

998. Man, Nature of—Body Shows Creator’s Planning and Skill

SOURCE: [James Patterson MacLaren], *Know Thy Body*, by “Medicus” [pseud.] (London: Thorsons Publishers, Ltd., 1934), p. 182. Used by permission.

Written unmistakably on every cell, tissue, organ and gland of the body are the marks of a purposeful mind planning every detail for a definite function or end, and that with a fertility of device and a splendour of successful execution which made one time and again almost shout with rapture at the felicity of the solution...

Even Voltaire said: “If there was not a God it would be necessary to invent one.”

999. Man, Nature of—Everlasting Life Through the Incarnation

SOURCE: Edward White, *Life in Christ* (London: Elliot Stock, 1875), p. 236.

The one line of thought, transcending all natural ideas of man, which pervades John’s Gospel, is—THE INCARNATION OF THE DEITY, of the LOGOS-THEOS, in the person of Jesus our Lord.—The other line of thought is the parallel affirmation from the lips of this Incarnate Deity, that MAN OWES THE PROSPECT OF EVERLASTING LIFE, not to his own nature, but to redemptive UNION WITH HIM, THE LIFE OF THE WORLD.

1000. Man, Nature of—Greek Philosophical View of Body as Prison of the Soul

SOURCE: Oscar Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?* (New York: Macmillan, 1958), pp. 19, 20. © 1958 by Oscar Cullmann. Used with permission of The Macmillan Company and The Epworth Press, London.

[p. 19] In Plato’s impressive description of the death of Socrates, in the *Phaedo*, occurs perhaps the highest and most sublime doctrine ever presented on the immortality of the soul. What gives his argument its unexcelled value is his scientific reserve, his disclaimer of any proof having mathematical validity. We know the arguments he offers for the immortality of the soul. Our body is only an outer garment which, as long as we live, prevents our soul from moving freely and from living in conformity to its proper eternal essence. It imposes upon the soul a law which is not appropriate to it. The soul, confined within the body, belongs to [p. 20] the eternal world. As long as we live, our soul finds itself in a prison, that is, in a body essentially alien to it. Death, in fact, is the great liberator. It looses the chains, since it leads the soul out of the prison of the body and back to its eternal home. Since body and soul are radically different from one another and belong to different worlds, the destruction of the body cannot mean the destruction of the soul, any more than a musical composition can be destroyed when the instrument is destroyed.

1001. Man, Nature of, Mortal; to Be Immortalized

SOURCE: Edward White, *Life in Christ* (London: Elliot Stock, 1875), p. 225.

What then, if we may follow the natural and proper sense of these declarations of Christ [concerning the reception of eternal life through faith in Him], is the result to which they lead us?

Beyond all question it is THAT THE VERY OBJECT OF THE INCARNATION IS TO IMMORTALISE MANKIND; that man can *live for ever* only by spiritual union with the Incarnate Deity; that apart from such union man will *die, perish, and be destroyed*.

When we wish to express the idea of perpetual existence, or the loss of being, there is no language in which we can so naturally and properly convey our meaning as in these words of Christ. Some will *live for ever*, others will *perish*. Were it not for certain extrinsic considerations, derived from foreign fields of thought, no one would ever have

imagined a different sense. Unless a reader had been warned beforehand that every man's soul, being destined by its nature to last for ever, and not to die—(being im-mortal)—he must therefore not put upon the terms of Christ's discourses any meaning which will contradict that doctrine of natural immortality,—he would not have dreamed of imposing such a figurative sense upon them, or of making *life eternal* stand for happiness, or *perishing* stand for endless misery. It is altogether due to foreign and unusual considerations, if readers have learned to take such words in an unnatural sense. For life signifies life, and to live for ever signifies to live for ever, and to perish signifies not to live for ever, but to lose organised and conscious being. That is the first and the natural meaning of the words.

1002. Man, Nature of — Psychosomatic Unity

SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, *The Bible Speaks to You* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955), pp. 229, 230. Copyright 1955 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 229] Now the way in which the notion to rebirth is emphasized in the New Testament in connection with eternal life is by the idea of resurrection. Rather than speaking of immortality of the soul, the New Testament, as we have seen, speaks of eternal life as something that will be accomplished by the power of God, who will raise up and transform the total personality of the individual; not just the soul, but all that is distinctive about him. Both Old and New Testament agree that the body and soul cannot be split apart. They are not two very different ingredients, poorly fused together. They form a unity. We are “psychosomatic” persons (*psyche*=soul, *soma*=body). We are not just one or the other; we are both, together and indissolubly.

[p. 230] This means, then, that eternal life is a transforming, rather than a junking, of life on earth. The “body” stands for everything that we *do* and *are*, here on earth. Thus, to talk of the “resurrection of the body” is a way of saying that all that happens on earth concerns God, and that he will pick up, fulfill, and complete all our partial incomplete human efforts.

1003. Man, Nature of—Unity of Body and Soul

SOURCE: [Allan Farris], “Worship and Work” (pamphlet for Labour Sunday, 1958; Toronto: Department of Social Relations of the Canadian Council of Churches, 1958), p. [3].

For centuries the Church has been plagued with a non-biblical anthropology. She has been inclined to an anthropology which divided man into two parts, body and soul. The real man is identified with the soul and the body is considered at least as a burden to the soul, if not the occasion for the soul's sinning. Salvation, in the light of such a definition of man, is really concerned with delivering man from the trammels of the flesh. The body is not significantly involved in the salvation process. Such an anthropology and a corresponding soteriology became the occasion of the divorce of the spheres of the body and the soul. The body was involved in the material and the secular sphere; whereas the soul was involved in the intellectual and spiritual sphere. The secularizing of education has, of course, embarrassed the older understanding that mind and spirit were of the same order.

The logical outcome of such thinking is asceticism of which the more organized form is monasticism. From the spirit of monasticism the Church has never quite been able to deliver herself, in spite of the lusty protest of the Reformation. Today, however, newer Biblical studies are calling into question the older understanding of man, and with support from the personality sciences are emphasizing the unity of the body and soul.

Now we are taught that man has not a body; he is a body—"an animated body". He has not a soul; he is a soul, and "body" is comprehended within the term soul. Both body and spirit, in inseparable conjunction, make up a man. Both body and spirit are essential to real manhood. For this reason the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body is taking on new meaning. Now this kind of thinking has tremendous significance for our present understanding of salvation. Salvation has to do with the whole man. Bodies, therefore, are also the object of the saving thrust of God. Where men are as animated bodies there is the locus of God's saving work.

1004. Marriage, Catholic Position on

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

[a. State's Power Over Marriage]

[p. 65] On the other hand, the Church maintains that the state has no direct or indirect power over the validity or licitness of the marriage of the Christians. It is conceded the right to prescribe reasonable regulations for the protection of public order, health, and safety and also to pass laws governing the merely civil effects of the contract. Further, in regard to marriages between the unbaptized the state can lawfully established establish impediments, even such as affect the validity of the contract; and prescribe other conditions, even affecting the validity of the contract; and prescribe other conditions, even affecting the validity, such as a requisite legal form for valid consent. It is generally held that the state has this power not as one of its proper functions but simply because there is no other competent authority to exercise it when the Church is not operative. Finally, when marriage has been or is to be contracted between a baptized and a non-baptized person, the Church claims the same jurisdiction as in marriages between Christians.

[b. Primary of Marriage]

[p. 66] It follows that we can learn the purposes of marriage and its essential traits by studying the nature of man. Reason shows that the primary purpose of marriage is the fitting procreation and education of children, and all its other ends are related to this purpose. We arrive at this conclusion by considering the existing order of created nature in which marriage appears as the only suitable means of providing for these ends in a manner befitting the dignity of men and women. Thus, we logically conclude that it has been designed by "God, the Author of nature," for this purpose...

[p. 67] Marriage considered as a state or society represents the actual living out of this contract. It may be defined as the legitimate union or society of a man and woman established for the purposes of generating and educating children, for mutual aid, and for sexual companionship. Hence the essence of the act of marriage is the mutual conjugal consent; the essence of the marriage state is the mutual sharing of conjugal life together.

[c. Mixed Marriages]

[p. 81] Catholics are forbidden to marry non-Catholics because such unions constitute a danger to the faith of both the Catholic partner and the children. The Code contains two impediments covering such marriages. One is termed "mixed religion" and renders *illicit* all marriages between Catholics and baptized non-Catholics. The other is termed "disparity of cult" and renders *invalid* all marriages between a Catholic and a non-Christian, that is, a person who is not baptized. If there are just and grave reasons for such a marriage, and if guarantees are offered that the faith of the Catholic party will be

respected and that the children born to the union will be baptized and educated in the Catholic faith alone, a dispensation may be granted for a Catholic to enter such a marriage. We shall treat the whole problem of mixed marriage in a later chapter.

[d. *Validity of Marriage*]

[p. 86] “Only those marriages are valid which are contracted before the pastor or the Ordinary of the place, or a priest delegated by either of these, and at least two witnesses” (Canon 1094 [of the Code of Canon Law]). The aim of this legislation is to safeguard the liberty of the contracting parties and to have assurance that the marriage has taken place validly. It is to be noted that the officiating priest does not administer the sacrament; the two contracting parties administer it to each other when they make the contract. The presence of the priest is required as a witness representing the Church. Also, as a representative of Christ he blesses the marriage.

There was no universal legislation on the form of celebration affecting the validity of marriage until the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century. From the beginning Christian couples had been urged to secure the blessing of the Church on their conjugal unions, but marriages celebrated without the presence of a priest were recognized as valid sacraments, inasmuch as the contract itself was the sacramental sign. However, these unwitnessed or “clandestine” marriages were open to abuse. The contract could later be repudiated by one or both the parties, and it was difficult to establish with certainty the validity of the marriage when no competent person had been present to make inquiries concerning the freedom of the parties to marry and the existence of annulling impediments. In order to stop this possible abuse of a sacred contract the first invalidating law was passed by the Council of Trent in 1563 and after some modifications was adopted in the present Code. The law applies to all who are baptized in the Western Catholic Church. Catholics of the various Oriental rites and all non-Catholics, when contracting marriage among themselves, however, are exempt from its provisions.

