessary to make confession, or to visit the churches and altars, but merely to purchase the confessional letter. . .

The fourth distinctive grace is for those souls which are in purgatory, and is the complete remission of all sins, which remission the pope brings to pass through his intercession to the advantage of said souls, in this wise; that the same contribution shall be placed in the chest by a living person as one would make for himself. It is our wish, however, that our subcommissioners should modify the regulations regarding contributions of this kind which are given for the dead, and that they should use their judgment in all other cases, where in their opinion modifications are desirable. It is furthermore not necessary that the persons who place their contributions in the chest for the dead should be contrite in heart and have orally confessed, since this grace is based simply on the state of grace in which the dead departed, and on the contribution of the living, as is evident [p. 9] from the text of the bull. Moreover, preachers shall exert themselves to give this grace the widest publicity, since through the same, help will surely come to departed souls, and the construction of the Church of St. Peter will be abundantly promoted at the same time.

### **862. Indulgences, Trent Decree Concerning**

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXV (Dec. 3 and 4, 1563), Decree Concerning Indulgences, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, pp. 173, 174. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 173] The sacred, holy synod teaches and enjoins that the use of indulgences for the Christian people, most salutary and approved of by the authority of sacred councils, is to be retained in the Church; and it condemns with anathema those who either assert that they are useless, or who deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them. . . It ordains generally by this decree that all evil gains for the obtaining thereof—[p. 174] whence a most prolific cause of abuses among the Christian people has been derived—be wholly abolished.

### **863. Infallibility, Papal, and Ex Cathedra Utterances**

SOURCE: Geddes MacGregor, *The Vatican Revolution* (Boston: Beacon, 1957), pp. 134–136, 139–141. Copyright 1957 by Geddes MacGregor. Used by permission of The Macmillan & Co., Ltd., London, and the author.

[p. 134] We are left, according to the testimony of modern Roman Catholic theologians, [in doubt] on the subject of whether papal utterances in the past were *ex cathedra* and therefore infallible, or private observations and therefore as fallible as those of anyone else. Hefele, the most learned [p. 135] authority on the subject, took the view<sup>4</sup> [Note 4: *History of the Councils*, English edition, Vol. V, p. 61.] that the seventh-century Pope Honorius, who was anathematized by both an ecumenical council and a subsequent pope (Leo II), was giving a doctrinal instruction to the whole Eastern Church and, implicitly, to all Christendom...

Hefele wrote a special pamphlet on the subject of Honorius and his account of the affair would seem to be fatal to the personal infallibility of popes. Other modern Roman Catholic theologians, therefore, try to escape from the difficulty by contending that Honorius could not have been speaking *ex cathedra* at the time he made the utterance that was subsequently condemned and is now universally held to have been heretical. This is a difficult course for them to have to take; yet not impossible. The point is that it is almost always possible to question whether a pronouncement is *ex cathedra*.

We do not, indeed, have to go as far back as the seventh century to be confronted with doubt whether a papal utterance was given out as *ex cathedra* or not: there is an eminently important example among others that could be cited in our own time. Dom E. C. Butler correctly says<sup>6</sup> [Note 6: *History of the Vatican Council*, Vol. II, p. 228.] that theologians in the 1860's and 1870's very commonly defended the *Syllabus [of Errors]* as an *ex cathedra* and therefore infallible document, though this was questioned by Fessler, the papal secretary at the Vatican Council, but that this view of it is to be dismissed as "being now almost given up." Pius himself maintained, however, that in applying the Vatican Decree there [p. 136] could be no such difficulty for any man of good will, since the Vatican definition was as clear as daylight. But there were certainly many very sincere persons within the Roman fold who, three-quarters of a century ago, believed the *Syllabus* to be an infallible utterance. There can be no doubt that Pius was aware of this fact, and yet only a generation later very few regarded the notorious *Syllabus* as having this all-important quality...

[p. 139] One looks in vain in the Codex of Canon Law for any commentary on the meaning of the words *ex cathedra*...

Dom E. C. Butler considers the question whether there had indeed been any [p. 140] infallible pronouncements from the time of the Vatican Decree till the date of his writing, some sixty years later. According to two of the experts he cites on this question, Père Choupin and Père Dublanchy, there probably were none. Nevertheless, some have supposed that the declaration, by Leo XIII, of the nullity of Anglican Orders, was an infallible pronouncement. Dom Cuthbert Butler doubts, however, whether that pronouncement was really invested with this character. Neither the word "define" nor the expression *ex cathedra* was used, so that there is ample room for doubt. Ought Leo to have left such room? Much less conspicuous officials of both Church and State are



accustomed to feel it their duty to take considerable precaution in making clear whether they are speaking *ex officiis* or “off the record.”

We now turn for enlightenment, not unnaturally, to the bishop who was papal secretary at the Vatican Council itself. But Fessler only tells us blandly that we are not to expect easily to discern an *ex cathedra* utterance. No mere circumstances suffice in themselves, he says, to enable us to recognize whether that which a pope proclaims is or is not an *ex cathedra* definition. It is only, he affirms, when it is *acknowledged* that the circumstances and the words and the pronouncement itself *all* support the view that it has been the papal intention to make an *ex cathedra* definition that the pronouncement may be presumed to be *ex cathedra*...

[p. 141] Who is to speak with greater authority concerning the interpretation of the intention of the Pope but the Pope himself, who evidently is not to be expected to do so? The interpretation, therefore, must always be left to others whose authority to make it is limited, and so, while having an infallible Pope, we can never know infallibly whether his definition is infallible or not.

#### **864. Infallibility, Papal, Cardinal Manning on**

SOURCE: Henry Edward [Manning], *Petri Privilegium* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1871), third pastoral letter, pp. 112, 113.

- [p. 112] 1. The privilege of infallibility is *personal*, inasmuch as it attaches to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of [p. 113] Peter, as a *public person*, distinct from, but inseparably united to, the Church; but it is not personal, in that it is attached, not to the private person, but to the primacy, which he alone possesses.
2. It is also *independent*, inasmuch as it does not depend upon either the *Ecclesia docens* or the *Ecclesia discens*; but it is not independent, in that it depends in all things upon the Divine Head of the Church, upon the institution of the primacy by him, and upon the assistance of the Holy Ghost.
  3. It is *absolute*, inasmuch as it can be circumscribed by no human or ecclesiastical law; it is not absolute, in that it is circumscribed by the office of guarding, expounding, and defending the deposit of revelation.
  4. It is *separate* in no sense, nor can be, nor can so be called, without manifold heresy, unless the word be taken to mean *distinct*. In this sense, the Roman Pontiff is distinct subject of infallibility; and in the exercise of his supreme doctrinal authority, or magisterium, he does not depend for the infallibility of his definitions upon the consent or consultation of the Episcopate, but only on the Divine assistance of the Holy Ghost.

#### **865. Infallibility, Papal, Decreed by Vatican Council, 1870**

SOURCE: Vatican Council, Session IV (July 18, 1870), First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ (*Pastor Aeternus*), chap. IV, Concerning the Infallible Teaching of the Roman Pontiff, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 266–271.

[p. 266] Moreover, that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the Apostolic primacy, which the Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, possesses over the whole Church, this Holy See has always held, the perpetual practice of the Church confirms, and oecumenical Councils also have declared, especially those in which the East with the West met in the union of faith and charity. For the

Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, gave forth this solemn profession: The first condition of salvation is to keep the rule of the true faith. And because the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ can not be passed by, who said: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,' these things which have been said are approved by events, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion and her holy and well-known doctrine has always been kept undefiled. De- [p. 267] siring, therefore, not to be in the least degree separated from the faith and doctrine of that See, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion, which the Apostolic See preaches, in which is the entire and true solidity of the Christian religion... Finally, the Council of Florence defined: That the Roman Pontiff is the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and the teacher of all Christians...

[p. 268] The Roman Pontiffs, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, sometimes assembling oecumenical Councils, or asking for the mind of the Church scattered throughout the world, sometimes by particular Synods, sometimes using other helps which Divine Providence supplied, de- [p. 269] fined as to be held those things which with the help of God they had recognized as conformable with the sacred Scriptures and Apostolic traditions. For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter, that by his revelation they might make known new doctrine; but that by his assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles. And, indeed, all the venerable Fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have venerated and followed, their Apostolic doctrine; knowing most fully that this See of holy Peter remains ever that this See of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error according to the divine promise of the Lord our Saviour made to the Prince of his disciples: 'I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren.'

This gift, then, of truth and never-failing faith was conferred by heaven upon Peter and his successors in this chair, that they might perform their high office for the salvation of all; that the whole flock of Christ, kept away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the pas- [p. 270] ture of heavenly doctrine; that the occasion of schism being removed, the whole Church might be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell.

But since in this very age, in which the salutary efficacy of the Apostolic office is most of all required, not a few are found who take away from its authority, we judge it altogether necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God vouch-safed to join with the supreme pastoral office.

Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Re- [p. 271] deemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that

therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irrefragable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church.

But if any one—which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition: let him be anathema.

Given at Rome in public Session solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate.

### **866. Infallibility, Papal—Errors of Popes, Luther on**

SOURCE: *Luthers Werke* (Erlangen, 1828–1870), *trans.* and *ed.* by H. Wace and C. A. Buckheim in *First Principles of the Reformation* (Philadelphia, 1885), pp. 159–239, *passim*. Reprinted in Louis L. Snyder, *ed.*, *Documents of German History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), pp. 69, 70. Copyright © 1958 by Rutgers, The State University. Used by permission.

[p. 69] They assume authority, and juggle before us with impudent words, saying that the Pope cannot err in matters of faith, whether he be evil or good, albeit they cannot prove it by a single letter... We will quote the Scriptures. St. Paul says, “If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace” (1 Cor. 14:30). What would be the use of this commandment, if we were to believe him alone that teaches or has the highest seat? Christ Himself says, “And they shall be all taught of God” (John 6:45). Thus it may come to pass that the Pope and his followers are wicked and not true Christians, and not being taught by God, have no true understanding, whereas a common man may have true understanding. Why should we then not follow him? Has not the Pope often erred? ...

Therefore it is a wickedly devised fable—and they cannot quote a single letter to confirm it—that it is for the Pope alone to interpret [p. 70] the Scriptures or to confirm the interpretation of them. They have assumed the authority of their own selves. And though they say that this authority was given to St. Peter when the keys were given to him, it is plain enough that the keys were not given to St. Peter alone, but to the whole community.

### **867. Infallibility, Papal, Historical Problem of**

SOURCE: J. J. Ign. von Döllinger, *Fables Respecting the Popes of Middle Ages*, *trans.* by Alfred Plummer (London: Rivingtons, 1871), pp. 219, 220.

[p. 219] ALVARO PELAYO, who, next to AUGUSTINE OF ANCONA [Augustinus Triumphus], furthered the aggrandisement of the papal power, with the greatest zeal, beyond all previous bounds, and almost beyond all limits whatever, in his great work on the condition of the Church, makes mention of the judgment which came upon Anastasius, in order to prove his dictum, that an heretical pope must receive a far heavier sentence than any other. OCCAM, also, makes use of the “heretical” Anastasius as an instance to prove, what was his main point, that the Church erred by his recognition. The council of Basle in like manner, with a view to establishing the necessary supremacy of an oecumenical council [p. 220] over the pope, did not fail to appeal to the fact, that popes who did not obey the Church were treated by her as heathens and publicans, as one reads of Liberius and Anastasius.

“The pope,” says DOMENICUS DEI DOMENICI, bishop of Torcello, somewhat later, in a letter addressed to pope Calixtus III. (1455–58), “the pope by himself alone is not an infallible rule of faith, for some popes have erred in faith, as, for example, Liberius and Anastasius II., and the latter was in consequence punished by God.” After him the Belgian JOHN LE MAIRE, also, says (about 1515), Liberius and Anastasius are the two

popes of ancient times, who, subsequent to the Donation of Constantine, obtained an infamous reputation in the Church as heretics.

### **868. Infallibility, Papal, Newman's Celebrated Letter on**

SOURCE: Extract from a letter from John Henry Newman to Bishop Ullathorne, quoted in *Letters From Rome on the Council*, by Quirinus [J. J. I. von Dollinger] (London: Rivingtons, 1870), pp. 356–358.

[p. 356] As to myself personally, please God, I do not expect any trial at all; but I cannot help suffering with the many souls who are suffering, and I look with anxiety at the prospect of having to defend decisions which may not be difficult to my own private judgment, but may be most difficult to maintain logically in the face of historical facts...

[p. 357] With these thoughts ever before me, I am continually asking myself whether I ought not to make my feelings public; but all I do is to pray those early doctors of the Church, whose intercession would decide [p. 358] the matter (Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Basil) to avert this great calamity.

If it is God's will that the Pope's infallibility be defined, then it is God's will to throw back "the times and moments" of that triumph which He has destined for His kingdom, and I shall feel I have but to bow my head to His adorable, inscrutable Providence.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Among the most noted converts from the Church of England to the Roman Catholic Church was John Henry Newman, who was made cardinal by Pope Leo XIII in 1879. This letter was written by him during the Vatican Council, when it appeared likely that the Council would adopt the decree of infallibility.]

### **869. Infallibility, Papal, Not Catholic Dogma Before 1870**

SOURCE: Stephen Keenan, *A Doctrinal Catechism* (New York: Edward Dunigan & Brother, 1848), pp. 305, 306.

[p. 305] **Q.** *Must not Catholics believe the Pope in himself to be infallible?*

**A.** This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic faith; no decision of his can oblige, under pain of heresy, unless it be [p. 306] received and enforced by the teaching body,—that is, by the Bishops of the Church. [See No. 870.]

### **870. Infallibility, Papal, Not Universally Taught in Past**

SOURCE: J. J. Ign. von Döllinger, *Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891), p. 84.

In several pastoral letters and manifestoes of recent date from the bishops, the opinion is maintained, or an historical proof is attempted, that the new doctrine of papal omnipotence over every individual Christian, and of papal infallibility in decisions of faith as proclaimed at Rome, has always been believed and taught universally, or, at all events, almost universally in the Church from the earliest times and throughout all the centuries. This assertion rests, as I am ready to prove, on a complete misunderstanding of ecclesiastical tradition in the first thousand years of the Church, and on a distortion of her history.

[EDITORS'S NOTE: Among the most illustrious and learned Catholic prelates and scholars who strenuously opposed the doctrine of the dogma of infallibility were Archbishop Darboy of Paris, Bishop Dupanloup of Orleans, Bishop Hefele of Hefele of Rottenburg (Charles Joseph Hefele, the author of the celebrated *History of the Councils of the Church*), Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, and J. J. Ign. von Döllinger, the well-known historian and theologian. Peter Richard Kenrick, Archbishop of St. Louis, prepared a speech to be delivered in the Vatican Council, but as he was prevented from delivering this speech by the sudden and unexpected closing of the debate, it was printed and circulated among the bishops at the council. The original of this famous speech is found in *Documenta ad Illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum*, part 1, pages 189–226. A translation of it is found in *An Inside View of the Vatican Council*, issued by the American Tract Society, New York, pages 95–166. See No. 1224.]

### **871. Infallibility, Papal—Scope and Limitations**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, pp. 165–167.

[p. 165] It [papal infallibility] does not mean that the Pope is infallible in his *private* opinions on theology and religion. As a man, he may be a heretic (as Liberius, Honorius, and John XXII.), or even an unbeliever (as John XXIII. [see editors' note], [p. 166] and, perhaps, Leo X.), and yet, at the same time, infallible as Pope, after the fashion of Balaam and Kaiphas.