1005. Mary, Virgin, and Isis, Parallels Between

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 54. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

It is not difficult, then, to understand why the Romans, at first repelled by the strange rites of [the Egyptian mother-goddess] Isis, were later attracted by them; the ordinary woman, by the splendid processions and the novelty of what she saw; the educated, by the antiquity and impressiveness of the ritual, the beautiful drama, the tenderness of Isis, her rigorous rules of abstinence and purification, communion with deity, separation of her clergy from the world, and especially the final judgment and promise of a blissful hereafter with her, here emphasized more than in any other of her sister religions. She, as the “universal woman” and “queen of heaven” also attracted men as well as women. Her ritual bore a marked resemblance to that of early Christianity, as Sir James Frazer has pointed out:

Indeed the stately ritual with its shaven and tonsured priests, its matins and vespers, its tinkling music, its baptisms as aspersions of holy water, its solemn processions, its jewelled images of the mother of God, presented many points of similarity to the pomp and ceremonies of Catholicism.³⁶ [Note 36: *Adonis, Attis and Osiris* (2nd ed.; London), p. 347.]

Isis was, then, the *mater dolorosa* of paganism who sympathized especially with mothers in their sorrows and afflictions. In his prayer Lucius [Apuleius] says:

[Thou] by thy bounty and grace nourishest all the world, and bearest a great affection to the adversities of the miserable as a loving mother... Thou art she that puttest away all storms and dangers from men's life by stretching forth thy right hand ... and appeasest the great tempests of fortune...

It is, then, only natural that some students have seen her influence as “mother of sorrows” and “mother of Horus,” in whom the Greeks saw their grief-stricken Demeter searching for her daughter Persephone raped by Pluto, on the Christian concept of Mary. The motif of mother and child appears in many statuettes which have been found in her ruined shrines on the Seine, Rhine, and Danube, and which the early Christians mistook for the Madonna and Child, and little wonder since it is still difficult to differentiate between the two types.

The epithet “Mother of God” (*Theotokos*) as applied to Mary seems to have been used at first by Alexandrian theologians at the close of the third century, although it does not appear in any extant writing of that period. It became common in the fourth, being used by Eusebius, Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus in Cappadocia and others, Gregory saying that “the man who does not believe Mary was the *Theotokos* has no part in God.”

1006. Mary, Virgin, and the Mother-goddesses—Parallels in Modern Madonna Cults

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 122–124, 129–133.

[p. 122] The cult of this Phrygian divinity, variously called the Mother of the Gods, Cybele, the Great Mother or the Idaean Mother, was introduced into Rome in 204 B.C. ...

[p. 123] Although this cult was one of the last to yield to Christianity and persisted obstinately after most of the other pagan forms of worship had passed away, it left but few traces of its protracted dominance. To be sure points of contact with the Virgin Mary have been pointed out. One of Mary’s titles, “the Mother of God” (Gran Madre di Dio), has inevitable reminiscences of the pagan “Mother of the Gods.” Moreover, many a visitor to Rome and student of sculpture has commented on the resemblance between the statues of the two. Furthermore, we know that the shrine of the Virgin on Monte Vergine near Avellino in the Apennines not far from Naples, which is visited each year by thousands of pilgrims, attracted by the fame of the wonder-working image there, was once the site of a temple of the Great Mother. That they were confused in people’s minds is shown by the question which an unbeliever addressed to Abbot Isidore of Pelusium in the sixth century. He asked what the difference was between the Magna [p. 124] Mater of the pagans and the Magna Mater Maria of the Christians. But mother-goddesses, whatever their origin or special characteristics, are bound to have certain features in common. Nor is there much reason for surprise in finding in Claudia’s prayer to the Great Mother a tone analogous to that of any prayer to the sanctissima Maria in modern times: “Hear my prayer, thou who art the gentle mother of the gods.” ...

[p. 129] The idea of the [the Egyptian goddess] Isis as the mother of the child Horus was in many minds transferred to Mary, mother of God. “Remember,” said [p. 130] Gregory the Great, when issuing his instructions to a missionary to the Saxon heathens, “that you must not interfere with any traditional belief or religious observance that can be harmonized with Christianity.” And the policy of the Church toward the Saxons was not unique. The same method was used in dealing with pagans everywhere. It was the bridge over which untold thousands passed from paganism to the new faith. Without this adaptability Christianity might not have succeeded. The shift from Isis to Mary was one of the easiest and most obvious. There are extant statuettes and figurines of Isis nursing Horus which are marked by a striking similarity to familiar representations of the Madonna and Child. It is said that sometimes images of this kind have been mistaken for

representations of Mary and Jesus and have actually been worshipped in Christian Churches...

[p. 131] Moreover, in the bedizened images of the Madonna in many Churches in southern Italy and elsewhere one cannot but see a repetition of the extravagant ornamentation that characterized some of the statues of Isis, such as the figure of the goddess described in an inscription in Spain, with its emeralds, pearls, and other jewels.

An interesting religious tradition lies in the statement of Mackenzie Wallace that an image of the Madonna, of especial sanctity, was from time to time taken by rich residents of Moscow to their houses. Its presence there was believed to bring a blessing on the family. This practice is one of great antiquity, for we know that the image of Isis was sometimes taken to the house of a devotee and left there for a brief period. Whether the modern practice is derived directly from the ancient is difficult to say. The evidence is hardly conclu- [p. 132] sive. But at least we have in the practice as it exists in the Madonna cult the survival of a belief that was well established in ancient times...

The similarity between the cult-epithets of Isis and those of the Virgin Mary has often been pointed out. While many of the parallels claimed, especially in the list given by Beaugard, are imaginary, others are undoubtedly valid and furnish us with additional evidence of the contact of the two cults. Corresponding to Isis Regina ["Isis the Queen"] are familiar appellations of the Virgin: *Sovrana*, *Sovrana dell' Universo*, *Regina*. To Isis Mater ["Isis the Mother"] corresponds the Christian *Mater Domini* ["Mother of the Lord"]; to Isis Furva ["Gloomy Isis"] the *Madonna Addolorata*, to Isis Pelagia ["Isis of the Sea"] the *Regina Maris* ["Queen of the Sea"] (*Madonna del Porto Salvo*), to *Dea Potens* ["the Powerful Goddess"] [p. 133] *Maria della Potenza*, to Isis Soteira ["Isis the Deliverer"] *Madonna del Ajuto*.

1007. Mary, Virgin, and the Virgin-goddesses

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 93–95.

[p. 93] There are indications that the veneration of Diana as a virgin goddess has contributed something to the worship of the Virgin Mary. We know that one of the earliest churches erected in honor of Mary occupied the site of the famous temple of Diana at Ephesus. For although the original divinity of this sanctuary was an Asiatic goddess, she had been identified with the Greek Artemis and ultimately with the Roman Diana...

[p. 94] It is only in the same limited way that Diana's appellation of queen of heaven can be said to have influenced the designation of the Virgin Mary as queen or sovereign of the uni- [p. 95] verse.³ [Note 3 cites Alfonsus de Liguori, *The Glories of Mary*, for these titles.] For other pagan divinities had contributed their quota to the establishment of this idea in the minds of the people. The Roman Juno had been called queen; the Greek Hera had borne the same title; the Carthaginians had their queen of heaven (*Dea Caelestis*); the Egyptian Isis, the Phoenician Astarte, and the Babylonian Mylitta had all been queens of heaven. The source of this appellative as applied to Mary is as multiplex as the title of immaculate virgin.

To the local epithets of Diana given above there are parallels in the case of the Madonna. For just as the ancients spoke of Diana of the Aventine or Diana of Tifata or Diana of Ephesus, modern churchmen speak of the Madonna of Monte Vergine, the Madonna of Pompeii, the Madonna of Einsiedeln, and many others. But here again the Madonna cult has been influenced not merely by Diana but by a practice that was

common to many pagan cults and is illustrated by such examples as Juno of Argos, Juno of Lanuvium, and Venus of Cyprus, of Cythera, and of Mount Eryx.

1008. Mary, Virgin, Assumption of, a Dogma Based on Tradition

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson, *The New Ordeal of Christianity* (New York: Association Press, 1957), pp. 43, 44. Copyright 1957 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

[p. 43] Even in his bull proclaiming the dogma of the Assumption of the Virgin, Pius XII has no historical or scriptural authority to adduce. The Assumption rests entirely on tradition, and it is a tradition with such a murky and disputed background that one wonders what goes on in the mind of a Catholic trained in methods of historical research and scholarship—such a man, for example, as Carlton J. H. Hayes, former ambassador to Spain and former head of the department of history at Columbia University—when he is faced with the demand that he believe such an anti-intellectual conception on pain of risking eternal damnation. Perhaps that is the sort of Catholic Pope Pius had in mind when, in his address to the bishops, he said: “Even though to someone certain declarations of the church may not seem proved by the arguments put forward, his obligation to obey still remains.” Tertullian could say, *Credo quia incredibile* [“I believe because it is unbelievable”], but that certainly is not the voice of this age.

1009. Mary, Virgin, Assumption of, Not Taught in the Early Church

SOURCE: Joh[an]n J. Ign[atz] von Döllinger, *The Pope and the Council*, by Janus [pseud.] (2d ed.; London: Rivingtons, 1869), pp. 34, 35.

[p. 34] Neither the New Testament nor the Patristic writings tell us anything about the destiny of the Holy Virgin after the death of Christ. Two apocryphal works of the fourth or fifth century—one ascribed to St. John, the other to Melito, bishop of Sardis—are the earliest authorities for the tradition about her bodily assumption. It is contained also in the pseudo-Dionysius; he and Gregory of Tours brought it into the Western Church. But centuries passed before it found any recognition. Even the Martyrology of Usuard, used in the Roman Church in the ninth century, confined itself to the statement that nothing was known of the manner of the holy Virgin's death and the subsequent condition of her body.

1010. Mary, Virgin, Exaltation of, as Most Honored of Saints

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913), p. 39.

The Blessed Virgin Mary.

199. *Whom should we honor and invoke more than any other saint?*

We should honor and invoke the Blessed Virgin Mary more than any other saint.

200. *Why should we honor the Blessed Virgin more than any other saint?*

We should honor the Blessed Virgin more than any other saint

- 1) because she is the Mother of God,
- 2) because she is also our Mother,
- 3) because she is the Queen of all the angels and saints,
- 4) because her intercession is most powerful.

“Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. Because He that is mighty hath done great things to me” (Luke 1, 48. 49)...

Application. Love to pray to the saints in Heaven. Have a filial confidence in Mary, your heavenly Mother. Devoutly honor St. Joseph. Honor your patron saint and celebrate his feast. Strive to become holy like the saints. If they could become saints, you can also.

1011. Mary, Virgin, Exaltation of, From Early Times

SOURCE: Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. by Neil Buchanan, Vol. 4 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1898), pp. 314–316.