Nor does it mean that infallibility extends beyond the proper sphere of religion and the Church. The Pope may be ignorant of science and literature, and make grave mistakes in his political administration, or be misinformed on matters of fact (unless necessarily involved in doctrinal decisions), and yet be infallible in defining articles of faith.

Infallibility does not imply impeccability. And yet freedom from error and freedom from sin are so nearly connected in men's minds that it seems utterly impossible that such moral monsters as Alexander VI. and those infamous Popes who disgraced humanity during the Roman pornocracy in the tenth and eleventh centuries, should have been vicars of Jesus Christ and infallible organs of the Holy Ghost. If the inherent infallibility of the visible Church logically necessitates the infallibility of the visible head, it is difficult to see why the same logic should not with equal conclusiveness derive the personal holiness of the head from the holiness of the body.

On the other hand, the dogma does mean that all official utterances of the Roman Pontiff addressed to the Catholic Church on matters of Christian faith and duty are infallibly true, and must be accepted with the same faith as the word of the living God... This infallibility extends over eighteen centuries, and is a special privilege conferred by Christ upon Peter, and through him upon all his legitimate successors. It belongs to every Pope... It is per- [p. 167] sonal, i. e., inherent in Peter and the Popes; it is independent, and needs no confirmation from the Church or an oecumenical Council, either preceding or succeeding; its decrees are binding, and can not be rejected without running the risk of eternal damnation.

Even within the narrow limits of the Vatican decision there is room for controversy on the precise meaning of the figurative term *ex cathedra loqui*, and the extent of faith and *morals*, viz., whether Infallibility includes only the supernatural order of revealed truth and duty, or also natural and political duties, and questions of mere history, such as Peter's residence in Rome, the number of oecumenical Councils, the teaching of Jansen and Quesnel, and other disputed facts closely connected with dogmas. But the main point is clear enough.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The John XXIII here mentioned was a pope who was later repudiated to the extent that his number, XXIII, was not counted. That is how it is possible for the modern Pope John XXIII to carry the same number.]

### **872. Infallibility, Papal—Significance of Dogma**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, pp. 164, 165.

[p. 164] The dogma of Papal Infallibility ... involves a question of absolute power... [p. 165] It is the direct antipode of the Protestant principle of the absolute supremacy and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures. It establishes a perpetual divine oracle in the Vatican. Every Catholic may hereafter say, I believe—not because Christ, or the Bible, or the Church, but—because the infallible Pope has so declared and commanded...

If the dogma is false, it involves a blasphemous assumption, and makes the nearest approach to the fulfillment of St. Paul's prophecy of the man of sin, who 'as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself off that he is God' (2 Thess. ii. 4).

### **873. Inquisition, Medieval, Not Justifiable**

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (reprint; Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), pp. 117, 118. First published in 1938 but William Heinemann, Ltd., London. Used by permission of both publishers.

[p. 117] We must not be hypercritical; but, on the other hand, we must not attempt to justify the unjustifiable... We must cast the main blame not on individuals, but on the spirit of the age, newly emerged from barbarism and lacking that respect for toleration which, after all, has come more from the practical experience of the last four centuries than from any speculation or argument. To us, the [p. 118] historical effect of past religious wars has brought conclusive proof that neither orthodox nor unorthodox can in fact exterminate each other, and therefore that agreement to differ is happiest for both parties. The Middle Ages had not that experience, nor sufficient knowledge of history to make up for their disadvantage. They erred, we may say, in invincible ignorance, and the most selfrighteous among us may well confess that he himself might have erred with them. But that is no excuse for setting ourselves, with history and experience before us, to justify their error. If indeed, as Lord Acton wrote: "the principle of the Inquisition is murderous," then no man in cold blood can justify what our forefathers did, without becoming an accomplice after the fact.

### **874. Inquisition, Papal, Beginning of**

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (reprint; Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), pp. 110, 112–114. First published in 1938 by William Heinemann, Ltd., London. Used by permission of both publishers.

[p. 110] What has been called the Episcopal Inquisition [that carried on by each local bishop] had proved evidently insufficient. By this institution, first from 1184 onwards, and then with redoubled emphasis at the Lateran in 1215, it was made the Bishop's duty to enquire after heretics throughout his diocese, and for the faithful in each parish to report any suspect, even though it were his own parent or child. This, again, broke down through the remissness or incapacity or immorality of many prelates, with rivalries or jealousies between Church and State authorities. Evidently persecution must be further systematised and the edge of the law sharpened: there must no longer be this more or less ambiguous talk of "extermination," but the plainest insistence upon the sword or the stake. Innocent himself would probably have undertaken this if he had long outlived the Lateran Council; fourteen years later it was undertaken by Gregory IX, the friend and patron of St. Francis, who had been as distinguished a canon lawyer as Innocent himself... [p. 112] Gregory IX then circularised all the bishops, to press upon them the need of systematic and ubiquitous enquiry, *inquisitio*, into the beliefs of their flocks. In some of the Italian cities, again, the magistrates were burning heretics. From 1227 to 1233 he gave full support and encouragement to the fanatic Conrad of Marburg...

[p. 113] In 1233 he formally entrusted the work to the recently formed and specially enthusiastic Dominican Order. From among these he named certain Inquisitors, whom he sent to different lands with powers to work with, and in many ways to supersede, the diocesan bishops. It is from this year that we must date, in so far as an exact date may be fixed, the full-blown Inquisition: the *Monastic*, as some call it, in view of the fact that it was mainly worked by Dominicans and Franciscans: or the *Papal*, as it may be more exactly called in virtue of the absolute papal responsibility for its creation...

Vacandard writes truly: "In short, Gregory IX only pressed upon Christendom the application of already existing laws, and introduced, when no such existed, the most rigorous legislation against heresy. But what belongs [p. 114] specially to him is the procedure to which he had recourse for the prosecution of heretics: that is, his Inquisitorial system. The Inquisition proper, the *Monastic*, is in fact his work."

### **875. Inquisition, Papal, Defined**

SOURCE: K. Benrath, "Inquisition," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 6, p. 1. Copyright 1910 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

The Inquisition (*Inquisitio haereticae pravitatis*) or the "Holy Office" (*Sanctum officium*) is the name of the spiritual court of the Roman Catholic Church for the detection and punishment of those whose opinions differ from the doctrines of the Church. It was a comparatively late outgrowth of ancient ecclesiastical discipline. "In the primitive Church there was no arrangement that could have borne even a remote resemblance to the Inquisition... The whole instinct and the prevailing cast of thought of Christendom in the first four centuries was opposed to compulsion in religious affairs." (J. J. I. von Dollinger, *Kleinere Schriften*, p. 295, Stuttgart, 1890.) The institution of "elder for repentance" ..., which occurs in the third century, bears quite a different character, as the very name denotes. Of course deviations in the sphere of Christian doctrine were combated, but hardly with other than spiritual weapons; and this practise continued until Theodosius (d. 395), before a Christian emperor found it advisable to impose an ultimate death penalty on (Manichean) heresy. Chrysostom repudiated such action: "It is not right to put a heretic to death, since an implacable war would be brought into the world" (*Hom.* x1vi. on Matt. xiii. 24–30); and still in the neighborhood of 450 the church historian Socrates characterized persecution for heresy as foreign to the orthodox Church. Nevertheless, in the meantime Augustine, in his conflict with the Donatists, had set up the contrary doctrine in the West and had recommended compulsion as well as penalties against heretics (*Epist.* xciii., c1xxxv.), though he did not approve the death penalty. Six centuries more passed before the theory of religious compulsion and of the violent extirpation of heresy came to have universal validity, although Pope Leo I. (*Epist.* xv., *ad Turribium*) had approved it in the fifth century. This long season of comparative tolerance is the more impressive in view of the circumstance that in Italy under East Gothic and Lombard rule, Catholics and Arians lived whole centuries in close proximity, or even together (as in Ravenna).

### **876. Inquisition, Papal—Development**

SOURCE: Alfred Baudrillart, *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance and Protestantism*, trans. by Mrs. Philip Gibbs (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1908), pp. 156, 157. Used by permission of Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London.

[p. 156] Historically, the Inquisition may be traced back as far as the thirteenth century, but it was not until 1542 that Pope Paul III., by the bull *Licet ab initio* gave it the form and extent which made it a supreme tribunal for the whole Church; it can reach cardinals and bishops as well as plain laymen. Paul III. placed at its head Cardinal Caraffa, who proved pitiless. He began by renting a house in which he installed surgeons and provided chains and instruments of torture. He then proclaimed these four fundamental principles: there must be no delay in matters of faith; no consideration for

princes or prelates; no clemency for anyone who seeks protection from the secular power; indefatigable activity in seeking out traces of Calvinism everywhere. When he became Pope Paul III. [i.e. IV], Caraffa pursued his course with extreme severity and did not spare such cardinals as Morone and Pole, who had spent their lives in defence of the Church. Pius IV., Pius V., Sixtus V. were to complete the work begun by Paul III. and to make the congregation of the Inquisition, [p. 157] or the Holy Office, the highest authority of the Roman Curia.

### **877. Inquisition, Papal, Procedures of**

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (reprint; Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), pp. 119–121, 123–125, 128–130. First published in 1938 by William Heinemann, Ltd., London. Used by permission of both publishers.

[p. 119] Procedure was by way of *inquisitio*, enquiry. If the man was branded as suspect by public report, ... the authorities might bring him into court. In this case his position was reversed; his guilt was assumed unless he could prove his innocence...

(2) Again, the judges were purely ecclesiastical: that is, interested parties. The civil powers vainly attempted to assert the right of even consulting the documents...

(3) The procedure was secret, and the Inquisitors jealously guarded their records from all outsiders.

(4) The names of the hostile witnesses were generally concealed, on the plea that this was necessary for their [p. 120] protection. Even when the Inquisitors took assessors to assist their judgment, no names were generally put before them, whether of the accused or of the witnesses...

[p. 121] (5) Whereas, in all other courts, the evidence of infamous persons or heretics was ruled out, in this court they were welcomed, so long as their testimony was hostile...

[p. 123] (6) In accordance with this same spirit, ordinary justice was no less grossly violated in the matter of advocacy. Innocent III, in a decree afterwards inserted in Canon Law, forbade advocates or scribes to aid heretics...

(7) A very small nonconformity might be magnified into a crime punishable by death. We shall see later on that it finally became a burning matter to possess a Bible in the mother-tongue, or to wear garments disapproved by the authorities...

[p. 124] (8) Beyond this, the theory of “constructive heresy” was pushed to its farthest limits. Any apparent want of respect for the Church might form a *prima facie* ground for suspicion.

(9) Whereas the persecutor Trajan had forbidden Pliny to seek out the concealed Christian, yet the Inquisition compelled every man to spy upon his neighbour’s secrets. Neglect of talebearing was, in itself, constructive heresy. A heretic who abjured, and thus exchanged the stake for prison, was obliged first to promise that he “would prosecute the heretics, and inform against them, and reveal them wherever he knew them to be.” ...

[p. 125] (10) With all these dice loaded against the suspect, it is not surprising that acquittals pure and simple are almost unknown; the most that an accused could hope for was a verdict of “not proven.” ...

[p. 128] It is sometimes pleaded that, after all, there is no feature of Inquisitorial procedure of which examples cannot be found in one or other of contemporary law-courts. This would be at best a poor apology, to plead that this court, which was, above all others, the most characteristic creation of the Church, should adopt every fault of a



comparatively cruel and lawless age. But it is not even strictly true... A few extracts from the lengthy analysis with which Bernard Gui [a medieval inquisitor] prefaces the fourth book of [p. 129] his *Practica* will give a sufficient, though still incomplete, idea... “The Inquisitors’ excommunication is stronger than another man’s in four respects. (a) They can compel *podestas* or governors of cities to banish whomsoever they excommunicate; (b) they can likewise compel them to confiscate the goods of the excommunicate; (c) they can condemn as heretics all men who persist a whole year under their excommunication; (d) they can excommunicate all who participate or communicate with any whom they have excommunicated.” Again: “The Inquisitors’ power of punishment is mighty and excellent. (a) They can punish in person. (b) They can punish substantially in goods or possessions. (c) They can punish in reputation. (d) They can punish in honour. (e) The rigour of the power of the Office of the Inquisition, in those matters which are committed to the Inquisitors, must be executed according to their discretion and will.” ... “The execution of the Inquisitor’s office is free and untrammelled, for all impediments are swept away. (a) The Inquisitors have no impediment from their superiors. (b) They have none from the inferiors against whom they proceed. (c) They have none from the officials or ministers through whose ministry they act. (d) They have none from the witnesses whom they hear. (e) They have none from contingent defects.”

History affords few plainer examples of the demoralising [p. 130] effects of absolute power upon fairly ordinary men... “Released from all the restraint of publicity, and unrestricted by the formalities of law, the procedure of the Inquisition, as [the Inquisitor] Zanghino tells us, was purely arbitrary.”

### **878. Inquisition, Papal, Sorcerers Condemned by**

SOURCE: E. Vacandard, *The Inquisition*, trans. from the 2d ed. by Bertrand L. Conway (New York: Longmans, 1908), p. 201. Copyright 1907 by Bertrand L. Conway. Used by permission.

It is impossible to estimate the number of sorcerers condemned. Louis of Paramo triumphantly declared that in a century and a half the Holy Office sent to the stake over thirty thousand. Of course we must take such round numbers with a grain of salt, as they always are greatly exaggerated. But the fact remains that the condemnations for sorcery were so numerous as to stagger belief.

### **879. Inquisition, Papal, Today**

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (reprint; Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), pp. 313, 314. First published in 1938 by William Heinemann, Ltd., London. Used by permission of both publishers.

[p. 313] It [the papal Inquisition] still exists under the title of Holy Office; and though the 1917 *Code of Canon Law* has at last abolished corporal penalties for [p. 314] questions of faith, yet the principle has never been abandoned. In the present century two separate professors of distinction in Rome, with Papal encouragement, have taught that the Pope possesses the *right* (as apart from *expediency* or *present power*) of punishing all baptized Christians (Protestants included) for pertinacious nonconformity, either in goods or in body. And, since the *Code of Canon Law* is the Pope’s own creation and may be altered by any succeeding Pope with a single stroke of the pen, therefore Roman authority reposes still upon this principle which we have traced all down the Middle Ages. Thus, if any State ever became again a hundred per cent Catholic, it is difficult to see how it could avoid not merely the possibility, but even the moral compulsion, of reintroducing the principles, if not the whole methods, of the medieval Inquisition.

## **880. Inquisition, Spanish, Differentiated From Papal, or Roman, Inquisition**

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (reprint; Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), p. 283. First published in 1938 by William Heinemann, Ltd., London. Used by permission of both publishers.

By common agreement the Spanish Inquisition stands in a category by itself, both as to its constitution and in its effects.

As England was least Inquisition-ridden among all the great countries of Europe, Spain at the end of the Middle Ages was worst: so much so, that modern apologists commonly attempt to draw a clean line of demarcation here. Elsewhere, they admit, the *Ecclesia Romana* was definitely responsible for this institution; but in the Peninsula it was a State machine; whatever ill was done must be reckoned not to the Church, but to Ferdinand and Isabella, the enlightened despots who created modern Spain.