[p. 314] Mary takes the first place among the saints. She came into [p. 315] notice even in the first three centuries. So early began the legends and apocryphal narratives that dealt with her; her place in the Symbol [creed] next the Holy Spirit insured a lofty position to her for all time. Pierius, Alexander of Alexandria, and Athanasius, already called her mother of God, and her virginity was maintained before, during and after the birth, the birth itself being embellished with miracle, as in the case of the Gnostics. But Mary obtained her chief, her positively dogmatic significance from the fact that the dogma of the Incarnation became the central dogma of the Church. Even the arguments of Irenaeus are in this respect very significant (Mary and Eve); but it was only from the fourth century that the consequences were drawn. It would lead us too far to give here a history of mariolatry even in outline. The orthodox Fathers of the Greek Church in the fourth century were still comparatively reserved. Ambrose and Jerome, above all, in their controversy with Jovinian, initiated the Church in the worship of Mary. Ambrose who exerted so strong an influence upon Augustine is especially to be mentioned as patron of this worship. He taught that Mary took an *active* share in the work of redemption, and already applied Gen. III., 3 to the holy virgin. In his time, again, the fables about Mary, which had long been in existence, began to be recognized as authoritative in the Church. All that had been sung in her praise by extravagant Latin, Greek, and Syrian poets and novelists, was consolidated into a kind of doctrine. It was believed as early as the end of the fourth century that Mary had not died, [p. 316] but had been removed from the earth by a miracle. Yet the Arabian Collyridians, who presented her with offerings of bread-cakes, as if she had been a goddess, were anathematised (Epiph[anius] H[eresies] 78). The Nestorian controversy brought Mary into the centre next Christ. She was the rock from which was hewn the deified body of the God-Logos. Nestorius cried in vain to Cyril, and with him to the whole Church, “Don’t make the virgin into a goddess”; at Ephesus Cyril exalted her for ever in the Catholic Church above all creatures, above Cherubim and Seraphim, and set her at the right hand of the Son. He started the *permutatio nominum* by which everything held true of the Son might be said to a great extent of the mother, because without her there would have been no God-man. She now really became a factor in dogma, which cannot be said of any saint or angel; for the name “she who bore God” (bride of the Holy Spirit) was thoroughly meant. It may be said in many respects that the orthodox now taught regarding Mary what the Arians had taught regarding Christ; she was a demi-god mediating between God and men.

1012. Mary, Virgin, Exaltation of—Mary Regarded as “Life” of Her Devotees

SOURCE: Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, *The Glories of Mary of Mary* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1902), pp. 17, 18, 43, 44.

[p. 17] As the glorious Virgin Mary has been raised to the dignity of Mother of the King of kings, it is not without reason that the Church honors her, and wishes her to be honored by all, with the glorious title of Queen. No sooner had Mary consented to be Mother of the Eternal Word, than she merited by this consent to be made Queen of the world and of all creatures. “Since [p. 18] the flesh of Mary,” remarks the Abbot Arnold of Chartres, “was not different from that of Jesus, how can the royal dignity of the Son be denied to the Mother?”

And if Jesus is the King of the universe, Mary is also its Queen, and as Queen she possesses, by right, the whole kingdom of her Son. Hence as many creatures as there are who serve God, so many they are who serve Mary: for as angels and men, and all things that are in heaven and on earth, are subject to the empire of God, so are they also under the dominion of Mary!

Mary, then, is a Queen: but, for our common consolation, be it known that she is a Queen so sweet, clement, and so ready to help us in our miseries, that the holy Church wills that we should salute her in this prayer under the title of Queen of mercy...

[p. 43] To understand why the holy Church makes us call Mary our life, we must know that as the soul gives life to the body so does divine grace give life to the soul; for a soul without grace has the name of being alive, but is in truth dead, as it was said of one in the Apocalypse, *Thou hast the name of being alive, and thou art dead*. Mary, then, in obtaining this grace for sinners by her intercession, thus restores them to life. So that to have recourse to Mary is the same thing as to find the grace of God. The Church applies to her the following words: *He that shall find me shall find life, and shall have salvation from the Lord*. "Listen," exclaims St. Bonaventure on these words, "listen, all you who desire the kingdom [p. 44] of God: honor the most blessed Virgin Mary, and you will find life and eternal salvation."

St. Bernardine of Sienna says that if God did not destroy man after his first sin, it was on account of his singular love for this holy Virgin, who was destined to be born of this race. Hence St. Bernard was right in exhorting us "to seek for grace, and to seek it by Mary;" meaning that if we have had the misfortune to lose the grace of God, we should seek to recover it, but we should do so through Mary; for though we may have lost it, she has found it; and hence the saint calls her "the finder of grace."

1013. Mary, Virgin, Exaltation of, Recent Emphasis on

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson, *The New Ordeal of Christianity* (New York: Association Press, 1957), pp. 48, 49. Copyright 1957 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

[p. 48] There is also an offensive aimed at the minds of those with no intellectual pretensions who nevertheless are [p. 49] seeking spiritual satisfactions beyond those experienced in the past. This consists in the tremendous emphasis now being placed by the church on the cultivation of the cult of the Virgin, mother of God and Co-Redemptrix of humanity. This sentimentalized form of popular worship (for that, despite all theological protestations to the contrary, is what this appeal to the intercession of Mary is fast becoming) is sweeping the rank-and-file Roman Catholic population of the world... [This] is happening in Catholic congregations, not only in consequence of the proclamations of new dogmas concerning the Virgin, but in the multiplication and exploitation of shrines where the Virgin, but in the multiplication and exploitation of shrines where the Virgin is supposed to have made recent miraculous appearances (the Catholic historian, Philip Hughes, lists four such in France alone during the last century; and the appearance of Fatima in Portugal—now the most exploited of all because it has to do directly with the church's struggle against communism—is so recent that one of the children to whom the appearance was granted is still alive); ... the multiplication of novenas where the intervention of the Virgin is invoked for every purpose from winning a husband or a job to curing tuberculosis, or the development of a popular Catholic hymnology of the "O mother dear, remember me," variety...

1014. Mary, Virgin, Immaculate Conception of, and Alleged Sinless Life

SOURCE: "Impeccability and Predestination of Mary," *The Sign*, 21 (August, 1941), 48, 49. Copyright 1941 by The Passionist Missions, Inc., Union City, N.J. Used by permission. [FRS No. 52]

[p. 48] Impeccability and Predestination of Mary

... Catholic doctrine teaches that the Blessed Virgin Mary was not only conceived immaculate, that is without the slightest stain of original sin, but was without the smallest actual sin throughout the whole course of her life. Our Lady had free will, since she was a perfect human being, but because of her intimate association with God, His divine grace so richly endowed her, and His providence watched over her with such loving care, that no breath of sin ever sullied the purity of her soul. She was not only without sin, original or actual, but she was also in a certain sense incapable of sinning because of a special privilege.

[p. 49] Her freedom from actual sin was the result of her confirmation in good, which accompanied her immaculate conception, at the moment when her soul was infused into her body. Her preservation from original sin also included her preservation from concupiscence, that disorderly affection in the human soul that inclines men to sin, though it is not sin itself. It was the opinion of St. Thomas Aquinas that Mary enjoyed the special privilege of impeccability only after the incarnation of Christ, but his opinion is no longer tenable, after the declaration of the doctrine of her Immaculate Conception (*Tract. de Beat. Virg. Art. III, De Impeccab. n. 13, Lepicier.*)

1015. Mary, Virgin, Immaculate Conception of, as Defined by the Pope, 1854

SOURCE: Pope Pius IX, Decree on the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 211, 212.

[p. 211] Since we have never ceased in humility and fasting to offer up our prayers and those of the Church to God the Father through his Son, that he might deign to direct and confirm our mind by the power of the Holy Ghost, after imploring the protection of the whole celestial court, and after invoking on our knees the Holy Ghost the Paraclete, under his inspiration we PRONOUNCE, DECLARE, AND DEFINE, unto the glory of the Holy and Indivisible Trinity, the honor and ornament of the holy Virgin, the Mother of God, for the exaltation of the Catholic faith and the increase of the Christian religion, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and in our own authority, that THE DOCTRINE WHICH HOLDS THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY TO HAVE BEEN, FROM THE FIRST INSTANT OF HER CONCEPTION, BY A SINGULAR GRACE AND PRIVILEGE OF ALMIGHTY GOD, IN VIEW OF THE MERITS OF CHRIST JESUS THE SAVIOUR OF MAN- [p. 212] KIND, PRESERVED FREE FROM ALL STAIN OF ORIGINAL SIN, WAS REVEALED BY GOD, AND IS, THEREFORE, TO BE FIRMLY AND CONSTANTLY BELIEVED BY ALL THE FAITHFUL. Therefore, if some should presume to think in their hearts otherwise than we have defined (which God forbid), they shall know and thoroughly understand that they are by their own judgment condemned, have made shipwreck concerning the faith, and fallen away from the unity of the Church; and, moreover, that they, by this very act, subject themselves to the penalties ordained by law, if, by word or writing, or any other external means, they dare to signify what they think in their hearts.

1016. Mary, Virgin, Immaculate Conception of, Only a Modern Dogma

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, revised by D. S. Schaff, "Immaculate Conception," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 5, pp. 455, 456. Copyright 1909 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 455] The doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary is a modern dogma of the Roman Catholic Church which declares the mother of Jesus absolutely free from all implication in the fall of Adam and its consequences. Like most doctrines, it was the result of a long development, and embodies in its history the story of a struggle between the Thomist and Scotist parties in the Church which was not ended till 1854. At the Council of Trent the Franciscans demanded the explicit exception of Mary in the dogmatic decree on the universality of original sin, and found valuable support from the learned Jesuits Lainez and Salmeron. The Dominicans entered a lively protest, and when the perplexed legates asked for instructions from Rome, they were ordered to try to satisfy both factions. In this spirit was drawn up the decree on original sin published June 17, 1546. For a time the more soberminded, even among the Jesuits, held to the decree. Bellarmine declared the object of the festival to be simply the conception, not the immaculate conception, of Mary. Petavius, while personally believing in the immaculate conception, denied that it was of faith. Even when, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Spanish Franciscans, aided by the Jesuits, stirred up fresh excitement over the question, and Philip III. and Henry IV. sent embassies to Rome, the apostolic preserved its diplomatic attitude. In 1617 Paul V. forbade both parties to engage in public disputes on this question, and Gregory XV. extended this prohibition even to private discussion, answering to the king of Spain that the eternal wisdom had not yet revealed the heart of the mystery to men. But the tendency in Rome favored the Scotist view more and more. Alexander VII. called the view very ancient and pious, while still declining to pronounce the opposite view heretical. Clement IX. gave an octave to the feast of the conception of the Virgin Mary; Clement XI. raised the festival in 1708 to the rank of a holy day of obligation for the whole Church. Under Gregory XVI. a strong inclination toward dogmatic definition showed itself. Several French bishops and one German received permission in 1844 to insert the term "immaculate" in the mass of the festival. Pius IX. had a special, almost romantic, devotion to the Virgin, to whose protection he attributed his preservation on the occasion of his flight from the Vatican in 1848. While still an exile, he asked the bishops, in his encyclical of Feb. 2, 1849, to say how far a dogmatic definition would agree with their wishes and those of their people. A number of voices were raised in warning, and only three fourths of the bishops agreed with the pope's desire; but the influence of the Jesuits was too powerful to be resisted. Perrone had already published (1847) an extended treatise to prove that the question was ripe for decision. In 1850 Pius named a commission to investigate the question, in which Perrone and his fellow Jesuit, Passaglia, were the most influential members. It reached no result until 1853, when it reported that no evidence from Scripture was needed for a dogmatic declaration, but that tradition alone sufficed, and that even this need not be shown in an unbroken line up to the time of the apostles.

Since these views were in harmony with the inclination of the pope, he called together in the autumn of 1854 a number of prelates (54 cardinals and about 140 bishops), who, in a preliminary meeting greeted the papal decision with loud applause. On Dec. 8 the pope solemnly took his seat in St. Peter's; the dean of the Sacred College came before him, and in the name of the whole Church begged him to pronounce a final decision on the question which had so long been discussed...

[p. 456] The dogma was not sanctioned by an ecumenical council; but since the Vatican Council of 1870 declared the pope infallible, independent of a council, the decree of 1854 must be received as an infallible utterance, and cannot be changed.

1017. Mary, Virgin, Immaculate Conception of—Significance

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, p. 164.

The sinlessness of the Virgin Mary and the personal infallibility of the Pope are the characteristic dogmas of modern Romanism, the two test dogmas which must decide the ultimate fate of this system. Both were enacted under the same Pope, and both faithfully reflect his character. Both have the advantage of logical consistency from certain premises, and seem to be the very perfection of the Romish form of piety and the Romish principle of authority. Both rest on pious fiction and fraud; both present a refined idolatry by clothing a pure humble woman and a mortal sinful man with divine attributes. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception, which exempts the Virgin Mary from sin and guilt, perverts Christianity into Marianism; the dogma of Infallibility, which exempts the Bishop of Rome from error, resolves Catholicism into Papalism, or the Church into the Pope. The worship of a woman is virtually substituted for the worship of Christ, and a man-god in Rome for the God-Man in heaven.

1018. Mary, Virgin, John the Baptist, and Jesus (Moslem View of)

SOURCE: Koran Sūra iii. 38, 42, 45–47 (preceded by commentary 56, on Sūra iii. 31–63, and accompanied by footnotes as indicated), in *The Holy Qur–an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 1, pp. 130, 131, 133–135. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

[p. 130]

C[ommentary] 56 (iii. 31–63.).—God’s truth is continuous, and His Apostles
From Adam, through Noah and Abraham,
Down to the last of the Prophets, Muhammad,
Form one brotherhood. Of the progeny
Of ‘Imrān, father of Moses and Aaron,
Sprang a woman, who devoted
Her unborn offspring to God.
The child was Mary the mother of Jesus.
Her cousin was the wife of the priest
Zakarīya, who took charge of Mary.

[p. 131]

To Zakarīya, in his old age, was born
A son Yahyā, amid prodigies:
Yahyā was the herald of Jesus
The son of Mary, and was known
As John the Baptist. Jesus
Was of virgin birth
And performed many miracles.
But those to whom he came as Prophet
Rejected him, and plotted for his death.
Their plots failed, for God’s Plan
Is above man’s plots. So will it be
With Islam, the Truth from all eternity....

[p. 133] 38. There did Zakarīya
Pray to his Lord, saying:
“O my Lord! Grant unto me
From Thee a progeny
That is pure: for Thou
Art He that heareth prayer!”³⁸⁰

[Note 380: The birth of Mary, the mystic mother of Jesus, of John the Baptist, the precursor of Jesus, and of Jesus, the mystic prophet of Israel, whom Israel rejected, occurred in that order chronologically, and are told in that order. They are all inter-connected. Zakarīya prayed for no ordinary son. He and his wife were past the age of parenthood. Seeing the growth of the mystic girl Mary, he prayed for some mystic child from God.—“from Thee, a progeny that is pure”. Perhaps he had adoption in his mind. Did he want to adopt Mary? To his surprise, he is given a son in the flesh, ushered in by a mystic Sign.]...

[p. 134] 42. Behold! the angels said:
“O Mary! God hath chosen thee
And purified thee—chosen thee
Above the women of all nations.”^{382,}

[Note 382: Mary the mother of Jesus was unique, in that she gave birth to a son by a special miracle, without the intervention of the customary physical means. This of course does not mean that she was more than human, any more than that her son was more than human. She had as much need to pray to God as anyone else. The Christian dogma, in all sects except the Unitarian, holds that Jesus was God and the son of God. The worship of Mary became the practice in the Roman Catholic Church, which calls Mary the Mother of God. This seems to have been endorsed by the Council of Ephesus in 431, in the century before Muhammad was born to sweep away the corruptions of the Church of Christ.]...

45. Behold! the angels said:
“O Mary! God giveth thee
Glad tidings of a Word
From Him: his name
Will be Christ Jesus,
The son of Mary, held in honour
In this world and the Hereafter
And of (the company of) those
Nearest to God;

[p. 135] 46. “He shall speak to the people
In childhood and in maturity.”³⁸⁸

[Note 388: The ministry of Jesus lasted only about three years, from 30 to 33 years of his age, when in the eyes of his enemies he was crucified. But the Gospel of Luke (ii. 46) describes him as disputing with the doctors in the Temple at the age of 12, and even earlier, as a child, he was “strong in spirit, filled with wisdom” (Luke ii. 40). Some apocryphal Gospels describe him as preaching from infancy.]

And he shall be (of the company)
Of the righteous.”

47. She said: “O my Lord!
How shall I have a son
When no man hath touched me?”
He said: “Even so:
God createth
What He willeth:
When He hath decreed
A Plan, He but saith
To it, ‘Be,’ and it is!”

[EDITORS' NOTE: The commentary and notes are no part of the Koran itself, and represent the views of the commentator.]

1019. Mary, Virgin, Venerated but Not “Adored”

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), p. 275. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

MARY. A great and popular veneration of Mary, the Mother of God (*Theotokos*), existed in the early Church long before any special feast was instituted in her honor. To her is accorded a veneration (*hyperdulia*) that transcends the honor given to any other saint (*dulia*). Her dignity as the Mother of the Incarnate Word of God, and the spiritual privileges conferred on her by reason of this dignity, raise her beyond all created spirits to the exalted position of “Queen of all Saints.” On the other hand, she still remains a mere creature in all her glory. The Church has never “adored” Mary or accorded her any honors that are reserved for Divinity.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The distinction between “adoration” (Latin *latria*) and “veneration” (Latin *hyperdulia*), notes Jaroslav Pelikan (*The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*, pp. 134, 135), is difficult to reproduce in English, and more difficult to observe in Roman Catholic religious practice.]

1020. Mary, Virgin, Virtues of

SOURCE: Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, *The Glories of Mary* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1902), pp. 159, 160.

[p. 159] Although there is little recorded in the Gospels of Mary's virtues in detail, yet when we learn from them that she was full of grace, this alone gives us [p. 160] to understand that she possessed all virtues in a heroic degree. St. Ambrose says, “Mary was such that her life alone was a model for all.” And then he concludes in the following words: “Let the virginity and life of Mary be to you as a faithful image, in which the form of virtue is resplendent. Thence learn how to live, what to correct, what to avoid, and what to retain.” Humility being the foundation of all virtues, as the holy Fathers teach, let us in the first place consider those how great was the humility of the Mother of God.

1021. Mary, Virgin, Worship of, Reference to, in Koran

SOURCE: Koran, Sūra v. 119, in *The Holy Qur-an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 1, p. 280. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

119. And behold! God will say:
“O Jesus the son of Mary!
Didst thou say unto men,
‘Worship me and my mother
As gods in derogation of God?’”
He will say: “Glory to Thee!
Never could I say
What I had no right
(To say). Had I said
Such a thing, Thou wouldst
Indeed have known it.”

1022. Mass—Benefits Extend to the Dead

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), p. 259. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

Pastors should next teach that such is the efficacy of this Sacrifice that its benefits extend not only to the celebrant and communicant, but to all the faithful, whether living with us on earth, or already numbered with those who are dead in the Lord, but whose sins have not yet been fully expiated.

1023. Mass—Charity Toward the Dead

SOURCE: Joseph Husslein, *The Souls in Purgatory*, p. 31. Copyright 1924 by The America Press, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 126.]

Our offerings for the dead will naturally be proportioned to our means. But all are able to show from time to time their charity to the dead, and to remember their own dear departed. Catholics should show by their example that they realize that Masses are of all but infinitely greater importance at the passing of the soul into eternity than precious caskets and mounds of flowers. The beauty of modest flowery wreaths is not indeed out of place to cheer the living and may well be a sweet act of charity to them in their desolation; but the Masses for the dead are the one supreme thing to bear in mind. Let retrenchments be made anywhere except here. Let there be, not one only, but many Masses; and let the souls not be forgotten with the months and years. Yet how often is not the contrary the practice of thoughtless Christians, who while meaning to be kind in their lavish funeral expenses are in reality unspeakably cruel to their dead, cherishing the lifeless form, and leaving the soul to smart in pain.

1024. Mass, Luther's View of

SOURCE: *Luther's Primary Works*, ed. by Henry Wace and C. H. Buchheim (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896), pp. 323, 324.

[p. 323] God (as I have said) never has dealt, or does deal, with men otherwise than by the word of promise. Again, we can never deal with God otherwise than by faith in the word of His promise. He takes no concern with our works, and has no need of them,—though it is by these we deal [p. 324] with other men and with ourselves;—but He does require to be esteemed by us truthful in His promises, and to be patiently trusted as such, and thus worshipped in faith, hope, and love. And thus it is that He is glorified in us when we receive and hold every blessing not by our own efforts, but from His mercy, promise, and gift. This is that true worship and service of God which we are bound to render in the mass. But when the words of the promise are not delivered to us, what exercise of faith can there be? And without faith who can hope? who can love? without faith, hope, and love, what service can there be? There is no doubt therefore that at the present day the whole body of priests and monks, with their bishops and all their superiors, are idolaters and living in a most perilous state, through their ignorance, abuse, and mockery of the mass, or sacrament, or promise of God.