This is a deceptive half-truth. The instrument which, confessedly, Spanish sovereigns abused had been constructed by the papacy. It was specially adapted to the purposes for which Ferdinand and Isabella used it; and popes themselves had often tried to employ it with equal severity; in so far as they failed, it was for lack not of will but of power. Finally, the Spanish abuses claimed papal protection, and nearly always got it, tacitly if not explicitly: the rare papal protests were never clinched with deeds. Civil authorities were threatened, and sometimes punished with the gravest penalties, for neglecting to back up the Inquisition, but never for excessive and misguided severity. Thus the Inquisition became one of the principal features of national life. The modern Spaniard owes as much to this institution, whether by attraction or by repulsion, as Britain does to her parliamentary constitution.

## **881. Inquisition, Spanish, Dutch Condemned by**

SOURCE: John Lothrop Motley, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic* (New York: A. L. Burt, [n.d.]), Vol. 1, p. 626.

The Roman tyrant [Nero] wished that his enemies' heads were all upon a single neck, that he might strike them off at a blow; the inquisition assisted Philip [II of Spain] to place the heads of all his Netherland subjects upon a single neck for the same fell purpose. Upon February 16, 1568, a sentence of the Holy Office condemned *all the inhabitants* of the Netherlands *to death* as heretics. From this universal doom *only a few persons, especially named*, were excepted. A proclamation of the king, dated ten days later, confirmed this decree of the inquisition, and ordered it to be carried into instant execution, without regard to age, sex, or condition. This is probably the most concise death warrant that was ever framed. Three millions of people, men, women, and children, were sentenced to the scaffold in three lines.

1

## **882. Inquisition, Spanish—Number of Victims**

SOURCE: D. Juan Antonio Llorente, *The History of the Inquisition of Spain* (London: Geo. B. Whittaker, 1827), pp. 575, 582, 583. [FRS No. 92.]

[p. 575] It is impossible to determine the exact number of persons who perished in the first years after the establishment of the holy office. Persons were burnt in the year 1481, and the Supreme Council was not created until 1483. The registers in its archives, and

---

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

those of the inferior tribunals, are of a still later date; and as the inquisitor-general accompanied the court, which had no fixed residence until the reign of Philip II., many of the trials must have been lost during these journeys. These circumstances oblige me to found my calculations on the combination of certain data, which I found in the registers and writings of the holy office.

Mariana, in his History of Spain, informs us that, in 1481, the Inquisitors of Seville condemned two thousand persons to *relaxation*, that is, to be burnt, and that there were as many effigies; the number of persons reconciled was one thousand, seven hundred. The latter were always subjected to severe penances.

The *autos-da-fé* of this period, which I examined at Saragossa and Toledo, lead me to suppose that each tribunal of the Inquisition celebrated at least four *autos-da-fé* every year. The provincial tribunals were successively organised. I do not speak of those of Mexico, Lima, Carthagenia in America, Sicily or Sardinia, although they were subject to the Inquisitors-general and the Supreme Council, because I am only enabled to establish my calculation for those of the Peninsula and the neighbouring isles...

[p. 582] *Thirty-seventh inquisitor-general*. Don Manuel Isidro Manrique de Lara, Archbishop of Santiago, four years [apparently 1742–1746]. Burnt, 336. Effigies, 68. Penances, 816. Total, 1020.

*Thirty-eighth inquisitor-general*. Don Francisco Perez de Prado y Cuesta, Bishop of Teruel. He was confirmed by the Pope in 1746; I do not know the exact term of his administration, but I have fixed it in 1757, before the death of Ferdinand VI., who appointed his successor. Burnt, 10. Effigies, 5. Penances, 107. Total, 122.

*Thirty-ninth inquisitor-general*. ... Seventeen years. Burnt, 2. Penances, 10 in public, a greater number in private.

*Fortieth inquisitor-general*. Don Philip Bertran, Bishop of Salamanca, nine years. Two were burnt every year of this administration, six condemned to public, and a great number to private penances \*. [Footnote \*: The last person burnt by the Inquisition was a Beata, for having made a compact with the devil. She suffered on the 7th of November, 1781.]...

*Forty-fourth inquisitor-general*. Don Ramon Joseph de Arce, Archbishop of Saragossa, eleven years. Twenty individuals were condemned to public, and a very consider- [p. 583] able number to private penances. The Curate of Esco was condemned to the flames, but the grand-inquisitor and the Supreme Council would not permit the sentence to be executed.

[Totals for the whole period of the Spanish Inquisition, approximately 300 years:]

Number of persons who were condemned and perished in the flames .....	31,912
Effigies burnt .....	17,659
Condemned to severe penances	291,450

---

341,021

### 883. Intolerance, Catholic—Effect on Catholic Unity

SOURCE: Albert Hartmann, *Toleranz und Christlicher Glaube* (Tolerance and Christian Faith) (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht Carolusdruckerei, 1955), p. 223, trans. in A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 53. Used by permission of both publishers.

The application of force to maintain unity of faith has not succeeded in preventing the secularisation of the modern spirit [in the very countries where there is the so-called Catholic unity]. On the contrary, this secularisation is largely the outcome of such compulsion.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Bracketed section not in the original, but appears without brackets in the translation.]

### **884. Isidorian Decretals, a Stupendous Forgery**

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 326, 335, 337–339. Used by permission.

[p. 326] The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals were a curious collection of documents, both genuine and forged, which appeared in western Europe about the middle of the ninth century under the name of Isidore Mercator, to give the Church a definite, written constitution. They were a stupendous forgery—the most audacious and pious fraud ever perpetrated in the history of the Church—worked out with admirable skill and consummate ingeniousness. Forgery was a common thing in those days, and it was generally believed that all things which upheld the doctrines and prerogatives of the Church of God were allowable...

[p. 335] Pope Nicholas I. (853–867) gave them papal sanction and used them to extend his power. He led the Church to believe that they were among the most venerable and carefully preserved documents of the papal archives. Backed up by them, he asserted his jurisdiction over both East and West; in fact, the whole world...

[p. 337] These forged decretals gave the Papacy a definite constitution; the Petrine theory was now proved by indisputable historical evidence—the ideal Papacy was made a fact from the very first... The Popes from St. Peter on were made the parents and guardians of the faith of the world, and the legislators for it, and also the supreme judges in all cases of justice. In short this constitution logically completed the Petrine theory...

[p. 338] Imperial control of the Church, exercised for eight centuries, was declared to be a usurpation which entailed disputes and wars. The state was represented as unholy, the Church as holy... In short these decretals carried the papal theocracy [p. 339] far beyond any claims made up to that time by the Popes themselves. It was left to Gregory VII. and Innocent III. to make the claim a living reality...

Both the civil and ecclesiastical polity of Europe was affected for centuries to follow. Over and over again they were quoted to prove papal omnipotence against temporal authority...

In this period of ignorance and lawlessness, while the Empire established by Charles the Great was disintegrating, the Papacy rapidly forged to the front as the champion of united Christendom; and to this end the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals contributed powerfully.

### **885. Islam, History, Practices, and Teachings of**

SOURCE: Salma Bishlawy, "Islam," in Vergilius Ferm, ed., *Religion in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 155–159, 161, 162, 167–170. Copyright 1948 by The Philosophical Library, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 155] Islam ... claims for its adherents about one-eighth of the world's population, over 250,000,000 [in 1961 estimated at about 350,000,000], and extends from Morocco to Zanzibar, from Sierra Leone to China, from the Balkans to the Philippines. Besides the nations of the Near East where the population is predominantly Mohammedan, the ninety

millions in India and the millions in China and Russia, there are communities of Muslims in Lithuania, the Cape Colony, West India Islands, British [and] Dutch Guiana, England, Australia, Japan, ... United States...

[p. 156] Muhammad was born to the clan of Banu Hashim, of the leading Meccan tribe of Quraish around 570 A.D.... He was a caravan conductor until his marriage to his employer, Khadījah, a wealthy widow fifteen years his senior and a woman of great character. This union which came when he was about twenty-five years of age, brought him freedom from economic care and enabled him to pursue his spiritual inclinations.

According to Muslim tradition, Muhammad, who had periodically [p. 157] sought solitude for his meditation, received his divine call (610 A.D.) in a cave outside Mecca... Fired by his vision he began to preach the Unity of God, the Creator, His omnipotence, the rewards of the believers in paradise and the punishment of the wicked in Hell. His ideas were largely the result of the impression religious and moral concepts of both Judaism and Christianity had made upon him. In the main, there were three chief features of his teaching upon which he laid particular emphasis: the Unity of God, the moral responsibility of man toward God, and the judgment awaiting mankind on the day of resurrection.

At first the powerful group that were the custodians of the pagan shrine [at Mecca], and for whom such doctrines were detrimental to their vested interests, met the new Prophet with ridicule and derision. In time, as more converts to the new faith were won, the persecution took a more severe turn... About 620 A.D. he was invited to make Yathrib (later called Medīna) his home and to mediate in the suicidal feud between the Aws and Khazraj tribes, which was fast depleting their ranks. They [the people of Medina] promised him and his Meccan followers protection. The Prophet accepted, and two years later, after he had arranged for his Meccan followers to precede, he followed them and arrived in Medina on September 24, 622, the official day of the beginning of the Muslim era...

[p. 158] As legislator, Muhammad enacted the social and political ordinance of the new Muslim theocracy... At first he seems to have tried to establish an alliance with the Jews in Medina. He included several features of their worship such as the instituting of the 10th Muharran as a fast day resembling the fast of the Day of Atonement on the 10th of Tishri, the introduction of the midday prayer and the purification ritual before the prayer—just to cite a few instances. However, it soon became quite apparent that compromise with the Jews was becoming increasingly impossible as they heaped ridicule upon him for his reproduction of Old Testament stories. This brought about a difficult situation. All along Muhammad had simply claimed that his revelation confirmed the Jewish and Christian scriptures. Instinctively he took over elements from the older religions and perpetuated them in his teaching, even though his sources were in the main apocryphal and heretical. The doctrine of the Logos can be easily traced in the Qur'ān, III: 4 and IV: 169. In his Christology Muhammad accepted the doctrine of the virgin-birth, the miracles of healing the sick, raising of the dead and the ascension. He rejected the suffering of Christ on the cross and vigorously denied the idea of Jesus being the son of God or that he ever made such a claim for himself.

Muhammad now accused both Jews and Christians of falsifying their scripture, and proceeded to Arabicize Islam. Friday was substituted for the Sabbath, the direction of prayer was changed from Jerusalem to Mecca, the pilgrimage to the Ka'ba was included

in Islam and the kissing of the Black Stone was permitted. Muhammad during this period led several battles against the Meccans and their mercenaries, but it was not until 630 A.D. that the complete conquest of Mecca was accomplished. The pagan idols were utterly demolished, but the inhabitants were treated very generously. Now one tribe after another, from all corners of Arabia, flocked to his banner. A year later he headed the farewell pilgrimage to Mecca and there gave his last sermon where he substituted the most vital [p. 159] bond of Arab relationship, that of tribal kinship, with the brotherhood of Islam. His life ended suddenly after a short illness on June 8, 632 A.D.

Arabia after its long strife and disunity had finally brought forth a man who aroused the religious feeling of his countrymen and laid down for them a socio-economic and moral code which not only satisfied them but served as a foundation for an intense and highly productive intellectual activity for other people who already could pride themselves on an old and venerable civilization. Muhammad had never claimed divine origin nor did he want to be regarded as different from other men. He did not claim that he could perform miracles and frequently admitted that he was not free from sin. However, his conviction was unshakable that God had selected and privileged him to preach his will to the Arabs. It was this firm belief in the divinity of his message that conquered the religiously indifferent Arab and made him a fanatical follower of his call.

[p. 161] *The Tenets of Islam and Its Prescribed Duties*

Belief in God, in His Angels, His divine Books, His Messengers, in Muhammad as the last of His Prophets, and in the Judgment Day—these are the tenets which constitute the articles of faith of Islam.

The only unpardonable sin is “shirk” or the joining of other Gods to the One Allah. Islam maintains an uncompromising monotheism. The practical religious duties incumbent on each believer are:

- p. 162] 1. The profession of faith (*shahādah*) which is summed up in the formula “there is no God but Allah; Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.” Upon conversion to Islam, the new believer is required to pronounce the formula once and hence becomes automatically a member of the Faith. There is no other ceremony involved.
2. Ritual prayer (*salat*) five times a day with the believer facing the direction of Mecca. The worshipper must be in a state of ceremonial purity and must use the Arabic language as his medium. The prayer consists always of the Fātīhah (the Muslim equivalent of the *paternoster*) and additional phrases of the Glorification of God, combined with genuflections and prostrations. The Friday noon prayer is the only public prayer obligatory for all adult males. An address is usually delivered during this service by the leader of the Prayer, the *Imām*.
3. The alms-tax (*zakāt*) was originally a voluntary act but it soon evolved into an obligatory tax on property. The money thus collected was used for the support of the poor, the building of mosques and for expenses incurred in the administration of the Muslim empire. With the disruption of the purely Muslim state, the *zakāt* became once more a voluntary gift left to the believer’s conscience.
4. Fasting during the month of Ramadan. During this month, in which the *Qur’ān* was first revealed, food and drink are abstained from, from dawn till sunset. The occurrence

of Ramadan at times during the summer months in hot countries makes this duty a particularly rigorous one.

5. The pilgrimage (*hajj*). This duty is incumbent on every Muslim at least once in his lifetime, provided he is physically and economically able to perform it...

[p. 167] *The Qur'ān*

It is the Orthodox Muslim view that the *Qur'ān* is the word of God transmitted to Muhammad through the Angel Gabriel from an arch[e]type preserved in heaven. Hence it is eternal and uncreated. It is also considered the most perfect model of the Arabic language... The Old Testament characters who figure prominently in the *Qur'ān* are Adam, Noah, Abraham, Ishmael, Lot, Joseph, Moses, Saul, David, Solomon, Jonah and Job; while of the New Testament only Zachariah, John the Baptist, Jesus and Mary are emphasized. There are also other *Qur'ānic* figures of purely Arabic origin.

The substance of the material indicates parallelism with accounts in the apocryphal Gospels, the Mishna, the Aggada, the Midrash and other non-canonical Jewish works. Several passages dealing with the theological reflections, moral exhortations and a great system of ceremonial and civil laws are laid down forming the core of Muslim canon law. The arrangement of the *Qur'ānic* material was arbitrary and mechanical. The longest *sūras* were placed first...

[p. 168] The *Qur'ān* has been translated into forty languages... Besides being the religious and ethical manual by which millions of Muslims are guided, it is the only reason why the Arabic dialects have not become distinct languages and why, although the Syrian may find it difficult to understand the Moroccan's spoken idiom, he has no trouble reading the written Arabic since the latter is modelled upon the *Qur'ān*.

#### *Muslim Sects*

The two main sects in Islam are the *Sunnī* and the *Shī'ites*. The former is by far the larger majority; the latter does not exceed nine per cent of all Muslims. The *Shī'ites* and their various subsects are found mainly concentrated in Iran and to some extent in India...

[p. 169] The *Sunnī* have shown relative unity in their main beliefs even though mystical elements, a few centuries after Muhammad, gained entrance into the rationalistic theology of Islam. Subsequently, we find development of pious fraternal organizations and worship of saint-like figures which heretofore were rejected as idolatrous. On the other hand, [there have been] puritanical and orthodox movements such as the Wahhabi movement in Saudi Arabia...