1025. Mass, Protestant Episcopal View Concerning Sacrifice of

SOURCE: Protestant Episcopal Church, *The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion* (as revised A.D. 1801), art. 31, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 507. (The same wording appears in the 1945 edition of the *Book of Common Prayer*.)

The Offering of Christ once made is *that* perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

1026. Mass—a Sacrifice

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXII (Sept. 17, 1562), On the Sacrifice of the Mass, canons 1–3, [trans.](#) in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 184, 185.

[p. 184] CANON I.—If any one saith, that in the mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God; or, that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat: let him be anathema.

CANON II.—If any one saith, that by those words, *Do this for the commemoration of me* (Luke xxii. 19), Christ did not institute the apostles priests; or, did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his own body and blood: let him be anathema.

CANON III.—If any one saith, [p. 185] that the sacrifice of the mass is only a sacrifice of praise and of thanksgiving; or, that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or, that it profits him only who receives; and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities: let him be anathema.

1027. Mass—Sacrifice Explained

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913), pp. 73, 74.

[p. 73] The Holy Sacrifice of Mass.

355. *What means: to offer sacrifice?*

To offer sacrifice means: to offer God a visible gift whole and entire.

[p. 74] 356. *Why do we offer sacrifice?*

We offer sacrifice to adore God as the Lord of all things.

357. *What is required for a sacrifice?*

For a sacrifice is required

- 1) a visible gift,
- 2) a priest who offers it to God,
- 3) an altar on which it is offered.

1028. Mass, Sacrifice of, Compared With Calvary

SOURCE: Herbert Vaughan, *The People's Manual.—The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass* ([St. Louis]: P. Fox, 1881), pp. 42, 43.

[p. 42] So far as the practical effects produced upon the soul are concerned, the Holy Mass has in some sense the advantage over Calvary; for, given the same dispositions, it is more profitable for us to assist day by day at the Sacrifice of the Mass than it would have been [p. 43] to have been present once upon Calvary. And, the reason is this. In the Mass Jesus Christ dispenses and applies to the soul, according to its dispositions, that which was won, but not dispensed, on the Cross. On the Cross we were redeemed; but on the Altar “the work of our redemption is carried out.”

1029. Mass—Sacrifice Same as That of the Cross

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, [trans.](#) by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 258, 259. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 258] We therefore confess that the Sacrifice of the Mass is and ought to be considered one and the same Sacrifice as that of the cross, for the victim is one and the same, namely, Christ our Lord, who offered Himself, once only, a bloody Sacrifice on the altar of the cross. The bloody and unbloody victim are not two, but one victim only, whose Sacrifice is daily renewed in the Eucharist, in obedience to the command of our Lord: *Do this for a commemoration of me.*

The priest is also one and the same, Christ the Lord; for the ministers who offer Sacrifice, consecrate the holy mysteries, not in their own person, but in that of Christ, as

the words of consecration itself show, for the priest does not say: *This is the body of Christ*, but, *This is my body*; and thus, acting in the Person of Christ the Lord, he changes the substance of bread and wine into the true substance of His body and blood...

This being the case, it must be taught without any hesitation that, as the holy Council (of Trent) has also explained, the sacred and holy Sacrifice of the Mass is not a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving only, or a mere commemoration of the Sacrifice performed on the cross, but also truly a propitiatory Sacrifice, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious to us. If, therefore, with a pure heart, a lively faith, and affected with an inward sorrow for our transgressions, we immolate and offer this most holy victim, we shall, without doubt, obtain mercy from [p. 259] the Lord, and grace in time of need; for so delighted is the Lord with the odor of this victim that, bestowing on us the gift of grace and repentance, He pardons our sins. Hence this usual prayer of the Church: *As often as the commemoration of this victim is celebrated, so often is the work of our salvation being done*; that is to say, through this unbloody Sacrifice flow to us the most plenteous fruits of that bloody victim.

1030. Meats, Offered to Idols

SOURCE: Frederick H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, p. 222. Copyright 1954 by the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Inasmuch as most meat eaten by the lower strata of the Roman world came from sacrificial animals, the fierce campaign of Apollonius [a philosopher of Tyana] against all sacrifices not only opposed the religious practices in vogue among Jews and gentiles, but also the dietary habits of almost every inhabitant of the empire.

1031. Medes, and Persians—the Name “Medes” Used

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, p. 37. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

Ecbatana [capital of Media] was captured [by Cyrus; see No. 544] and its wealth of gold, silver, and precious objects was carried off to Anshan (550).

Media ceased to be an independent nation and became the first satrapy, Mada. Nevertheless, the close relationship between Persians and Medes was never forgotten. Plundered Ecbatana remained a favorite royal residence. Medes were honored equally with Persians; they were employed in high office and were chosen to lead Persian armies. Foreigners spoke regularly of the Medes and Persians; when they used a single term, it was “the Mede.”

1032. Medes—Median Empire

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 31–33. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

[p. 31] The three Medias were inhabited by Median tribes—Busae, Paretaceni, Struchates, Arizanti, and Budii—to which was added the non-Iranian priestly tribe of the Magi. These Medes were still half-nomads. On the Assyrian reliefs they are depicted with short hair confined by a red fillet and with short curled beard; over a tunic is worn the sheepskin coat, still the traveler’s best friend in the bitter winter of the plateau, which also required high-laced boots to plow through the deep snows. They were armed with only the long spear and were defended by the rectangular wicker shield. With these semi-nomads, aided by the Persians, Phraortes dared to attack Assyria, only to meet defeat and death in battle (653).

Parsa [Persia] again became independent. Two years later (651), Cyrus I [grandfather of Cyrus the Great] joined with Elam in sending aid to Shamash-shum-ukin of Babylon, who was in revolt against his brother Ashurbani-apal of Assyria; ...

Cyaxares (Uvakhshatra) had succeeded his father Phraortes; appropriately he bore the surname of the wargod Verethragna. The [p. 32] army was remodeled along modern lines and was divided into spearmen, bowmen, and cavalry. It would seem that it was Cyaxares who also changed the clothing and weapons. Two quite different forms are regularly illustrated on the sculptures at Persepolis. The Mede is at once distinguished by the wearing of the more original Iranian costume. On his head is the round, nodding felt cap with neck flap. A tight, long-sleeved leather tunic ends above the knee and is held in by a double belt with round buckle; over the tunic might be thrown on ceremonial occasions a cloak of honor. Full leather trousers and laced shoes with projecting tips indicated that their wearers spent much of their time on horseback. A short, pointed beard, a mustache, and hair bunched out on the neck were all elaborately curled, while earrings and necklace gave added ornament. The chief offensive weapon remained the spear of cornel wood with a flanged bronze point and the base held by a metal ferrule. To this spear many warriors added the bow, held in an extraordinarily elaborate bow case and serviced by arrows from a quiver. The Median costume is sharply contrasted with the form labeled Persian, distinguished by the fluted felt hat, the ankle-length flowing robe, and the low-laced shoes.

With the Median army reorganized, the threat to Assyria became extreme. Ashurbani-apal died, and even weaker successors did not dare to dissipate their strength by aiding their nominal allies such as Parsa. The successors of Ariaramnes and Cyrus were again forced to become vassals of Cyaxares. Once more the Assyrians were driven back, and Nineveh was actually under siege by the Medes when news arrived that Scythians had poured through the gate between the Caucasus Mountains and the Caspian Sea. Defeated by their chief, Madys, son of Protothyas, Cyaxares had to pay tribute for twenty-eight years until he killed their drunken leaders at a banquet.

Nineveh was destroyed in 612. Amid the ruins, Cyaxares, now known in Babylonia as king of the Umman Manda (from his conquest of the Scythian hordes), made peace with Nabopolassar. Two years later, by the defeat of Ashur-uballit at Harran, Cyaxares destroyed the last pretense of Assyrian rule and won all northern Mesopotamia. [p. 33] Since the road to the south was closed by the alliance with the Chaldean, who also held Susa, Cyaxares followed the Zagros as it bends westward into the cold uplands of Armenia, where other Iranian bands had destroyed the kingdom of Haldia and introduced their own Indo-European speech. The fertile valleys of Armenia led down through the Anti-Taurus into the broad plains of Cappadocia and to the river Halys, frontier of Lydia. Five years of warfare ended in a drawn battle at the time of a solar eclipse (May 28, 585) and a peace by which the Halys remained the boundary. The Cadusians along the Hyrcanian Sea refused submission, but the ruler of Parthia admitted himself a vassal.

Four great powers—Media, Chaldaea, Lydia, and Egypt—divided among themselves the whole of the Near East, but, of these, only Media could be called an empire. Far more significant, Media represented the first empire founded by northern warriors who spoke an Iranian language and thought in northern terms.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Median Empire was roughly contemporary with the Neo-Babylonian Empire of Nabopolassar, Nebuchadnezzar, and their successors down to Nabonidus and Belshazzar. However, Media fell to Cyrus the Persian before Babylon did. Those commentators who consider Media as the second

empire of Daniel 2 and 7, following Babylon, generally hold that the author of Daniel was a later writer who was mistaken in the facts of the Babylonian period.]

1033. Megiddo, Mound of

SOURCE: Robert M. Engberg, "Megiddo—Guardian of the Carmel Pass," *BA*, 3 (December, 1940), 41–44. Used by permission.

[p. 41] If, at the beginning of the twentieth century, you had travelled along the southwestern edge of the Plain of Esdraelon in northern Palestine, you would have passed an oval, flat-topped hill which the natives would have told you was Tell el-Mutesellim. Its thirteen acre top, high above the road, would have been covered with waving grain if you had arranged your trip during the spring, the best of all the seasons in Palestine, and the sides of the mound would have been blanketed with richly colored anemones. If you looked closely among the rocks you might also have found delicate wild cyclamen, much smaller than the hothouse variety we know in this [p. 43] country, but just as colorful. And if your eyes were especially keen you would have observed among the dirt and rocks small pieces of pottery, edges worn smooth from exposure over many centuries. Since that time the world has come to know this mound as Megiddo or Armageddon... The history of the city of Megiddo had long been known to Bible readers and historians, but its exact location was a matter of dispute until archaeologists in this century began their systematic search for evidence at Tell el-Mutesellim...

Grain no longer grows at Megiddo and the mound is quite a bit lower, but instead we have a vast body of knowledge of the ancient cities which from sometime in the fourth millennium to about 350 B.C. played their part in the growth of civilization in the Near East, and which served as the guardian of the most important pass through Mount Carmel. Geography early decreed that the principal highway to and from Egypt and Mesopotamia should traverse Palestine, and it was discovered that the pass which led to Megiddo lay naturally on such a road. Access to this pass and the Plain of Sharon was probably one of the important reasons why the earliest settlers decided to build their homes at Megiddo.

Twenty times the city was built and twenty times it fell, beginning back around 3500 B.C., but each time there was something left by which to characterize the people who had put their efforts into making this richly historical city. Perhaps it was only a series of broken down foundations and scattered debris, but whatever remained after a city had collapsed was effectively preserved for our discovery, when the next community to build at Megiddo erected their homes, their granaries, their workshops, their administrative, and their defence structures. The builders did not stop to scrape away the underlying debris. They smoothed it over if necessary, and built on top, thus sealing everything beneath. They often lost small articles such as rings, or beads from a broken string, and in [p. 44] stumbling dropped pottery vessels which were allowed to lie where they fell or were carelessly kicked to the side of a floor. When they died, they were buried on the hill, or more usually in the cemeteries on the slopes, their mortuary gifts with them... This same process happened again and again, and today we are able to reconstruct to some extent what occurred here centuries ago.

1034. Megiddo—Stables of "Solomon"—(Rather of Ahab) in Megiddo

SOURCE: Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land* (New York: Praeger, 1960), pp. 270, 271. Copyright 1960 by Kathleen M. Kenyon. Used by permission.

[p. 270] The rest of the area cleared [at the summit] was occupied by two great stable complexes. The more elaborate of these immediately adjoined the palace. It consisted of

a courtyard 55 metres square, flanked on one side by stables and on a second by long buildings which may have housed chariots. In the centre was a water-tank. The stables were made up of five units consisting of a central passage flanked on either side by a row of stables. At the end of each stall was a stone-cut manger and an upright monolith in which there was a tethering-hole. The whole group would have held one hundred and fifty horses. The second group of stables was composed of similar units. There did not in this case appear to be an enclosing courtyard, but the area was not completely excavated. This group may have housed another three hundred horses...

[p. 271] Thus, as at Samaria, the summit of the hill at Megiddo was at this stage occupied for official purposes. In spite of the attraction of the theory that the buildings represent one of Solomon's chariot cities, planning, building style and pottery evidence all point to the approximate contemporaneity of this stratum with the first layout of Samaria [about 850 B.C.]. Emphasis is, however, on garrison purposes rather than a royal residence, as is natural in view of the strategic importance of the site. As at Samaria, the mass of the population must have lived on the lower slopes, and some traces were observed of an outer city wall.

1035. Mennonite Bodies

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1002–1004.

[p. 1002] *History*. The origin of the denominations classed under the head of Mennonite bodies is traced by some to an early period in the history of the Christian Church. As various changes in doctrine and church organization came about, in both the East and the West, a number of communities, unwilling to accept them and preferring the simplicity of the Apostolic Church, remained more or less distinct through the Middle Ages. These communities received various names in different localities and in different centuries, but from the time of the first General Council at Nicea in the early part of the fourth century to the Conference of Dort, Holland, in 1632, they represented a general protest against ecclesiastical rule and a rigid liturgy, and an appeal for the simpler organization, worship, and faith of the apostolic age.

Present historical authorities, however, see little or no connection between these early independent movements and the present Mennonite Church, since those who founded the body to which present Mennonite bodies trace their origin came out from the Roman Catholic Church.

The first congregation of the church now known as Mennonite was organized in January 1525 at Zurich, Switzerland, by Conrad Grebel, Felix Mantz, George Blaurock, and others. They called themselves "Brethren" (Swiss Brethren), but were commonly known as "Täufer." Grebel and his friends had been ardent coworkers with Ulrich Zwingli, but withdrew from his leadership in 1523, when they realized that he would consent to a union of the church with the state, and that a church was to be established in which the whole population of the state would be obliged to hold membership. Zwingli's program called for the introduction of certain reforms in the existing Roman Catholic State Church. Grebel and his friends did not recognize infant baptism as scriptural. Hence they baptized again those who had been baptized in their infancy. For this reason they were called Anabaptists (Re-Baptizers). In 1534 the first Anabaptist congregations were organized in Holland by Obbe Philips. Two years later Obbe baptized Menno Simons (1496–1561), a converted Catholic priest. Menno soon became the most prominent leader

of the “Obbenites,” as the followers of Obbe Philips were called, in Holland and North Germany.

The name “Mennonite” dates from 1550, but would scarcely be recognized in Holland, where the usual name is “Doopsgezinden,” or “Doopers,” the Dutch equivalent for the English “Baptist.” Similarly in parts of Germany, Switzerland, and Austria, the German form “Taufgesinnte,” or “Täufer,” was used to indicate Baptists, although this name was not applied to all Mennonites. It was to some of the Flemish Mennonites, who, upon the invitation of King Henry VIII, settled in England and became the pioneers of the great weaving industry of that country, that the Baptists of England were largely indebted for their organization as a religious body, although it was not as “Mennonites” that they were invited to come to England, since it is known that persons of this faith were severely persecuted in England in the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth along with other nonconformists.

The persecutions of the Mennonites were due to the fact that in all countries, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, church and state were united and dissenters were not tolerated. The number of Mennonites martyred is very great. Their *Book of Martyrs* (First German Edition, Ephrata, Pa., 1749; First English Edition, Lancaster, Pa., 1837; Second English Edition, Elkhart, Ind., 1886) is a ponderous volume. In the Netherlands the persecution was very severe, but by the second decade after Menno Simons’ death his followers had increased to respectable numbers, since in many places the authorities had been slow [p. 1003] to carry out the decrees against them. The very presence of these numerous Mennonites proved the error of the supposition that the best interest of the state demands the toleration of only one creed within its realm. Holland became the first country to throw this principle overboard and grant religious freedom. After the founder of the Dutch Republic, William of Orange, had embraced the Reformed faith he ordered the cessation of persecution there (in 1577).

In Switzerland the persecution continued well into the seventeenth century. The last martyr was Hans Landis, the most prominent Mennonite bishop of that time, who was beheaded at Zurich in 1614. Thereafter many were imprisoned and some sentenced to the galleys.

After the Thirty Years’ War (1618–48) Mennonites were permitted to settle in the Palatinate, in South Germany. Many fled to this province from Switzerland. When William Penn acquired Pennsylvania from the English Crown, he offered a home to all who were persecuted for their faith. The Mennonite pioneers in America were 13 families from Crefeld, Germany, who came on the ship *Concord*, in 1683, and settled at Germantown, now a part of Philadelphia. During the eighteenth century many Swiss Mennonites emigrated to Pennsylvania. They were for the most part poor. Their brethren in Holland formed an organization for the aid of those who did not have the means to go to America and contributed liberally for this purpose. Practically all the so-called Pennsylvania Dutch Mennonites are of Swiss descent. As their numbers increased during the first third of the eighteenth century, the Mennonites spread northward and westward from Germantown into Lancaster, Bucks, Berks, Montgomery, and other counties in Pennsylvania, and southward to Virginia, and from these original settlements they have since spread to western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and farther west, and to Canada. As these early settlers came in contact with the Indians, they often found that their nonresistant principles served as a better protection than the rifles and stockades of

most of the settlers, and there are but few records of injury of any kind inflicted upon them by the Indian tribes.

Since their settlement in this country a number of minor divisions have taken place among the Mennonites, occasioned by divergent views on some questions, but of late years the feeling has developed among nearly all branches that closer union and cooperation along certain common lines of gospel work would be desirable.

Doctrine. At a conference of some of the Mennonite groups in the Netherlands held at Dort, Holland, in 1632, a compilation of previous confessions of faith was made and called "A Declaration of the Christ Articles of our Common Christian Faith." This confession, containing 18 articles, was later accepted by the Alsatian Mennonites and is accepted by the great majority of the American Mennonite churches today.

A brief summary of these articles includes the following:

God the Creator of all things; the fall of man, through his disobedience; his restoration through the promise of the coming of Christ; the Advent of Christ, the Son of God; redemption has been purchased by His death on the cross for all mankind, from the time of Adam to the end of the world, who shall have believed on and obeyed Christ.

The law of Christ is contained in the Gospel, by obedience to which alone humanity is saved. Repentance and conversion, or complete change of life, without which no outward obedience to Gospel requirements will avail to please God, is necessary to salvation. All who have repented of their sins and believed on Christ as the Saviour, and in heart and life accept His commandments, are born again. As such they obey the command to be baptized with water as a public testimony of their faith, are members of the Church of Jesus Christ, and are incorporated into the communion of the saints on earth. By partaking of the Lord's Supper the members express a common union with one another and a fellowship of love for and faith in Jesus Christ. The washing of the saints' feet is an ordinance instituted, and its perpetual observance commanded, by Christ. The state of matrimony is honorable between those spiritually kindred, and such alone can marry "in the Lord" [see 1 Cor. 7:39].

The civil government is a part of God's ministry, and members are not permitted to despise, blaspheme, or resist the government, but must be subject to it in all things and obedient to all its commands that do not militate against the will and law of God, and should pray earnestly for the government and its welfare, and in behalf of their country. Christ has forbidden His followers the [p. 1004] use of carnal force in resisting evil and the seeking of revenge for evil treatment. Love for enemies cannot be shown by acts of hatred and revenge, but by deeds of love and good will. The use of all oaths is forbidden [see Matt. 5:34], as contrary to God's will, though simple affirmation is allowed.

Those who willfully sin against God are to be excluded from the rights and privileges of the church, but are to be kindly exhorted to amend their ways, the object of expulsion being the amendment, not the destruction, of the offender, and for the benefit of the church. Those who, on account of their obstinacy, are finally reprov'd and expelled from the church, because separated from God, must also be shunned socially, "that the openly obstinate and reprobate one may not defile others in the church," though in case of need they are to be kindly cared for, and admonished as those in need of spiritual help.

At the end of earth and earthly existence, all those who have lived and shall then be living are to be changed in a moment at the sound of the last trump, and are to appear before the judgment seat of Christ, where the good shall be separated from the evil; the good to enter into the heavenly joys prepared for them, the evil to depart forever from God's presence and mercy into the place prepared for the devil and his servants.