According to our historical knowledge, Muhammad has modified his concept of the monotheistic convictions according to the specific emotional needs of the Arabic people. Nevertheless, he was carried by the firm conviction that his revelation of God was the true God of Abraham undistorted and undiluted by faulty tradition...

It has been pointed out by scholars of many faiths that Islam has found its success by its great realism as to human nature. Its ethical teachings are not transformed into rigid demands interfering with the biological needs of human existence. The divine laws are

not zealously surrounded by narrow barriers of continuous ritual. God's character is not presented by mystical and secretive allusions. No original sin and self-sacrificial purifications interfere with the positivism of the Muslim's attitude towards God. God is merciful and compassionate. He needs no interpretation by priest appointed by Him or devoted exclusively to the performance of religious rituals. No theological hierarchy interferes with the immediacy of the individual's worship and his communication with his creator.

Islam can boast of being thoroughly practical. It makes no [p. 170] demands upon its adherents which require explaining away because of their impossibility, none that cannot be fulfilled...

The simplicity of the creed together with unelaborate but still all-pervading ceremonial of worship which keeps a constant unifying bond within the believers has proved to be of equal appeal to the primitive nomad as well as the sophisticated scholar.

### **886. Islam, Rise and Spread of**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 100, 101. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 100] The Moslems ... had appeared as a new rival on the scene before Christianity had completed the conquest of Europe. A century before Charlemagne's time the followers of Mohammed had burst upon the stage of history as a terrifying surprise. The Arab prophet had fled from Mecca and taken over the rule of Medina in 622. That is the year one in the Moslem calendar. It may be helpful to note that at this crucial date the monk Augustine was still archbishop of Canterbury. Mohammed died ten years later [632]. While the Saxons were settling England and had not yet been Christianized, the Moslems were spreading through the Middle East and sweeping across North Africa. With a unique success in giving religious sanction to military conquest and in turning conquered peoples into ardent propagandists of the faith of their conquerors, within a century after the prophet's death Islam had conquered and converted Arabia, Egypt, Syria, Persia, North Africa, and Spain, and had advanced its armies almost to the middle of France. Charles Martel, Charlemagne's grandfather, had [p. 101] stopped them at Tours in 732. This was just three years after the pope had commissioned Boniface to convert the Germans. Thus new and unsettled was the state of Europe when the great Moslem menace came.

Rather quickly the Moorish Moslems were forced back across the Pyrenees, and more slowly into the southern half of Spain. They held Cordova, and made it the seat of a high Islamic culture, until it was taken by a Christian king of Castile in 1236. Granada, the last stronghold of the Moors in Spain, held out until 1492. Through a great part of that period the Moslem powers constituted a menace and a challenge to Christian Europe on three sides. For more than two centuries the Crusades furnished an outlet for the energies of the Christian peoples, a field for knightly exploits, an opportunity for giving a pious coloration to deeds of violence and pillage, and a method of combining meritorious pilgrimages to sacred places with profitable adventure. The Crusades were, in the aggregate, only an episode in this long Moslem threat. From the seventh century to the seventeenth (there was a Turkish siege of Vienna in 1683), European Christianity knew that it had an enemy, sometimes only potential, sometimes actual, in the powerful religious-political system of Islam.

It has been customary for Christians to regard with a sense of moral superiority the slogan "the Koran or the sword," which is supposed to represent the ruthless technique of



the Moslem advance. This attitude requires correction for two reasons: first, historical research has shown that the expansion of Islam, though paralleled and accelerated by military action, did not rest wholly or even chiefly on that basis; second, a frank recognition of the known facts about the expansion of Christianity itself during and after the fourth century requires the admission that it rested quite as much on compulsion as on conversion.

**887. Islam.** See as Reaction Against Corrupt Christianity

SOURCE: Denis Baly, *Multitudes in the Valley*, pp. 266, 267. Copyright 1957 by The Seabury Press, Inc., Greenwich, Conn. Used by permission.

[p. 266] Islam [is] the most resistant system in the world to Christian missionary endeavor. Its strength lies in its simplicity, and the truth which it proclaims above all others is the authority and unity of God. Originally God's rebuke to the corrupt teaching and disunity [see No. 64] of the Church of Muhammed's day it has endured because in their modern forms these things still persist. As long as Christians permit themselves the luxury of their divisions, as long as the West rejects the absolute demands of the Creator, as long as a major section of Christendom toys with the idea of a "co-redemptrix,"\* [Note \* : This goes back to the original protest of Muhammed, who was so impressed by the excessive devotion paid to the Virgin Mary that he understood that she formed a member of the Christian Trinity.] so long will Islam endure to throw back [p. 267] the falsehood in their teeth.

**888. Israel, Ancient Religion of, Despite Environment, Unique**

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, pp. 80-82. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

[p. 80] Writers sometimes speak of the two religions of Israel, because it is clear from the Old Testament itself that there was a popular religion, with which the religion of Yahweh was often mingled and fused, but which was fundamentally different from it, and against which the prophets with increasing clearness protested. These texts enable us to understand more clearly against what the prophets declaimed. From the start there was the consciousness that Yahweh was the God of Israel and that the indigenous fertility cult was not Israel's true faith. While there were periods when this consciousness receded into the background, in all times of national revival it awoke anew and came to the fore...

Archaeology has helped to make some Old Testament narra- [p. 81] tives live afresh, and has placed Israel in her contemporary world; it has shown us the stock from whence she came, the cultural inheritance she began with, and the world into which she came; it has shown the nature of the constant struggle Israel had with the ideas and practices that prevailed around her, and helped us to realize that by her very geographical position she was exposed to influences that were hard to resist. It has not diminished our regard for the Bible, nor our respect for Israel. For in the light of her origin and her environment we are the better able to appreciate the heights she attained. We see the finger of God more clearly in her story, and wonder at the way He led her from such a beginning, and through such an environment, to such heights. And our regard for the succession of men we call the prophets, who served as the mouth-piece of God to Israel, is deepened. The uniqueness of the religious quality of the Old Testament, its profound insight and spiritual penetration, are more manifest than ever in the light of all that Israel had to discard, both within and around her...

[p. 82] Her debt to her Semitic inheritance, and to her environment may be readily acknowledged. But deeper than both, because infusing her literature and her life with that spirit which has made it endure, and which makes it still of living worth to men, was her debt to her own experience. The most enduring things that Israel attained were not the things she had in common with others, but the *differentiae*, that were progressively born out of her growing experience of God. For the appreciation of the religious significance of the Old Testament, then, the study of Biblical archaeology is not without value. It brings into crystal clarity the recognition that nothing it can unfold can really explain the Old Testament in its deepest meaning, and beyond gratitude for the measure of light it brings, it induces a profound sense that the only satisfying clue to all it leaves unilluminated must be found in the perception of the hand of God in Israel's life and in her Scriptures.

### **889. Israel, Ancient Religion of, Not Derived From Babylonian Polytheism**

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1908), pp. 227, 228.

[p. 227] The religion of Israel is not developed out of Babylonian polytheism. Babylonian polytheism existed as polytheism in the earliest periods of which we have even the semblance of knowledge, and it endured as polytheism unto the end...

[p. 228] The origin of Israel's religion, the motive power of its mighty and resistless progress, is to be sought in a personal revelation of God in history, and that this personal revelation looks forward to the kingdom that was to be, when Judaism had passed over her carefully guarded body of truth to the Christianity which was to be born within her portals. The explanation of the religion of Israel is not to be sought in the religion of Babylonia which lies behind, outworn and useless, but in the living Christianity which stands before it.

### **890. Israel, Ancient Religion of, Unique in Ethical and Prophetic Character**

SOURCE: E[rnst] Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. by W. Montgomery (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1923), pp. 205, 206. Used by permission.

[p. 205] The literatures of Ancient Egypt and of Babylon show us that in respect of religious lyric, as of prophecy, the People of the Revelation reached a height absolutely unique among the nations of the Ancient East. In spite of all the formal affinities of style, imagery, etc., it is here alone that [p. 206] the ethical is set free from the bondage of the natural ...; it is here alone that a consciousness of salvation is attained which in places already bears an almost New-Testament character ...; it is here alone that the keynote is the hope of a Kingdom of God which is to embrace all nations, along with the heavens and the earth.

### **891. Israel, Kingdom Rejected by**

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, Scriptural Studies in the Kingdom of God (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1959), p. 107. Copyright 1959 by The Paternoster Press. Used by permission of the author and of The Paternoster Press, London.

It cannot be denied that Jesus offered the Kingdom to Israel. When he sent his disciples upon their preaching mission, he told them not to go among the Gentiles but to "go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10:6). Jesus rebuffed a Canaanitish woman with the words, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of

Israel” (Matt. 15:24). Furthermore, our Lord spoke of the Jews as the “sons of the Kingdom” (Matt. 8:12), even though they were rejecting the Messiah and the Kingdom of God. They were the sons of the Kingdom because it was Israel whom God had chosen and to whom He had promised the blessings of the Kingdom. The Kingdom was theirs by right of election, history, and heritage. So it was that our Lord directed His ministry to them and offered to them that which had been promised them. When Israel rejected the Kingdom, the blessings which should have been theirs were given to those who would accept them.

### **892. Israel, Remnant of, in New Testament Church**

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible* (1957 ed.), pp. 108, 109. Published 1955 by The Westminster Press. Used by permission of The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, and Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., London.

[p. 108] The Church consisted of a Remnant of Israel, together with Gentiles who were won to the faith by them. The first Christians were all Jews, undeniably a Remnant of Israel, whether they be thought to be the Remnant of Promise or not. Soon they had communicated the faith to non-Jews who entered whole-heartedly into it and took its obligations seriously. Either this was the fulfillment of the hope and promise of the Old Testament or it was not. If it was not, then where shall we look for the fulfillment? And if it was not, how comes it to pass that here we find so remarkable a correspondence with the promise that had been set forth? If this was not the Remnant of Promise, then how comes it to pass that the obligations of the Covenant, including the obligation to make the Only God of all men known throughout the world, and to carry His Law to the nations, were so enthusiastically taken up by this Remnant, while the Remnant of Promise is still to seek? The faith of the Church that it was the Remnant of Promise is surely supported by the testimony of history, in which its inner hope has found such signal vindication in demonstrable fact.

Here, then, are a few of the ways in which the New Testament may be said not alone to spring out of the Old, but to respond to the faith and promise of the Old. We have not merely a development that did in fact follow from the Old. Expectations and promises are set before men in the Old Testament, and in the New Testament and in the Church we have the only response to them so far seen, which can be taken seriously. It is not that we have in the New Testament and in the Church a response which the Church believes to be superior to the response that can be found in Judaism. With all its nobility and grandeur, which may be recognized with the utmost sincerity, Judaism does not even claim to be the response to these hopes. It has no Messiah to [p. 109] offer, no Suffering Servant that can gather to Himself the things predicated of the Servant in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, no new revelation of God to authorize the dispensing with sacrifice, no vital sense of a mission to win the world for its God, no overmastering passion to communicate the Law of God to all men. All of these things, and more that could be added to them, are offered in the New Testament and in the Church, where the response to the promises is impressive indeed.

### **893. Israel, Restoration of—Conditionality of Promises (Millerite View)**

SOURCE: [S.] B[liss?] “The Return of the Jews,” *The Signs of the Times*, 3 (August 31, 1842), 170.

The covenant which God made with that nation [Israel] was a conditional covenant. If they should serve the Lord their God with all their heart, to do all his commandments, and should diligently hearken unto him, they were to be blessed above every nation, and were to be forever the chosen people of God; but if they would not hearken unto the

voice of the Lord their God, to observe and to do all his commandments, and his statutes, they were to be cursed above every nation, until they should be finally destroyed. In the other predictions of their various dispersions, they were promised that IF they would return unto the Lord their God, that the Lord would have compassion upon them, and would turn their captivity, and gather them from all nations whither he should scatter them. And we accordingly find that he was faithful who promised; for as often as they repented in their various captivities, he restored them to their own land. But in the chapter referred to, Moses evidently looked forward to the time when their waywardness and folly should be fully proved, when all the mercies and judgments of God should be found to be of no avail in restraining them from utterly rejecting the Lord their God, and walking after the evil imaginations of their own perverse hearts; and when it would seem that there was nothing more which God could do for his vineyard, which he had not done for it, so that he should cast them off forever and leave them to their own hardness of heart and blindness of minds, until they should perish. That the dispersion here predicted was their dispersion by the Romans, is evident from the nation that was to be brought against them, and from the complete fulfillment of that prediction, in the destruction of Jerusalem by that nation...

From this dispersion there is no promise of a return [see No. 1073n] ... [signed] B.

#### **894. Israel, Restoration of—Millerite and British Literalist Differ**

SOURCE: *Signs of the Times* (a Millerite periodical), 1 (Sept. 15, 1840), 90; (Oct. 15, 1840), 109.

*a. Letter, dated June 27, 1840, from Henry Jones, a Millerite*

[p. 90] So many of our dear brethren [i.e. premillennialists] both in Europe and America, including the celebrated Frey, Wolff, converts of Judaism, with whom I am agreed in the expected near coming of Christ and his kingdom, ... are doing a great and good work, in vindicating the coming of the Lord at hand; so that I would not, for my life, oppose them in it; but would rather consecrate all that I have and am, to help forward the same great work. And yet, in the most successful preaching of the kingdom of God at hand, I feel impelled to take the ground that the literal return to Palestine of the people called the Jews, is a doctrine not sustained by the Holy Scriptures.

*b. Letter, dated Sept. 16, 1840, from James Begg of Scotland, a Literalist*

[p. 109] I regret to perceive, on the part of some of those who are in America testifying of the speedy advent of the Redeemer, much misconception of what appears to me so interwoven with it as to require corresponding consideration, especially the restoration of Israel to the land of their fathers, and their faithful fulfillment of Jehovah's purpose there... He [Miller] speaks of all the prophecies in which this is predicted, having been fulfilled in the restoration of the Jews from Babylon.

*c. Letter from J. V. Himes, the editor, to James A. Begg, dated Oct. 8, 1840*

[p. 109] I cannot express to you my gratitude on the reception of intelligence from England, Scotland, and Ireland, of the progress of the cause of the Second Advent *near* [i.e. premillennialism]. "As cool water to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country." When I commenced the paper called the "*Signs of the Times*," I did not know of another devoted to the doctrine of the Second Advent near... But I rejoice that the "day has dawned;" and that the time has now come, for the friends of the advent near, to become *one* in both countries. We wish now to open a correspondence with our brethren in Great Britain, and to get all the intelligence we can on the subjects connected with the

return of the Lord Messiah to our earth; while in return, I shall unite with the friends in this country to give you a full account of the cause among us...

We think you in great *error* in relation to the “literal return of the Jews.” Though we are not all united on this subject, yet the sentiment, that they will return, is fast passing away, among those who believe the advent near. Indeed, there are but few among our opposers who now publicly advocate the literal return of Israel. Our difference of opinion, on the Jews’ return, however, will be no bar to our fellowship and co-operation.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: For this difference of opinion about the return of the Jews as a prophetic doctrine, see No. 1073n.]

### **895. Israel, Restoration of—Millerite Statement on No Future Return of the Jews Promised**

SOURCE: G. F. Cox, *Letters on the Second Coming of Christ* (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), pp. 37–43.

[p. 37] *No return of the Jews, as a nation, to the land of Palestine is promised in the Scriptures, other than what has already taken place.*

1. ... When Zerubbabel returned, there are mentioned as going with him other tribes than those of Benjamin and Judah. Also, under the Maccabees, and in the time of our Saviour, Palestine was peo- [p. 38] pled by the *Israelites* of all the tribes indifferently.