To the conviction that some of the requirements of civil law are contrary to the teachings of Christ is largely due the fact that the Mennonites have suffered so severely in past centuries, and have often been charged with being "clannish."

The Lord's Supper is observed twice a year in nearly all the congregations, and the great majority of them also observe the ordinance of washing the saint's feet in connection with and immediately after the Lord's Supper. In nearly all the Mennonite bodies baptism is by pouring.

Organization. With two exceptions the form of church government in the different bodies of the Mennonites is the same. The local church is autonomous, deciding all matters affecting itself. District or State conferences are established, in most cases, to which appeals may be made; otherwise the authority of the congregation or of a committee appointed by the congregation is final. All decisions of State or district conferences are presented to the individual congregation for ratification. The divinely appointed offices of the Church of Christ are held to be those of bishop (sometimes called elder), minister (pastor or evangelist), and almoner (deacon). The ministers are generally self-supporting, sharing the farming life or other occupations of the Mennonite communities.

1036. Mennonites—General Conference, Mennonite Church (Formerly, of North America)

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1046, 1047.

[p. 1046] *History.* In March 1859 two small Mennonite congregations in Lee County, Iowa, composed of immigrants from southern Germany, held a conference to discuss the possible union of all the Mennonite bodies in America. Until that time, while in a general way the different organizations had held to the same doctrines, they had not cooperated actively, or at least had taken no concerted part in any particular work. The resolutions adopted at this meeting drew the attention of all the Mennonite bodies. Among those especially interested was John Oberholzer, of Bucks County, Pa., who had taken advanced ground in the matter of aggressive work, and, together with 16 other ministers, having been charged with insubordination to the then established form of church government in his conference and having been disowned by that conference, had organized a separate conference in eastern Pennsylvania in October 1847. The publication by Oberholzer of the *Religiöser Botschaffter*, founded in 1852 and later styled *Christliches Volksblatt*, gave wide publicity and strong support to the new union movement, which promised to advance along broader and more liberal lines than this conference permitted. The Iowa congregations extended a general invitation to all Mennonite congregations and conferences, and in May 1860, at West Point, Iowa, the first effort was made to hold a general conference of Mennonites in America. While this conference was not completely representative, questions of education, missions, and unity were discussed, and the organization of the General Conference of Mennonites in America was brought about. On the basis of uniting in the support of mission work, other congregations were soon added, and the membership and influence of the body grew rapidly. Many of the congregations whose members had come from Russia and Germany since 1850, and who had become acquainted with the movement before leaving Europe, joined the new organization. Among the Amish Mennonites who came from Europe and settled in Ohio about 1840 were some who favored greater leniency in discipline, and who separated from the Amish body on that account. They were known as the Apostolic Mennonite Church, but since the organization of the General Conference of Mennonites they have affiliated with that body.

The church is well organized and aggressive in the various lines of Christian effort, and is rapidly increasing in numbers in the United States and Canada.

[p. 1047] *Doctrine.* In doctrine this body is, with few exceptions, in strict accord with other Mennonites, the main difference being that in most of the congregations the passage in 1 Corinthians XI, 4–15, is not understood as making obligatory the use of a covering

for the head of female members during prayer and worship, and that the passage in John XIII, 4–15, is not generally believed to command the institution of an ordinance (that of foot washing) to be observed according to the example there described. In the matter of conformity to the world, some congregations adhere less strictly than others to the articles of faith adopted by the body as a whole. Their common ground of union is contained in the following confession:

This conference recognizes and acknowledges the sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only and infallible rule of faith and life; for “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” In matters of faith it is therefore required of the congregations which unite with the conference that, accepting the above confession, they hold fast to the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, baptism on confession of faith, the refusal of all oaths, the Christ-taught doctrine of a peace and nonresistance, and the practice of a scriptural church discipline.

Organization. The local church is autonomous in its government, although appeal may be made to the local and district conferences, which meet annually. The General Conference meets every 3 years, and is not a legislative, but an advisory body.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Membership (1959), 35,531 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 256).]

1037. Mennonites—the Mennonite Church

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1015, 1016.

[p. 1015] *History.* The Mennonite Church, by far the largest of the different Mennonite bodies, represents the general trend of them all and is most closely identified with the history already given. In the controversy which resulted in the separation of the Amish Mennonite Church, it stood for the more liberal interpretation of the Confession of Faith, and has ever since included what may be called the conservatively progressive element of the Mennonite communities. It furnished the first Mennonite colony at Germantown, Pa., in 1683, and was the most important factor in the westward extension of the different communities mentioned in the general statement. It should be stated, however, that the Amish division did not occur until 1693.

Doctrine and Organization. The general Confession of Faith adopted at Dort, Holland, in 1632 is accepted in full. In polity, so far as the local church and district and State conferences are concerned, the church is in accord with most other Mennonite bodies.

The General Conference,³ [Note 3: Not to be mistaken for the General Conference of the Mennonite Church of North America, p. 1040.] organized in 1898, meets every 2 years, but is regarded as merely an advisory body. Delegates are chosen from among the ministers and deacons of the various State conferences and they, together with the bishops, who are members of the conference by virtue of their office, decide all questions by majority of vote. All their ministers and deacons have the privilege of debate but have no vote. This General Conference furnishes the basis for the practical union of the Mennonite Church and what was formerly known as the Amish Mennonite Church. Three conferences of the former Amish Men- [p. 1016] nonite Church have been merged with the Mennonite conferences in which their congregations are located.

For a better understanding of the relations of these bodies, an historical sketch of the origin and development of the Amish Mennonites has been given on page 1006. [See No. 1036.]

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Membership (1959), 72,138 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 256).]

1038. Mental Reservations, Catholic Doctrine of

SOURCE: Bertrand L. Conway, *The Question-Box Answers* (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 165, 166. [FRS No. 6.]

[p. 165] A mental reservation, or restriction, is the limitation of an affirmative or negative. If not verbally expressed, it can be either known by the circumstances or else it is purely mental. A purely mental reservation being equivalent [p. 166] to a lie, is never lawful. Reservation not purely mental—that is, equivocation—is in general forbidden, because language is intended to express thoughts, not to hide them. It is, however, allowed for a just cause, in virtue of the principle of morals, that we can lawfully perform an act having two effects, the one good and the other evil, whenever the good effect is paramount to the bad. Thus, a servant could say to a visitor whom her mistress did not want to receive, “Not at home,” or a priest or any professional man when asked a secret could answer, “I do not know”; in both instances the limiting of the negation can be gathered from the circumstances.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The author contends that the Catholic teaching is “much more strict than that of Protestant writers and theologians, such as Melancthon, Bodin, Gentilis, Grotius, Pufendorf, Heineccius, Cocceius, Jeremy Taylor, Johnson, Paley, and others, who permit lying when the person addressed has no right to the truth.”]

1039. Messiah, Coming of—Talmudic Warning Against Calculation of Time

SOURCE: *Talmud Sanhedrin 97b*, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), p. 659. Used by permission.

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan: Blasted be the bones of those who calculate the end.⁶ [Note 6: I.e., Messiah’s advent.] For they would say, since the predetermined time has arrived, and yet he has not come, he will never come.

1040. Messiah, Coming of—Talmudic Warning Against Revelation of Time

SOURCE: *Talmud Megillah 3a*, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 195–1952), pp. 9, 10. Used by permission.

[p. 9] The *Targum* of the Prophets was composed by Jonathan ben Uzziel under the guidance of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, and the land of Israel [thereupon] quaked over an area of four hundred *parasangs* by four hundred *parasangs*, and a *Bath Kol* came forth and exclaimed, Who is this that has revealed My secrets to mankind? Jonathan b. Uzziel thereupon arose and said, It is I who have revealed Thy secrets to mankind. It is fully known to Thee that I have not done this for my own honour or for the honour of my father’s house, but for Thy honour I have done it, that dissension may not increase in Israel. He further sought to reveal [by] a *targum* [the inner meaning] of the Hagiographa, but a *Bath* [p. 10] *Kol* went forth and said, Enough What was the reason?—Because the date of the Messiah is foretold in it.² [Note 2: The reference is probably to the Book of Daniel.]

1041. Messiah, Expectations of, Among Jews

SOURCE: Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (Fair Lawn, N.J.: Essential Bks., 1957), p. 5. Used by permission of Oxford University Press, Inc., New York.

In [Second Esdras, or *Fourth Ezra* the Messiah is shown as the Lion of Judah at whose roar the last and worst beast—now the Roman eagle—bursts into flame and is consumed; and again as the Son of Man who first annihilates the multitudes of the heathen with the fire and storm of his breath and then, gathering together the lost ten tribes out of alien lands, establishes in Palestine a kingdom in which a reunited Israel can

flourish in peace and glory. According to *Baruch* there must come a time of terrible hardship and injustice, which is the time of the last and worst empire, the Roman. Then, just when evil has reached its greatest pitch, the Messiah will appear. A mighty warrior, he will rout and destroy the armies of the enemy; he will take captive the leader of the Romans and bring him in chains to Mount Zion, where he will put him to death; he will establish a kingdom which shall last until the end of the world. All the nations which have ever ruled over Israel will be put to the sword; and some members of the remaining nations will be subjected to the Chosen People. An age of bliss will begin in which pain, disease, untimely death, violence and strife, want and hunger will be unknown and in which the earth will yield its fruits ten-thousand-fold. Would this earthly Paradise last for ever or for some centuries only, pending its replacement by an otherworldly Kingdom? On this matter opinions differed but the question was in any case an academic one. Temporary or eternal, such a Kingdom was worth fighting for; and these apocalypses had at least established that in the course of bringing the Saints into their Kingdom the Messiah would show himself invincible in war.

1042. Messiah, of Roman Empire—Augustus Believed to Be

SOURCE: M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, Vol. 1 (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), p. 43. Used by permission.

The leading ideas of Virgil and Horace were the ideas of thousands and thousands in the Roman Empire, who believed with Horace (for whom personally it might, no doubt, have been a poetic flight only) that Augustus was one of the mightier gods, Mercury or Apollo or Hercules, who appeared among men (ἐπιφανής), that he was the Messiah and the Saviour of the mighty and holy Roman Empire.