2. It should be recollected that *all* the prophets who have been supposed to predict the return of the Jews, lived and uttered their prophecies *prior* to the return of the Jews from Babylon; so that all the predictions referred to *may have* been fulfilled already, as far as they can be in an earthly sense... The Jews, universally, had liberty to return, if they [p. 39] wished, wherever they may have been scattered. And they did actually return—vast numbers of them at least—built their temple again, and enjoyed more or less prosperity till Christ came, who was its glory and end.

3. Does not the return of the Jews to Palestine, to build up again their temple, conflict with express declarations of the gospel, and otherwise appear absolutely *absurd*? Think of it. Prophets raised up, and prophecies uttered over two thousand years beforehand, that the nation of the Jews shall return to Palestine, and build up Jerusalem so that it shall equal in magnificence Boston, or New York, or even London!—with a wonderful temple, in its structure, gold and other appendages—for what? Why, to worship God in—to worship the true God—the meek and lowly Jesus... [p. 40] He came to make both Jews and Gentiles ONE—to break down the middle wall of partition, and to make of the twain *one new man*. What conflicts with the plain testimony of the gospel cannot be true.

4. The fourth argument I offer is, that the Jews have no more title to Palestine than have the Gentiles; because the original promise to Abraham was a *general one*. ... It was given before circumcision, that he might be father of the Gentiles; and circumcision was added that he might be father of the Jews also. But the promise was given to both Jew and Gentile, through FAITH; and they only which be of FAITH are blessed with faithful Abraham...

2. The promise was given to Abraham *in person*, and to *his seed*, which was *Christ*. ... Christ had not where to lay his head; and “to Abraham he gave none inheritance in it.” ... [p. 41] These things show plainly that what was promised to Abraham and to Christ, was a “heavenly kingdom,” shadowed out by Canaan. For Abraham and Christ both became heirs of the world... And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s *seed*, and *heirs* ACCORDING TO THE PROMISE. ...

[p. 42] I conclude, then, if the land of Palestine was promised to Abraham and to Christ, neither of whom ever possessed it, they must either come back again to inherit it as it now is, or they are to possess it in its new and purified form under the new heavens and earth; either of which implies a resurrection...

Let me conclude, then, by asking the reader if he does not join me in saying, if ... the prophets who have predicted their return, prophesied before their return from Babylon; and if at the time they were restored from all the tribes, indifferently, and built their temple, and flourished in Jerusalem; if Christ came to break down the middle wall of partition—to break up the division between the Jews and Gentiles as [p. 43] distinct nations; and if the original promise was never given to any but to Abraham and Christ, and to those who *believe* with Abraham; is it not probable that no restoration is intended in the Scriptures [see No. 1073n], other than what has already taken place, or may be claimed equally by the Jew and Gentile? Thus I judge, and thus I think the prophets testify.

### **896. Israel, Restoration of—Millerites Versus Literalists**

SOURCE: [Josiah Litch], “The Rise and Progress of Adventism,” *The Advent Shield and Review*, 1 (May, 1844), 92.

In 1840, an attempt was made to open an interchange between the Literalists of England and the Adventists in the United States. But it was soon discovered that they had as little fellowship for our Anti-Judaizing notions, as we had for their Judaism; and the interchange was broken off.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Litch refers to an irreconcilable difference in the views of the two groups of premillennialists, the American Millerites and the British Literalists. The “Judaism” that he attributes to the Literalists was the belief (found also among some postmillennialists) that the prophecies required the restoration of the Jews as God’s chosen people and their theocratic world leadership in the expected millennial kingdom (see Nos. 1052, 1073). By the Millerites’ “Anti-Judaizing” (not anti-Jewish; see No. 1073n) notions he meant their contrasting view that the promises to Israel were conditional and either had been fulfilled to Biblical Israel or were inherited by spiritual Israel—all Christians, whether Jew or Gentile—and would be realized in the kingdom on the earth made new (see Nos. 893, 895, 1085).]

### **897. Israel, Restoration of—Nonrestorationist Position Summarized**

SOURCE: Everett F. Harrison, “Restoration of Israel,” in *Baker’s Dictionary of Theology*, p. 447. Copyright 1960 by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

The nonrestorationist position seeks to establish its case principally on the following considerations. (1) OT prophecies often appealed to in support of national restoration, such as Isa. 11:11 and Ezek. 37, were fulfilled in the return from Babylonian captivity. (2) What was not thus fulfilled must be regarded as realized in the church of the NT, the new Israel. (3) Jesus frankly told the Jews that the kingdom of God would be taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth its fruits (Matt. 21:43). This emphasizes that the restoration promises regarding Israel in the OT must have a conditional rather than an absolute character. Israel failed to meet the conditions. (4) In the unfolding of the divine purpose the NT church includes both Jews and Gentiles, the middle wall of partition between them being broken down by Christ. A return to special consideration for one nation would seem to be an anachronism once the church is a reality. (5) The return of the Jews to Palestine in considerable numbers in modern times, however interesting as a phenomenon of history, does not in itself guarantee for this nation a spiritual future in terms of national conversion [see No. 1073n].

### **898. Israel, Salvation of, in Christian Church**

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, Scriptural Studies in the Kingdom of God (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1959), pp. 117, 118. Copyright 1959 by The Paternoster Press. Used by permission of the author and of The Paternoster Press, London.

[p. 117] While we must therefore speak of Israel and the Church, we must speak of only one people of God. This is vividly clear in [p. 118] Paul's illustration of the olive tree in Romans 11. There is one olive tree; it is the people of God. In the Old Testament era, the branches of the tree were Israel. However, because of unbelief, some of the natural branches were broken off and no longer belong to the tree (v. 16). We know from verse 5 that not all of the branches were broken off, for "there is a remnant, chosen by grace." Some Jews accepted the Messiah and His message of the Gospel of the Kingdom. We must remember that the earliest Church consisted of Jewish believers; but they came into the Church not because they were Jews but because they were believers.

When these natural branches were broken off, other branches were taken from a wild olive and contrary to nature grafted into the olive tree (vv. 17, 24). This refers to the Gentiles who received the Gospel of the Kingdom, the "other nation" (Matt. 21:43) of which our Lord spoke. The natural branches which were broken off were cast from the tree because of unbelief; and the wild branches were grafted on because of their faith (v. 20). This entire procedure is "contrary to nature"; *i.e.*, it is not what one would expect from reading the Old Testament. From the Old Testament point of view, one would never know that the people of God was to consist largely of Gentiles and that the majority of the Jewish nation were to be broken off. This mixed character of the Church is indeed another mystery—a further disclosure of God's redemptive purpose which had not been revealed to the Old Testament prophets (Eph. 3:3).

In the Old Testament era, the olive tree—the people of God—consisted of the children of Israel. Gentiles entered into the blessings of God's people only as they shared the terms of the covenant with Israel. In the New Testament dispensation, the natural branches, Israel, have been largely broken off the tree because of unbelief and wild branches from the Gentiles have been grafted in, through faith. But there is but one tree, one people of God, which consisted first of Israelites and then of believing Gentiles and Jews. It is impossible to think of two peoples of God through whom God is carrying out two different redemptive purposes without doing violence to Romans 11.

### **899. Israel — History — Abraham to Exodus, Josephus' Reckoning of the Period**

SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* ii, 15, 2; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 3 (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 269. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

They [the Hebrews] left Egypt in the month of Xanthicus [Nisan], on the fifteenth by lunar reckoning, 430 years after the coming of our forefather Abraham to Canaan, Jacob's migration to Egypt having taken place 215 years later.

### **900. Israel — History — Canaan, Conquest of**

SOURCE: Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel* (Ithaca N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1954), pp. 49–51. Copyright 1954 by Cornell University. Used by permission.

[p. 49] According to the traditional understanding of the Biblical account, the taking of Canaan was accomplished in a single spectacularly successful invasion, with Joshua smiting one-and-thirty kings. In this picture, the Hebrew tribes, led by Joshua, crossed the Jordan near the Dead Sea and took the key point of Jericho, "whose walls came tumbling down." The next objective was Ai, up in the Hill Country...

Joshua took and razed a series of fortified towns, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Hebron, and Debir. This done, he conquered all the highland of southern Canaan, a section of the coastal strip as far as Gaza, and then in the north by the Waters of Merom, a hundred miles more or less from his base at Gilgal, he routed a Canaanite army.

Reuben, Gad, and half of the tribe of Manasseh took occupation of Transjordan; the other half of Manasseh settled on the Plain of Sharon just south of Esdraelon. The tribe of Levi, consisting entirely of religious functionaries, received no single fixed territory. The rest of the tribes shared in the partition of Canaan according to their population.

The author of Chapters 10–11 in the Book of Joshua provides the basis of this traditional view. Joshua, he recounts,

defeated all the land, the hill country, and the Negeb, and the Shefelah, and the slopes, and all their kings; he left none remaining, but utterly destroyed all that breathed ... So Joshua took the whole land according to all that the Lord said to Moses; and Joshua gave it for an inheritance to Israel according to their divisions by their tribes. And the land had rest from war.

Chapters 15–19 in Joshua and Chapter 1 in Judges, however, give a different picture both of the conquest and of the role of Joshua therein. This version describes the conquest as a slow piecemeal affair, accomplished largely after Joshua and his generation were gone, by individual tribes and clans seldom acting even in partial unison. Thus Judges 1:1 would indicate that the land was not at rest from war, in fact was never pacified: “After the death of Joshua, the Israelites asked of the Lord, ‘Who shall go up for us first against the Canaanites to fight against them?’”

The latter picture of the conquest was generally taken by scholars to be correct and the former thrown into discard, together with Joshua’s traditional career, as myth. The truth of the matter, however, appears to comprehend both versions. Excavations at Lachish, Tell Beit Mirsim (=Kiriath-sepher?), Hebron, Eglon, Beth-shemesh, Gibeah, Bethel, Shiloh, Megiddo, and Beth-shan indicate that these places were destroyed or occupied, then were sometimes retaken [p. 51] and rebuilt by the Canaanites, only to change hands again, during the thirteenth, twelfth, and eleventh centuries B.C. ... “There was a campaign by Joshua which achieved an amazing success in attacking certain key Canaanite royal cities but ... there was also a long period of struggle for possession which continued after Joshua’s death.”<sup>1</sup> [Note 1: Quoted from G. E. Wright, in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, V (1946), 105–114.]

Biblical authors tended to telescope accounts of long campaigns—a device by no means abandoned even today... Thus Joshua acquires once again an association with the conquest of Canaan no less deserving and prominent in its way than that of Moses with the Exodus and the Wilderness.

### **901. Israel—History—Chronology of the Judges**

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 180, 181. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 180] The date allocated to the period of the Judges is, of course, dependent upon the date assigned to the Exodus from Egypt and the Conquest of Palestine. Following the early date 1441 B.C. for the Exodus and 1401 B.C. for the fall of Jericho, and allowing thirty years for Joshua and ten years for the elders who outlived him, the period would extend from about 1361 to about 1020 B.C., the time of Saul. Following the later theories the period would be placed from about 1200–1020 B.C. This latter dating, although considered inescapable in the light of certain alleged archeological findings,<sup>3</sup> [Note 3: Cf.



W. F. Albright, *Archeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore, 1942), pp. 110–113; *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 212.] is nevertheless fraught with grave problems and much confusion, and is not in focus with the Biblical data. It not only clashes with the time scheme of the earlier period from Abraham to Moses, but also necessitates telescoping the era of the Judges, if one follows the Biblical chronological notices contained in the book even in a general way.

1. *Detailed Chronological Notices in the Biblical Account.* Although the numerous indications of time which are found in the Book of Judges do not permit this period of Israelite history to be dated by this medium, a careful collocation of the various chronological elements found in the book and a comparison with other pertinent chronological elements in other books of the Old Testament show that the time scheme underlying the Biblical narrative is quite consistent with the early or 1441 B.C. date [equally with 1445; see No. 723] for the Exodus and in keeping with 1 Kings 6:1, according to which the fourth year of Solomon, in which he began building the temple, was 480 years after the children of Israel came up out of Egypt. However, this underlying time plan of the Book of Judges is quite irreconcilable with the late-date theories of the Exodus and must be almost completely rejected or largely explained away by advocates of these late-date theories.

Chronological notices dealing with the length of the various oppression, judgeships and periods of peace as given in the Book of Judges... [p. 181] total ... 410 years... But this is obviously far too great an interval, for the much more extended period from the Exodus ... till Solomon's fourth year ... is only 480 years (1 Kings 6:1). The answer to this problem is quite evident from the narrative. Individual judges, like Shamgar, who has no chronological notation connected with his name (3:31), Tola (10:2), Jair (10:3), Ibzan (12:9), Elon (12:11), Abdon (12:14), who are listed in the barest possible manner without any detail and perhaps others whose careers are described more fully were merely local chieftains whose activity was strictly confined to some limited district and who doubtless ruled simultaneously with other judges, at least for part of their regime. For instance, the period of Ammonite oppression (18 years) was almost completely confined to Transjordan and doubtless overlapped the era of Philistine aggression during Samson's long judgeship of two decades (15:20; 16:31).

## **902. Israel—History—David and Solomon**

SOURCE: Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1954), pp. 67, 69, 72, 73, 80, 81. Copyright 1954 by Cornell University. Used by permission.

[p. 67] Ancient Israel's Golden Era came during the tenth century B.C., when David and Solomon ruled Israel and Israel dominated western Asia...

Recent discoveries have greatly enhanced the historical value of the Biblical account, and even enriched its three-thousand-year-old story with considerable new material. The Queen of Sheba, after she met Solomon, is reported to have exclaimed, "It was a true report that I heard in my country concerning your achievements and your wisdom... [p. 69] But I did not believe the reports until I came, and my own eyes saw. Indeed, the half of it was not told me. You have wisdom and prosperity exceeding the report that I heard" (1 Kings 10:6–7). The same words might well express the mood of modern scholars rereading the Biblical history of the reigns of David and Solomon in the light of the recent revelations...

[p. 72] The rise of the Israelite empire can be understood properly only in the context of the entire Near East. At the turn of the second millennium not a single state in

Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt—the aggressive forces normally active within the historic constellation of which Israel was a part—was powerful enough to interfere with David’s plans for expansion. Babylonia had been in decline since the downfall of the Hammurabi dynasty in the sixteenth century B.C. The Hurrian state, in northeast Iraq, had been destroyed by Assyria in the thirteenth century. The latter, in turn (except briefly about 1100 under Tiglath-pileser I), was too weak to seek empire and adventure outside its territory until after 900 B.C. The Hitties, who had taken over northern Syria and the Hurrian state early in the fourteenth century, and whose power in the entire Near East at the time was equaled only by that of Egypt, collapsed before the onslaughts of the Aegean peoples at about 1200 B.C.

Egypt’s power, too, had waned. The disintegration which had begun during the Twentieth Dynasty, especially after 1150, was not alleviated when the Amon priesthood and their wealthy associates assumed control of the land, shortly after 1100. Except for a brief period under Sheshonk I, the Biblical Shishak (about 925), Egypt was in no position to challenge anyone outside its borders until over four centuries later, when her power revived under Necho of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. As for the Arameans (Syrians), their ascendancy in upper Transjordan, where they eventually founded a number of city-states, had only just begun.

In the context of this political void which was western [p. 73] Asia about 1000 B.C., the Biblical account of the rise of David’s empire bears eloquent testimony to the skillful manner in which the Israelites moved to fill the vacuum...

[p. 80] It is a frequent archaeological experience to uncover the material remains of the Solomonic (Early Iron) level of Israelite towns—for example, at Megiddo, Gezer, Tell Qasileh, Eziongeber, Hazor, and Lachish. Like the Temple, these structures were generally Phoenician in concept and in such details as the pattern of masonry, the use of capitals (which the Greeks also borrowed from the Phoenicians a couple of centuries later), and the style of gateways. The government buildings at Megiddo ... form a particularly noteworthy example...

Of particular interest is the famous copper refinery and seaport at Eziongeber, on the Gulf of Aqabah, rediscovered in the early 1930’s, about a third of a mile north of the present coastline. Although the site of the port had long been sought by scholars and travelers, no one was prepared [p. 81] for the discovery of the extraordinary structure built specifically to smelt the copper ore which was dug from the mines of near-by Sinai and Edom. Its excavator called Ezion-geber “the Pittsburgh of Palestine, in addition to being its most important port,” and described Solomon “as a great copper king.” Eziongeber, like the corresponding levels from the period of Solomon at Megiddo and Tell Qasileh, “was planned in advance, and built with considerable architectural and engineering skill at one time as an integral whole.”<sup>6</sup> [Note 6: From N. Glueck, *The Other Side of the Jordan* (New Haven, 1940), chs. iii, iv.]

### **903. Israel—History—Fall of—Kingdom of Israel**

SOURCE: Jack Finegan, *Light From the Ancient Past* (2d ed.), p. 210 & n. 29. Copyright 1959 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

If these statements comprise the authentic record of the fall of Samaria, then that city must have been captured at the earliest in the accession year of Sargon II, that is sometime after late December, 722 B.C., hence probably in 721 B.C. This is, however, in conflict with the data which indicate that Samaria was taken by Shalmaneser V. If Samaria fell in the summer or fall of 722 B.C. it was only a few months until the death of

Shalmaneser V in December of that year, and this may have made it easy for Sargon II, in inscriptions written late in his reign, to claim for his own glory the conquest which was actually accomplished by his predecessor. Furthermore, in the few months before his death Shalmaneser V may have but barely begun the deportation of the people of Samaria and the actual carrying out of this deportation may have actually been the work of Sargon II, as the latter says.<sup>29</sup>

[Note 29: Tadmor in JCS 12 (1958), pp. 37f. It has also been thought that Sargon II might have participated in the taking of Samaria along with his brother, Shalmaneser V, but prior to his own accession to the kingship, and in this connection it is pointed out that II Kings 18:9f. says that Shalmaneser besieged Samaria but that “they” (ASV) took it. The use of the word “they” could allow for the association of Sargon with Shalmaneser at the end of the siege; on the other hand it may be simply a reference to the Assyrian army in the plural.]

#### 904. Israel—History—Hezekiah Attacked by Sennacherib

SOURCE: Sennacherib, Annals, trans. in James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (2d ed.), pp. 287, 288. Copyright 1955 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 287] In my third campaign I marched against Hatti. Luli, king of Sidon, whom the terror-inspiring glamor of my lordship had overwhelmed, fled far overseas and perished. The awe-inspiring splendor of the “Weapon” of Ashur, my lord, overwhelmed his strong cities (such as) Great Sidon, Little Sidon, Bit-Zitti, Zaribtu, Mahalliba, Ushu (i.e. the mainland settlement of Tyre), Akzib (and) Akko, (all) his fortress cities, walled (and well) provided with feed and water for his garrisons, and they bowed in submission to my feet. I installed Ethba‘al (*Tuba’lu*) upon the throne to be their king and imposed upon him tribute (due) to me (as his) overlord (to be paid) annually without interruption.

As to all the kings of Amurru—Menahem (*Mi-in-ḥi-im-mu*) from Samsimuruna, Tuba’lu from Sidon, Abdili’ti from Arvad, Urumilki from Byblos, Mitinti from Ashdod, Buduili from Beth-Ammon, Kammusunadbi from Moab (and) Aiarammu from Edom, they brought sumptuous gifts (*igistû*) and—fourfold—their heavy *tâmartu* -presents to me and kissed my feet...

[p. 288] As to Hezekiah, the Jew, he did not submit to my yoke, I laid siege to 46 of his strong cities, walled forts and to the countless small villages in their vicinity, and conquered (them) by means of well-stamped (earth-) ramps, and battering-rams brought (thus) near (to the walls) (combined with) the attack by foot soldiers, (using) mines, breeches as well as sapper work. I drove out (of them) 200,150 people, young and old, male and female, horses, mules, donkeys, camels, big and small cattle beyond counting, and considered (them) booty. Himself I made a prisoner in Jerusalem, his royal residence, like a bird in a cage. I surrounded him with earthwork in order to molest those who were leaving his city’s gate. His towns which I had plundered, I took away from his country and gave them (over) to Mitinti, king of Ashdod, Padi, king of Ekron, and Sillibel, king of Gaza. Thus I reduced his country, but I still increased the tribute and the *katrû* -presents (due) to me (as his) overlord which I imposed (later) upon him beyond the former tribute, to be delivered annually. Hezekiah himself, whom the terror-inspiring splendor of my lordship had overwhelmed and whose irregular and elite troops which he had brought into Jerusalem, his royal residence, in order to strengthen (it), had deserted him, did send me, later, to Nineveh, my lordly city, together with 30 talents of gold, 800 talents of silver, precious stones, antimony, large cuts of red stone, couches (inlaid) with

ivory, *nîmedu* -chairs (inlaid) with ivory, elephant-hides, ebony-wood, boxwood (and) all kinds of valuable treasures, his (own) daughters, concubines, male and female musicians. In order to deliver the tribute and to do obeisance as a slave he sent his (personal) messenger.

2

### **905. Israel—History—Hezekiah Attacked Twice, by Sennacherib**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *The Biblical Period* (reprint; Pittsburgh: Presbyterian Board of Colportage of Western Pennsylvania), pp. 43, 44. Copyright 1949 by Louis Finkelstein. Used by permission of Harper and Brothers, New York.

[p. 43] The Chaldean chieftain, Merodach-baladan, had re-established himself as king of Babylon and was defying Assyrian efforts to dislodge him. Under the circumstances, it was to be expected that Judah would try to throw off the onerous Assyrian yoke. In preparation for the day of decision, Hezekiah accepted the overtures made by Babylon and Egypt, intervened in Philistine affairs in order to strengthen the hands of the local rebels, and fortified Jerusalem, where he excavated the Siloam tunnel through the solid rock in order to provide the city with water in time of siege.

In 701 B.C.E. the Assyrian army invaded Palestine and crushed the rebellion, after defeating a large Egyptian and Ethiopian host which had advanced northward to relieve the beleaguered town of Ekron. The strong frontier fortress of Lachish was stormed, as vividly pictured in the Assyrian reliefs, and the fortified towns—forty-six in number, according to the Assyrians—fell in rapid succession. Hezekiah thereupon capitulated, paying an extremely heavy tribute, listed in detail by the Assyrian records, which agree substantially with the much briefer summary in Kings. According to the Assyrian annals, Sennacherib also turned over a strip of Jewish territory in the Shephelah to the three neighboring Philistine principalities. What happened subsequently we do not know, though it appears that the Jewish towns were recovered not long afterwards.

Deuteronomic tradition connects a disastrous pestilence with an Assyrian invasion which took place after the accession of the Ethiopian prince Taharqo (Tirhakah) to the Egyptian throne in 689. Since Hezekiah died in 686, the invasion would have occurred between 689 and 686. Our Assyrian records close in 689 and we have no record of military doings in Sennacherib's reign thereafter. In 691, however, the Assyrians were defeated at Khalule by the Babylonians and Elamites, so it is entirely reasonable to suppose that Hezekiah then began planning a new revolt with Ethiopian aid, and that he revolted after Tirhakah's accession. This time the aged Isaiah supported the king, who [p. 44] was saved by the pestilence and apparently died before the Assyrians were able to put a new army into the field.

### **906. Israel — History — Jehoiachin of Judah Captured (Babylonian Record)**

SOURCE: Babylonian Chronicle, tablet BM 21946, reverse, lines 11–13, trans. in D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Caldaean Kings* (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1956), p. 73, with explanation from translator's Introduction, pp. 33, 44. Used by permission.

[p. 73] 11. In the seventh year, the month of Kislev, the king of Akkad [Nebuchadnezzar] mustered his troops, marched to the Hatti-land,

---

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

12. and encamped against (i.e. besieged) the city of Judah and on the second day of the month of Adar he seized the city and captured the king.

13. He appointed there a king of his own choice (lit. heart), received its heavy tribute and sent (them) to Babylon.

[From translator's Introduction: p. 33] The Babylonian Chronicle gives but a brief reference to operations in this year [the seventh of Nebuchadnezzar's reign] ... Judah was the primary objective for this year's expedition, which was led by Nebuchadnezzar in person. The date of this conquest of Jerusalem is now known precisely for the first time, namely, the second of Adar (15/16th March 597 B.C.)...

Although no details of the siege are given, the Chronicle clearly expresses the result. The king of Jerusalem was captured, a substitute chosen by Nebuchadnezzar was placed on the throne and considerable tribute collected and sent back to Babylon. Jehoiachin's place was taken by a Babylonian nominee, the young uncle of Jehoiachin named Mattaniah whose official name was designated or changed to Zedekiah... [p. 34] Having personally settled the future administration Nebuchadnezzar collected 'a heavy tribute' from Jerusalem which was otherwise spared. This booty included such parts of the treasures of Solomon's temple and the royal palace as were easily transportable. Jehoiachin, his mother, wives, family and the leading state and military officials were taken as hostages to the court at Babylon... The Babylonians do not seem to have collected this large group quickly and the Jewish captives only moved off to their exile home some weeks after the city itself had fallen. Thus their exile began at 'the turn of the year' in the month following the capture of the city, which month also marked the commencement of Nebuchadnezzar's eighth year.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This brief record of Nebuchadnezzar's 7th year harmonizes perfectly with the Bible account (2 Kings 24:1, 6, 8-17; 2 Chron. 36:5-10). The difference between the "7th year" in the Chronicle and the "8th year" in 2 Kings 24:12 may be due, as Wiseman explains, to a delay in the transportation of the captives. However, it has also been explained as representing merely the difference between the Babylonian and Jewish calendars, with the Bible writer using the Jewish civil year (beginning with the 7th month, in the autumn), which ran 6 months earlier than Nebuchadnezzar's spring-beginning Babylonian year. For the two calendars see "Year" in *SDADic*. The two unnamed kings are Jehoiachin and Zedekiah. The latter, who reigned 11 years, was taken into exile in Nebuchadnezzar's 19th year, 586 B.C. The B.C. dating of Nebuchadnezzar's regnal years is astronomically fixed (see No. 452).]

### **907. Israel—History—Jerusalem destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955), pp. 101, 102. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 101] Until very recently it was impossible to disprove the views of Torrey and other eminent scholars who declared that the destructive effects of the Chaldaean conquest had been greatly exaggerated in the Hebrew records and that the Babylonian [p. 102] Diaspora did not become important until much later; the Book of Ezekiel was regarded by this group as being more or less unhistorical...

Excavations in Judah (see Chapter XVI) have proved that many of the towns of the land were completely destroyed about 600 B.C. or a little later, and never reoccupied; others were destroyed and their occupation interrupted for a considerable length of time.

Moreover, the discoveries at Tell Beit Mirsim, Bethshemesh, and Lachish have shown that the final catastrophe took place between 589 and 587, when Jerusalem was captured and destroyed, according to the chronological researches of most recent scholars.

### **908. Israel—History—Jews and Others Repatriated by Cyrus**

SOURCE: Ira Maurice Price and others, *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, p. 319. Copyright 1958 by The Judson Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

When Cyrus issued his proclamation in Babylon about 538 or 537 B.C., it undoubtedly met with a hearty response from thousands of captive peoples who had been forcibly brought into that land. This proclamation reversed the transportation policy of the Assyrian kings of the eighth century B.C. Cyrus permitted the homesick captives to return to their homelands. He aided them to rebuild their ruined cities and to organize autonomous governments under the suzerainty of Persia. Perhaps the Jews were more highly favored than others in that special aid was given them by the authorities...

The captive and migrating Jews were not all from the Mesopotamian valley or Babylonia. Many had been sold as slaves by the Philistines (Amos 1:6) and the Edomites (Amos 1:9), probably to the Phoenicians who distributed them about the Mediterranean countries. Some also had found their way into Egypt, either as captives, as mercenaries, or as immigrants.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Relatively few Jews actually returned, but Cyrus' decree extended the privilege to all worshipers of the God of Israel. These included those of all the tribes, in all parts of Cyrus' empire—Media, Persia, Babylonia, old Assyria, Syria, and the neighboring lands of Phoenicia, Edom, Moab, Ammon, etc. The decree could not yet apply to Jews in Egypt, which was not part of the Persian Empire until the reign of Cyrus' successor, Cambyses.]

### **909. Israel—History—Jews' Ecclesiastical State**

SOURCE: Cyrus H. Gordon, *The World of the Old Testament* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1958), pp. 277–280. Copyright 1953 by Ventnor Publishers, Inc., copyright © 1958 by Cyrus H. Gordon. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc.

[p. 277] Nehemiah resisted the attempt of Judean fanatics to revive Messianic pretensions for which there could be no place in the Persian Empire... National aspirations, which had proved unrealistic, were deferred to the far-off golden age of the Messiah. For the time being, Judah would content itself with its church as a church state, which Josephus (*Contra Apionem* 2:165) later termed a theocracy. No more pretenders to the Davidic throne appeared on the scene. Tribute was paid to the empire which attended to external politics, military affairs and the security of life and property. But autonomy in religion (and in other internal affairs such as justice) had been secured for Judah by the religious party, whose most influential leaders were Babylonian Jews.

In the ecclesiastical state of Judah, where the Temple was the *raison d'être*, the priests soon became the wealthy elite who assumed the leadership over the council of elders for administration and justice. The High Priest, who alone was acknowledged to have direct contact with Yahwe, mediated between God and the people. The function of the laity was to support the Temple so that its service should be kept up. Laymen had to be content with the role of spectators and worshipers blindly obedient to the divine Law...

It was in that period that the rupture between Samaritans and Jews became irreparable and that the Samaritan heresy became firmly established. The fact that Samaritans and Jews were close neighbors with the same faith, Law and ritual made them deadly enemies. The only difference between them was the identification of God's Holy Mountain. Though the Samaritans were numerically significant for centuries (as is, for example, witnessed by the New Testament), they could have no future, because their religion and hope were those of the Jews, and withal they were not Jews. History was to show that the continuity of the Jewish people depended on the Diaspora (i.e., the

dispersal of the Jews beyond the limits of Palestine) and not on the Palestinian community...

[p. 279] The expansion of the Jews meant that the High Priest, presiding in Jerusalem over the assembly of ecclesiastical and civil leaders, was growing in importance with the spread of his followers.

As the end of the Book of Nehemiah shows, Judah was set up strictly as an ecclesiastical entity. The community there was not the main body of Jewry. The Diaspora was ever widening. From Babylonia, Jews spread to Susa, Media and westward to all the provinces of the World Empire (Esther 3:8; 8:17; 9:2–3, 16). Those Jews, no matter how separated they were, retained their Jewish identity so that they were different from the rest of the population (Esther 3:8). As is sometimes the case with minorities, the Jews were enterprising and successful in government service as well as private business. Since the Jews were not bound by close ties to their gentile neighbors, they [p. 280] were free to serve the king without conflicting loyalties. Thus men like Nehemiah or Mordecai were in a position to serve their king well, to attain to serve their king well, to attain positions of influence and to secure royal protection for their coreligionists when necessary.

### **910. Israel—History—Jews in Egypt, 5th Century B.C.**

SOURCE: A. Cowley, *Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra* (New York: Macmillan, 1919), pp. x–xvii, xxiii, xxiv.

[p. x] The present texts [the Jewish papyri from Elephantine], which ... cover practically the whole of the fifth century B.C. (494 to *circ.* 400), during which time Egypt was under Persian rule, ... are the earliest Jewish documents in existence (except one or two inscriptions) outside the Bible, and are a valuable contemporary illustration of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

The language in which they are written is Aramaic, a language distinct from, though closely allied to, Hebrew... It was, in fact, like modern French, the diplomatic or international language of that time in the East, and was used by the Persian Government in the administration of the provinces...

[p. xi] As to the origin of the colony [Yeb, on the Nile island of Elephantine] whose existence is here revealed to us, we have no evidence in the texts themselves. That it was Jewish, and conscious of being so, seems to be certain. Individual members of it are described as *Yehudi*, "Jew," the community is called "the Jewish force," and the names of the people are good Jewish names of the post-exilic type, mostly ending in *-iah*. They were, however, not the only inhabitants of Elephantine, for we find names of various other nationalities, Babylonian, Persian, Egyptian, Arab, etc. The Jews lived apparently on equal terms with the people of other races, doing business with them, and even intermarrying without compunction.

Probably the connexion between Judaea and Egypt was always close, and Jewish settlers in Egypt must have become more numerous as trade increased; cf. *e. g.* Deut. 17<sup>16</sup>, Jer. 44. But this colony seems to have had a more definite origin. It was essentially military, since it is called the "Jewish force." ... [p. xii] Now, the writer of the letter of Aristeas incidentally mentions (§ 13) that Psammetichus, King of Egypt, used Jewish mercenaries in his campaign against Ethiopia. This must be Psammetichus II (see Herodotus ii, 159), who reigned from 595 to 590 B.C. ...

These colonists ... were already settled in the south of Egypt at the time when their brethren were returning to Jerusalem, and they were developing independently as a religious community during all the constructive, or re-constructive, activity of Ezra and Nehemiah...

The religious and internal affairs of the community were directed by priests, as we see from No. 30 and frequently, but these priests (*kahanin*) are never called sons of Aaron. They acknowledged the God of the Jews, who is called Yahu, the older (not an abbreviated) form of the name which we used to pronounce Jehovah, now generally written Yahweh. They had no scruple, as the later Jews had, about writing or uttering the name. But we also find mention of Ishumbethel and 'Anathbethel (No. 22<sup>124-125</sup>), apparently as gods associated with Yahu, though their relation to him is obscure.

Elsewhere Herembethel and 'Anathyahu seem to be gods, and we find personal names compounded with Bethel and Herem, just as others are formed with -yah(u). Whatever may be the origin of the other names, it is probable that Bethel is the old Canaanite god (cf. Gen. 31<sup>13</sup> in the Hebrew), whom the colonists had brought with them. Not only so, but in No. 14<sup>5</sup> a Jewess of good position (therefore presumably not from ignorance), in a transaction with an Egyptian, [p. xiv] takes an oath by the Egyptian goddess Sati. Yet it is evident throughout that they regarded Yahu as the supreme God, and themselves as specially devoted to the worship of Yahu.

This worship was conducted in a temple—not merely a synagogue or meeting-house, but (from the description in No. 30) a building of considerable dignity, containing an altar on which burnt-sacrifice was offered to Yahu. Now, according to Deuteronomy 12<sup>5-6</sup>, etc. this ought to have been impossible. The law is very definite: sacrifice was only to be offered in the place which the Lord should choose, to put His name there. It is a clear restriction of the earlier practice recognized in Exodus and frequently illustrated in the Books of Samuel. Was the colony, then, ignorant of Deuteronomy or did it understand the command to apply only to Judaea, or was it frankly heretical? Not the last, apparently, for when their temple was destroyed they appealed to Jerusalem for help to rebuild it. Clearly they saw no reason why they should not offer sacrifices in their local temple, just as Samuel sacrificed at Gilgal (1 Sam. 11<sup>15</sup>) and others elsewhere. Both this practice and the worship of other (subsidiary) gods look like a continuation of earlier, pre-exilic customs, which became impossible in Judaea after the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah... [p. xv] They were as sheep without a shepherd in the spiritual desert of Egypt. Their national existence was ended, and it is not surprising or discreditable that they should have organised themselves as an independent religious community, and, since the temple at Jerusalem was destroyed, should have erected a temple of their own at Elephantine. According to the statement in 30<sup>13</sup>, it was built before the Persian conquest of Egypt, and when Cambyses came into the country (in 525) it was already there, and was not injured by him.

Much more difficult to understand is the complete silence of these texts as to some of the fundamental facts of Jewish history and religion... [p. xvi] The fact that there is none suggests a doubt whether these isolated colonists in the fifth century B.C. really knew anything of their early history and institutions—and this doubt again suggests a question whether they had forgotten it all, or, supposing their mental attitude to be that of their



ancestors in 600 B.C., whether the ordinary Jew of that date, in Judaea, was equally uninstructed.

Even the mention of the Passover does not make the case better, for a special order seems to have been necessary for its celebration, and the regulations for the feast of Unleavened Bread, which is connected with it, have to be explained to the people...

[p. xvii] It would seem that the colony knew about the Passover, although they had not kept it regularly, but that the feast of Unleavened Bread was either unknown to them or had been entirely neglected.

The important point, about which there can be no question, is that the order was sent by the Persian king. It was a curt command, and the details were added by the messenger, who was a Jew. If, then, Darius could be induced, for whatever reasons, to issue a special edict concerning a single religious observance in an obscure colony of Jews, we need not question the authenticity of the letter of Artaxerxes in Ezra 7<sup>12</sup>, dealing with the much more important matter of Ezra's mission. In neither case need we suppose that the details are due to the king himself. In the papyrus they certainly are not, and in Ezra 7<sup>12</sup> one can imagine the king, when once his consent had been obtained, saying, "Very well, then, give the man an order for what he wants." The order would then be drawn up by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, probably advised by Ezra himself, and sealed by the king's seal-bearer. Granted the initial good-will of the king, there is nothing improbable about the rest...

[p. xxiii] The religion of Judaea in the time of church was not the same as that of the book of Judges. A thousand years had fashioned it in a thousand ways, and anything which throws light on the process is as instructive as it is interesting. Much has been done by careful analysis of the Old Testament text, but hitherto the external evidence has been very slight. For this reason the present texts are of first-rate importance. At the present time the daily life of the practicing Jew is one continuous religious exercise: there is a *dîn*, a religious rule, for every act. In the business documents of this collection, on the contrary, we see a people whose daily life appears to be wholly uninfluenced by religious considerations, and who seem to be quite unconscious of any religious past. In the Ahikar story we have a sample of the literature they read. It may have been, and almost certainly was, of entirely foreign origin. There is nothing Jewish about it, and the proverbs are as different as can be from the high standard of collections like the Pirke Aboth. Yet such documents as No. 30 show that they held to one essential fact—the worship of Yahu—regarding the interruption of it as a national calamity. They may have been less spiritually minded than the main body of their contemporaries in Judaea, but it seems likely that they had remained at much the same [p. xxiv] level as their forefathers of the sixth century B.C. There could have been no natural religious development among a people such as these colonists appear to be. Nothing short of an earthquake could make the dry bones live. It was in the shock of Ezra's reforms that modern Judaism was born, and the system of morality in which Christianity was afterwards planted. As the rabbis said, "the Law was forgotten, and Ezra restored it."

One other point. The existence of this colony, unsuspected fifteen years ago, shows that the Diaspora, or Dispersion of the Jews (1 Peter 1<sup>1</sup>), had already begun several centuries before the Christian era. Besides the colony at Elephantine, there was a settlement at Abydos, and no doubt others elsewhere. The use of Aramaic, which was common all over the East, came easily to the Jews abroad, and eventually became their

natural language. (Though there are Hebraisms in these documents, there is not a single text composed in Hebrew.) Probably intercourse between the colonists and the mother-country helped to establish Aramaic in Judaea, as we find it in the time of Christ. But the important thing is that these outlying settlements, with their common language and common belief in a revived Judaism, were there as a field prepared for the scattered seed of Christianity. The records of this colony show us an earlier type of the communities so often mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles (2<sup>5,9-11</sup>). They are therefore not merely of antiquarian interest. They reveal the rock whence we are hewn, and appeal to our human sympathy with the difficulties of a people seeking God in their darkness, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us.

### 911. Israel—History—Jews in Egypt, Temple of

SOURCE: A. Cowley, ed. and trans., *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), No. 30, pp. 108, 113, 114. Used by permission.

[Translator's note; p. 108] It [papyrus No. 30] is a (draft or copy of a) letter from Yedoniah, who thus appears to be the chief priest (see below) and head of the community at Yeb, to Bigvai the Persian viceroy of Judaea. It describes a plot (to which allusion has already been made in no. 27) between the Egyptians and the Persian governor Waidrang for the destruction of the temple, which took place three years before the date of writing. Incidentally the temple is described, and some historical facts are mentioned. Finally Bigvai is asked to give orders for its re-building...

[p. 113: Text of papyrus No. 39] <sup>1</sup>To our lord Bigvai, governor of Judaea, your servants Yedoniah and his colleagues, the priests who are in Yeb the fortress [Elephantine, Egypt]. The health <sup>2</sup>of your lordship may the God of Heaven seek after exceedingly at all times, and give you favor before Darius the king <sup>3</sup>and the princes of the palace more than now a thousand times, and may he grant you long life, and may you be happy and prosperous at all times. <sup>4</sup>Now your servant Yedoniah and his colleagues depose as follows: In the month of Tammuz in the 14th year of Darius the king, when Arsames <sup>5</sup>departed and went to the king, the priests of the god Khnub, who is in the fortress of Yeb, (were) in league with Waidrang who was governor here, <sup>6</sup>saying: The temple of Ya'u the God, which is in the fortress of Yeb let them remove from there. Then that Waidrang, <sup>7</sup>the reprobate, a letter to his son Nephayan who was commander of the garrison in the fortress of Syene saying: The temple which is in Yeb <sup>8</sup>the fortress let them destroy. Then Nephayan led out the Egyptians with the other forces. They came to the fortress of Yeb with their weapons, <sup>9</sup>they entered that temple, they destroyed it to the ground, and the pillars of stone which were there they broke. Also it happened, 5 gateways <sup>10</sup>of stone, built with hewn blocks of stone, which were in that temple they destroyed, and their doors they lifted off (?), and the hinges <sup>11</sup>of those doors were bronze, and the roof of cedar wood, all of it with the rest of the furniture and other things which were there, <sup>12</sup>all of it they burnt with fire, and the basons of gold and silver and everything that was in that temple, all of it, they took <sup>13</sup>and made their own. Already in the days of the kings of Egypt our fathers had built that temple in the fortress of Yeb, and when Cambyses came into Egypt <sup>14</sup>he found that temple built, and the temples of the gods of Egypt all of them they overthrew, but no one did any harm to that temple. <sup>15</sup>When this was done, we with our wives and our children put on sack-cloth and fasted and prayed to Ya'u the the Lord of Heaven, <sup>16</sup>who let us see (our desire) upon that Waidrang. The dogs tore off the anklet from his legs, and all the riches he had gained were [p. 114] destroyed, and all the men <sup>17</sup>who had sought to do evil to that temple, all of them, were killed and we saw (our desire) upon them. Also before this, at the time when this evil

<sup>18</sup>was done to us, we sent a letter to your lordship and to Johanan the high priest and his colleagues the priests who are in Jerusalem, and to Ostanes the brother <sup>19</sup>of 'Anani, and the nobles of the Jews. They have not sent any letter to us. Also since the month of Tammuz in the 14th year of Darius the king <sup>20</sup>till this day we wear sack-cloth and fast. Our wives are made widow-like, we do not anoint ourselves with oil <sup>21</sup>and we drink no wine. Also from that (time) till (the present) day in the 17th year of Darius the king, neither meal-offering, incense, nor sacrifice <sup>22</sup>do they offer in that temple. Now your servants Yedoniah and his colleagues and the Jews, all *of them* of Yeb, say as follows: <sup>23</sup>If it seem good to your lordship, take thought for that temple to build (it), since they do not allow us to build it. Look upon your <sup>24</sup>well-wishers and friends who are here in Egypt, (and) let a letter be sent from you to them concerning the temple of the God Ya'u <sup>25</sup>to build it in the fortress of Yeb as it was built before, and they shall offer the meal-offering and incense and sacrifice <sup>26</sup>on the altar of the God Ya'u on your behalf, and we will pray for you at all times, we, our wives, our children, and the Jews, <sup>27</sup>all who are here, if they do so that temple be re-built, and it shall be a merit to you before Ya'u the God of <sup>28</sup>Heaven more than a man who offers to him sacrifice and burnt-offerings worth as much as the sum of a thousand talents. As to gold, about this <sup>29</sup>we have sent (and) given instructions. Also the whole matter we have set forth in a letter in our name to Delaiah and Shelemiah the sons of Sanballat governor of Samaria. <sup>30</sup>Also of all this which was done to us Arsames knew nothing. On the 20th of Marheshwan the 17th year of Darius the king [407 B.C.].

### 912. Israel—History—Jews in Period of Alexander's Divided Empire

SOURCE: Edwyn Bevan, *Jerusalem Under the High-Priests* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1940), pp. 20–23, 27–29. Used by permission.

[p. 20] When Alexander died without out leaving a capable heir, there followed, as we might expect, a period of terrible confusion and fighting. I think it is a popular fallacy, due perhaps to the first book of *Maccabees*, that Alexander on his death-bed divided his kingdom among four of his generals. Of course, nothing could be more untrue. There was some pretence at first of keeping the kingdom together, with Alexander's son, born after his death, and Alexander's feeble-minded half brother [Philip], for joint [p. 21] kings. But really there was a general scramble among all the strong Macedonian chiefs. The poor kings were soon made away with in that wild time... [Some sixty] years after Alexander's death, ... it has come to the formation of three kingdoms [earlier, four kingdoms; see No. 53], which are to be ruled by the descendants of the most fortunate three out of those five. One of these kingdoms, whose territory corresponds roughly with the old Macedonian kingdom which Alexander inherited, need not concern us at all; it lies far off from the region which interests us now. Of the other two we shall have a great deal to say... One of Alexander's principal friends, a Macedonian chief called Ptolemy, had the shrewdness to get himself made governor of Egypt before the actual fighting began...

[p. 22] The other kingdom with which we shall have to do offers a striking contrast to the Ptolemaic. It fell to the heirs of the last survivor of Alexander's generals, Seleucus, who finally outlived all his competitors... [p. 23] The line of kings descended from Seleucus are what we call the Seleucid dynasty. They did not have one royal name for all the kings, as the Ptolemies had, but the earlier kings were all called either Seleucus or

Antiochus. Later on other names came in as well. The territory which at the outset this dynasty aspired to hold was all the Asiatic part of Alexander's empire from the Mediterranean to the frontiers of India... [p. 27] After Ptolemy had definitely occupied Palestine in 301, a period of comparative peace may be supposed to have ensued; for although the wars between the houses of Seleucus and Ptolemy began [p. 28] in the next generation we do not hear of the Seleucid armies getting farther south, in the interior, than Damascus. But if it was peace, it was subjection to the Ptolemaic government.

The phases in the hundred-years' struggle between Ptolemy and Seleucid make up whatever external history the Jewish state has during that epoch. They are traced in the eleventh chapter of the book of *Daniel*. We have there the break-up of Alexander's empire, its division "towards the four winds of heaven"; the rise of Seleucus to great dominion; the truce in the struggle about 250, when Antiochus II. married the daughter of Ptolemy II.; the tragedy in which that truce too soon ended, and then the victorious march of the third Ptolemy into the heart of the Seleucid realm; the renewal of the conflict by Seleucus II. and his sons.

In all these vicissitudes the Jews were apparently passive spectators. They would often, looking down from their uplands upon the Philistian plain, have seen the long lines of King Ptolemy's army moving past against the king of the north, covering the country with its tents. The rumours of far-off battles, of the shifting policy of kings, would be matter of talk in the bazaars of Jerusalem. That is all that we can safely say.

In 223, a hundred years after the death of Alexander, there came to the Seleucid throne the man under whom the controversy was to be finally settled in favour of the northern kingdom—the third Antiochus, commonly known as Antiochus the Great. Antiochus waged two series of campaigns for the possession of Palestine... [p. 29] The decisive battle was fought in 198 at the place where the road through the defiles of the Lebanon approaches the sources of the river Jordan—the battle of the Panium. There was a sanctuary of the god Pan close by, and the place is still called Baniyas. The Seleucid army was commanded by Antiochus himself and his eldest son; the Ptolemaic army was commanded by a Greek called Scopos. Antiochus was victorious, and Palestine immediately passed finally to the house of Seleucus. The hundred-years' tenure of Palestine by the Ptolemies comes now to an end; the Seleucid kings are henceforth the kings with whom the Jews have to deal.

### **913. Israel—History—Jews of Palestine Between Ptolemies and Seleucids**

SOURCE: C. W. Boase, "The Macedonian Empire," *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. 15 (9th ed. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1883), p. 144.

The Ptolemies [of Egypt] gained Cyrene and Cyprus, and struggled hard with the Syrian kings [the Seleucids] for the possession of Phoenicia; Palestine was as of old the battlefield for the king of the north and the king of the south. The Ptolemies even held Seleucia at the mouth of the Orontes for some time. The history of these times is lost in its detail.

### **914. Israel—History—Jews Persecuted by Antiochus IV Epiphanes**

SOURCE: Edwyn Bevan, *Jerusalem Under the High-Priests* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1940), pp. 76–83. Used by permission.

[p. 76] The Jewish state found itself in 175 B.C. [under the rule of Antiochus IV Epiphanes]. Syria soon felt that a man with a progressive program was at the head of affairs. Antiochus saw in his kingdom a field in which to operate as the crowned apostle

of Hellenism; or perhaps we should say he saw in Hellenism the medium which could best unify his heterogeneous kingdom. The cities were encouraged to conform more perfectly to the Hellenic pattern, and possibly a larger measure of autonomy was conceded to those which were willing to do so, in accordance with that ground-principle of Hellenism which prescribed that every city-state should be a free and sovereign community. This conversion ... was [p. 77] not something ... Antiochus forced upon unwilling societies, but something conceded as a favour, a grant of liberties, of dignity... Antiochus, if he expected to receive divine honours, was not expecting anything unusual according to the notions of the time. Alexander the Great had received divine honours, and so even had some of the prominent men of Greece in the generations before Alexander; all the Ptolemies and all the Seleucids were officially worshipped in their kingdoms; the Roman emperors later on were worshipped, as a regular thing, with temples and priesthoods and sacrifice... [p. 78] Now for the first time in the Seleucid realm the coins display, beside the name of the king, high-sounding surnames, *Epiphanes*, that is, as it sometimes appears in full, *Theos Epiphanes*, the “god made manifest”; *Nikephoros*, “the holder of victory,” a surname connected by Greek usage with the supreme god, Zeus.

The accession of such a king made a great difference at Jerusalem. The prospects of the Hellenising party opened to an unexpected extent; they would now find ready enough hearing at Antioch. Oniah the high-priest was an obstacle, but the Hellenists had a champion in his brother Jeshua, or, by his Greek name, Jason... Jason, by the usual sort of money-transaction at court, got himself recognized as high-priest by the king's government in the place of his brother, and he obtained [p. 79] leave to remodel Jerusalem, as a new Antioch, on Hellenic lines... The indispensable gymnasium rose in the heart of the city; the younger members of the Jewish aristocracy eagerly formed a body of *epheboi*, and flaunted about the streets in the ephebic garb, which corresponded, as we saw, to the Greek country dress—chlamys and broad-brimmed hat. By the act of its own people, Jerusalem had renounced its age-long isolation and come into line with the great Hellenic world.

You can imagine the grief and horror, the consuming indignation, with which members of the Hasîdîm watched those young men stroll by. I think we must allow that, if we had sought for real piety and high earnestness, we should have found it in the meetings of the Hasîdîm rather than in the gymnasium... The HasEdEm ... were men of their day with its limitations and narrow thoughts; but it was they who [p. 80] kept, in whatever shell of old-world prejudice, that spiritual treasure, so unspeakably precious to the whole human race, committed to Israel...

[p. 81] While Antiochus was campaigning in Egypt [in 170 or 169 B.C.] a report spread through Palestine that he was dead... But Antiochus was not dead, and this outbreak at Jerusalem, this rebellion during the process of a foreign war, seemed to call for signal chastisement. On his way back from Egypt he turned aside to beat down Jerusalem beneath the feet of the high-priest, and let loose his soldiers to massacre. But that was not all. It was an unwise practice of Antiochus to relieve his financial necessities by appropriating the treasures of the Syrian temples. The Temple at Jerusalem was said to contain great riches, and Jerusalem had made itself liable to punishment. Antiochus determined to enter the Temple and carry off whatever pleased his fancy. It is difficult for

us to realise the horror which such a profanation would send through the Jewish people, the appalling insistence with which the question would rack them, Why, why the Lord did not defend His own sanctuary? “Wherefore do the heathen say, Where is now thy God?” ...

[p. 82] He [Antiochus] came to the conclusion that it was possible, that it was expedient, to extinguish the eccentric Jewish religion once for all. As far as Jerusalem itself went, the execution of his plans was fairly simple. Already a part of the population, and especially, as we saw, of the ruling class, had adopted Hellenism; the political organisation of the state after the pattern of a Greek republic was carried through by a royal commissioner; and Jehovah having been identified with the Olympian Zeus, the Temple service was recast in Greek forms, with an image of the god, which probably displayed the features of Antiochus himself. A garrison of the king’s troops occupied the citadel; and under their eye Jerusalem held its new political assemblies, and sacrificed animals forbidden by Moses to its transfigured divinity. No doubt, a large number of those who took part in these things, did so with a heavy heart; the triumph of Hellenism was not as complete as outward appearances proclaimed. But there were many whom no stress could bring [p. 83] to conform, and these forsook the city and thronged into the country towns and villages. Here they were followed up by the agents of the government, which was resolved to stamp out Jewish practices throughout the land. If only these practices could be once interrupted, if circumcision were once stopped and the rules of food broken through, the thing would be done. And surely practices so irrational and uncouth, as they seemed to the Greeks, would soon give way, if torture and death were applied firmly to break them down.

How familiar it all sounds to us, who look back along such a dreadful vista of religious persecutions! But it was a new thing then. Israel had never gone through such a crisis before. And when we reckon up our debt to Israel, we must remember that it is this crisis which opens the roll of *martyrs*. There were many in that day of agony who endured everything, the several forms of torture and death, rather than disobey the Law of their God. You may read the typical cases, as they were remembered in subsequent generations, in the 6th and 7th chapters of *2 Maccabees*, the story of the old scribe Eleazar, of the Seven Brethren.

### **915. Israel—History—Jews, Rome’s Treaty With (161 B.C.)**

SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* xii. 10. 6; translated by Ralph Marcus, Vol. 7 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 217, 219. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 217] Thereupon, having heard of the power of the Romans and that they had subdued Galatia and Iberia and Carthage in Libya, and in addition had conquered Greece and the kings Perseus, Philip and Antiochus the Great, he [Judas Maccabaeus] decided to make a treaty of friendship with them. Accordingly, he sent to Rome his friends Eupolemus, the son of Joannes, and Jason, the son of Eleazar, and through them requested the Romans to become his allies and friends, and to write to Demetrius that he should not make war on the Jews. When the envoys sent by Judas came to Rome, the Senate received them, and after they had spoken about their mission, agreed to the alliance. It also made a decree concerning this, and sent a copy to Judaea, while the original was engraved on bronze tablets and deposited in the Capitol. It read as [p. 219] follows. “A decree of the Senate concerning a treaty of alliance and goodwill with the Jewish nation. No one of those who are subject to the Romans shall make war on the

Jewish nation, or furnish to those who make war on them any grain, ships or money. And if any attack the Jews, the Romans shall assist them so far as they are able, and on the other hand, if any attack the Romans, the Jews shall help them as allies. And if the Jewish nation wishes either to add anything to, or remove anything from, this treaty of alliance, this shall be done with the concurrence of the Roman people, and whatever may be added shall be valid.”

### **916. Israel—History — Jews Under Successive Empires**

SOURCE: F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1956), pp. 11–13. Copyright 1956 by the Paternoster Press, London. Used by permission of the author and of the Paternoster Press.

[p. 11] When the Persian king Cyrus brought the Babylonian Empire to an end in 539 B.C., he authorized a body of Jewish displaced persons to return to their home in Judaea, from which they had been deported by Nebuchadrezzar two generations previously, and to rebuild their national shrine in Jerusalem. After some years the temple was rebuilt, and its services were carried out anew by the members of the old priestly families, at whose head stood Jeshua, a scion of the house of Zadok, which had occupied the chief priesthood in the former temple since its dedication in by King Solomon about 960 B.C. down to its destruction by the Babylonians in 587 [rather 586]. But, while the ancient chief-priestly family was restored to its sacred office, the royal house of David, which also returned from exile, was not restored to the kingship.

The new Jewish community was organized as a temple-state, consisting of Jerusalem and a few miles around. At the head of the state was the high priest, who controlled internal Jewish affairs; the wider interests of the Persian Empire were the responsibility of the civil governor of Judaea, who was appointed by the crown. When, after two hundred years, the Persian Empire was in its turn brought to an end by Alexander the Great, no material change took place in the Jewish constitution. They had a Macedonian governor over them instead of one appointed by the Persian king; they had to pay taxes to a Macedonian court instead of to the Persian court; they were exposed to the powerful influence of Hellenistic culture. But the high priests of the house of Zadok remained as before at the head of the Jewish temple-state. So matters continued under the domination of the Ptolemies, who inherited Alexander’s empire in Egypt, and retained Palestine under their control until 198 B.C. When in that year they lost Palestine to the rival dynasty of the Seleucids, who had succeeded to Alexander’s heritage in the greater part of Asia, the transition was smooth so far as Judaea was concerned. To be sure, the [p. 12] increasing tendency to follow western ways caused grave concern to the more conservatively-minded Jews, but they had no complaint against the Gentile government, which guaranteed the temple constitution and granted the utmost liberty in the practice of the Jewish religion.

For a variety of reasons a change came about with the accession of Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) to the Seleucid throne in 175 B.C. Early in his reign he interfered with the Zadokite succession to the high priesthood; later he tried to prohibit the Jewish religion altogether. This led to a national and religious rising, as a result of which Judaea ultimately secured complete political independence. The leaders of this rising, the priestly family of the Hasmoneans, became the ruling dynasty in the independent state, and assumed the high priesthood in addition to the chief civil and military power. From 142 to 63 B.C. the Jews preserved their hardly won independence under the Hasmoneans, but in the latter year they lost it to the Romans, who reorganized all the territory west of the

Euphrates as part of their empire. But the Romans left a Hasmonean high priest in charge of the internal affairs of Judaea for over twenty years. In 40 B.C., however, the political situation in western Asia caused them to nominate one Herod as king of the Jews, and Herod ruled Palestine from 37 to 4 B.C. in the interests of Rome. His son Archelaus, who succeeded him in Judaea, was deposed by the Roman Emperor in A.D. 6, and for the next sixty years Judaea was governed by procurators appointed by the Emperor, except for three years (A.D. 41–44) when a grandson of Herod, Agrippa I, reigned over Judaea as king. From the beginning of Herod's reign the high priests, who were henceforth appointed by Herod and his descendants, or else by Roman governors, counted for less and less, although by virtue of their office they continued to preside over the Sanhedrin, the supreme court of the Jewish nation.

Misrule by Roman procurators, combined with an increasing intolerance of Gentile control on the part of Jewish nationalists, led to the Jewish revolt of A.D. 66 and the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem by the Roman forces in A.D. 70. With the fall of the temple, the last vestiges of the temple constitution, together with the highpriestly office, came to an end. Judaea was placed under firmer military control than before. But in A.D. 132 a new revolt broke out, and the independence of Judaea was pro- [p. 13] claimed under a messianic claimant who is commonly known as Bar-Kokhba. After three years of guerrilla fighting this rising was crushed. Jerusalem was rebuilt by the Romans as a completely Gentile city, and a new chapter opened in the history of the Holy Land.

### **917. Israel, State of (Modern), Jewish View of**

SOURCE: Denis Baly, *Multitudes in the Valley*, pp. 4, 5. Copyright 1957 by The Seabury Press, Inc., Greenwich, Conn. Used by permission.

[p. 4] A great many Israelis could perhaps best be described as “post-religious” in the sense in which much of Western Europe today has been called “post-Christian,” but, of course, the religion through which they have passed is Judaism and not Christianity. Even though they do not practice it, it commands respect because it is undoubtedly the religion of the Jewish people and of none other. In just the same way as among the “post-Christians” of Western Europe, their thinking is determined by the religion which they once held and which is still in some undefined measure “their” religion. Naturally, the factors which determine their thinking are different, and it might perhaps be suggested that some of the chief controls are: the Promises of God, the Messianic Hope, the Sense of the Community, the Rabbinic Method, and the Absence of Theology...

The promises of God, of course, are those which concern the land of Palestine. Jewish thinking is more [p. 5] strongly conscious of the covenant relationship than Christian thinking tends to be. It is perfectly true that part of the Christian claim is that in Jesus there has been a new agreement, and that this is the meaning of the prophecy in the thirty-first chapter of Jeremiah, but this idea of an agreement having been made with God is not normally very much to the forefront of the minds of the Christian laity. It is otherwise with the Jew... It is, in fact, drummed into him by his teachers that what makes Judaism different from other religions is just that it is based upon a contract... Even the most secular observance of Passover seldom entirely obscures this fact. The feasts of Pentecost and Tabernacles likewise emphasize that God kept His word and that He will continue to keep it... This has burned down into their thinking, and it colors much of their emotional reaction to the State of Israel. Even the least religious of them conceive of Palestine as in



some way theirs by more than historic justice—[they believe that] it is theirs by divine right.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Bracketed insertion is the author's.]