1043. Messiahs, False, Before and After Fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70)

SOURCE: "Messiah," *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959), cols. 1308, 1309. Copyright 1959 by Encyclopedia Publishing Company, Ltd. Used by permission of I. J. Carmin-Karpman, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

[col. 1308] Messianic emotionalism became intense shortly before 70 CE. [col. 1309] merous false m.'s now appeared, the New Testament vividly reflecting the messianic ferment at this time. The belief in a M. grew even stronger after the destruction of the Second Temple (70 CE), and critical world events affecting the Jews invariably sharpened anticipation of his advent. Frequent predictions as to its timing were based on the Book of Daniel and other biblical passages. The widespread Jewish revolt of 115–117 certainly had a messianic content, and during the last revolt against the Romans, BAR KOKHBA was acclaimed M. (131).

1044. Messiahs, False, in Early Christian Times

SOURCE: Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (Fair Lawn, N.J.: Essential Bks., 1957), pp. 5, 6. Used by permission of Oxford University Press, Inc., New York.

[p. 5] As, under the rule of the procurators, the conflict with Rome became more and more bitter, messianic phantasies became with many Jews an obsessive preoccupation. According to Josephus it was chiefly the belief in the imminent advent of a messianic king that launched the Jews upon the suicidal war which ended [p. 6] with the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70. Even Simon barCochba, who led the last great struggle for national independence in A.D. 131, was still greeted as Messiah. But the bloody suppression of that rising and the annihilation of political nationality put an end both to the apocalyptic faith and to the militancy of the Jews.

1045. Methodists—African Methodist Episcopal Church

SOURCE: *CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1184, 1185.*

[p. 1184] *History.* Soon after the Revolutionary War Negro members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in different places, dissatisfied with conditions, began to hold separate services, hoping thus to secure larger privileges and more freedom of action than they believed were possible in continued association with their white brethren and also to avoid certain humiliating discriminations practiced against them. They styled themselves, for the most part, African Methodists, simply because they were of African descent and Methodists, and not because they thought of permanently dissociating themselves from the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Thus, as early as 1787, a company of Negro Methodists in Philadelphia withdrew, built a chapel, and obtained a Negro preacher through ordination by Bishop White of the Protestant Episcopal Church. In 1793 Bishop Asbury dedicated the Bethel Church in Philadelphia, built by Richard Allen, a well-to-do Negro, and the platform adopted by the congregation included the statement following:

We consider every child of God a member of the mystical body of Christ, *** yet in the political government of our church we prohibit our white brethren from electing or being elected into any office among us, save that of a preacher or public speaker.

[p. 1185] As reasons for this action they gave the inconveniences arising from white people and people of color mixing together in public assemblies, more particularly in places of public worship.

In 1799 Allen was ordained deacon and the church, according to an arrangement already made, remained under the discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the jurisdiction of a white elder. This arrangement, however, did not work very well and contentions between the white and Negro Methodists of the city increased to such an extent that an appeal was made to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. The court declared in favor of the Bethel Church, which thus became an independent body. In 1814 the Methodist Episcopal elders announced that the white preachers could no longer maintain pastoral responsibility for the Negro congregation, and in 1816 Richard Allen and 15 others called together a number of similar societies, which had been formed in New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, to meet in Philadelphia to organize a church of Negro persons with autonomous government. This convention was held in April of that year and resulted in the organization of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. The movement received the cordial assistance and sympathy of a number of white persons, among whom were Dr. Benjamin Rush, Robert Ralston, William McKean, and Bishop White, of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Having become a distinct body by reason of separation from the Methodist Episcopal Church they found it necessary at this first General Conference to elect one of their own body who was adequate to be set apart in Holy Orders to superintend the connection then formed. Rev. Richard Allen, who had been ordained to preach by Bishop Asbury 17 years previously, was unanimously elected to that office and April 11, 1816, was solemnly set apart to the episcopal office by prayer and imposition of the hands of five regularly ordained ministers, one of whom, Absalom Jones, was a priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church under the diocese of the Right Reverend Bishop White, of Pennsylvania.

For the first 20 years the operations of the new denomination were confined chiefly to Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. Later they were extended to the New England States, New York, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, and

Louisiana, in the last State being represented in New Orleans alone. Previous to the Civil War comparatively little was done in the Southern States, but during the war, through the influence of two chaplains in the United States Army, Rev. W. H. Hunter and Rev. H. M. Turner, and of some Negro soldiers who were also preachers, two organizations were formed on the South Atlantic coast. After the war the church extended rapidly throughout the South, and today it is represented in each of the original slave States, while its northern field includes the Northern States from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the Province of Ontario in Canada.

Doctrine and Organization. As already indicated, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, in doctrine and polity, is in substantial agreement with the Methodist Episcopal Church. The governing bodies are the General Conference, annual conference, district conference, quarterly conference, and church conference. Bishops preside over general and annual conferences, presiding elders at district and quarterly conferences, and the preacher in charge at the church conference and all boards of the local church.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1951), 1,166,301 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 256). This is the largest Negro Methodist body. Third in membership, next to the A.M.E. Zion Church, is the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church (originally the Colored branch of the M.E. Church, South), with a 1951 membership of 392,167 (*YAC*, 1961, pp. 74, 256).]

1046. Methodists—African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1195, 1196.

[p. 1195] *History.* Among the early independent Negro Methodist congregations in this country was one organized in New York City in 1796 by James Varick, Abraham Thompson, William Miller, and others, who were members of the John Street Methodist Episcopal Church. Their desire to have a separate organization in which “they might have opportunity to exercise their spiritual gifts among themselves, and thereby be more useful to one another,” was occasioned largely by the “caste prejudice which forbade their taking the sacrament until the white members were all served,” by the desire for other church privileges denied them, and by the conviction that it would assist in the development of a ministry adapted to their needs. The first church was built in the year 1800 and was called “Zion.” The next year it was incorporated as the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and articles of agreement were entered into with the Methodist Episcopal Church by which the latter supplied them with ordained preachers until the year 1820. Meanwhile the organization of the Union Church of Africans in Wilmington, Del., and of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, Pa., as separate and distinct denominations, caused considerable uneasiness and the Zion Church made application to the Methodist Episcopal Church for the ordination of some of its local preachers as elders. To this no answer was given, and in 1820 as the congregation had developed several preachers of ability and had fellowship and union with churches which had been formed at New Haven, Conn., Philadelphia, Pa., Newark, N. J., and on Long Island, N. Y., it decided to abrogate the agreement with the Methodist Episcopal Church to supply its pulpits.

The first annual conference was held in Mother Zion Church, corner of Church and Leonard Streets, New York City, June 21, 1821. At that time the denomination consisted of 6 churches, 19 preachers, and 1,426 members. As they had no ordained elders, the conference was presided over by Rev. William Phoebus, of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and Rev. Joshua Soule (afterwards a bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church)

acted as secretary. James Varick, who was active and influential, and generally spoken of as the founder of the denomination, was made district chairman.

The second annual conference, which was also the first General Conference, met in Wesley Church, Lombard Street, Philadelphia, May 16, 1822, and was presided over by Abraham Thompson. After some routine business, it adjourned to meet, July 18, in Mother Zion Church, New York City. In the meantime, on June 17, James Varick, Abraham Thompson, and Levin Smith were ordained elders by Dr. James Covell, Sylvester Hutchinson, and William Stillwell, white elders of the Methodist Episcopal Church. On July 21, at this conference, six persons were elected deacons in the forenoon and elders in the afternoon, and James Varick was elected the first superintendent, or bishop, of the denomination. No other general conference was held until 1827, when Christopher Rush was elected the second bishop of the denomination. After Bishop Varick's death, in 1827, Bishop Rush served alone until 1840, when William Miller was elected as his associate. It was not until 1848 that the present name of the church was adopted, when it was learned that a group of Negro members had withdrawn from George Street Methodist Episcopal Church at Philadelphia, led out by Richard Allen for the same reason the New York group had withdrawn from the John Street Church in New York. The Philadelphia group gave its organization the name of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. The word "Zion" was added by the New York group out of respect to its first church. In 1848 the name A. M. E. Zion Church was approved as the permanent title of the church organized in 1796.

The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church did not begin operations in the South until 1863, when Bishop Joseph J. Clinton sent Elder James W. Hood to North Carolina and Elder Wilbur G. Strong to Florida and Louisiana, though work was not begun until the following January. The appointment to North Carolina was specially fortunate, and churches sprang up rapidly. Men only just emancipated from the yoke of slavery felt themselves called to enter the ministry and to preach the gospel to their own people. Before the year closed the North Carolina Conference was organized, the parent of several large conferences in that and neighboring States. The success in Florida, Louisiana, [p. 1196] and Alabama was not so phenomenal, but the missionary effort in these States proved to be most fruitful, especially in Alabama. So successful were the efforts of these early missionaries that, when the General Conference met in 1880 at Montgomery, Ala., 15 annual conferences had been organized in the South.

The General Conference of 1880 was an important one. Livingstone College was established at Salisbury, N. C., Rev. C. R. Harris being its first principal. Two years later, on his return from England, where he had collected \$10,000 for the college, Rev. Joseph C. Price, considered one of the greatest champions of Negro citizenship, was made president and continued in this office until his death in 1893. The Star of Zion, the chief weekly organ of the church, was adopted by this General Conference as a permanent organ of the denomination, and the first organized missionary effort was instituted by the formation of a Board of Missions and a Woman's Missionary Society.

At the General Conference of 1892 the denomination took a forward move by the organization of the departments of missions and education, which have been productive of large and far-reaching results in promoting the cause of education and missions at home and in foreign fields. The founding of the publication house and the placing in it of a printing plant for publishing literature of all kinds used by the church, and for carrying

on a general printing business, was one of the notable achievements of the church in that year. The A. M. E. Zion Quarterly Review, issued first in 1889, was adopted as denominational periodical in 1892.

Doctrine and Organization. In doctrine the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church is in entire accord with the Methodist Episcopal Church, accepting the Apostles' Creed and adhering strictly to the doctrine of the new birth, regeneration followed by adoption, and entire sanctification. It recognizes the Scriptures as written by holy men as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. In polity, also, it is in substantial agreement with that church, having the same system of conferences—quarterly, annual, and general. The itinerancy is maintained throughout all ranks of ministers. A bishop holds office for life or during good behavior.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 780,000 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 256).]

1047. Methodist—The Methodist Church

a. Combined Methodism

SOURCE: Walter G. Muelder, "Methodism," in Robert S. Bilheimer, *The Quest for Christian Unity* (New York: Association Press), pp. 158–163. Copyright 1952 by Haddam House, Inc. Used by permission.

[p. 158] Methodism's theological perspectives are best understood in relation to what some of its leaders have considered to be the cardinal principles of protestantism, and especially of the evangelical revival of the eighteenth century. The power of the Wesleyan movement was in part due to the timeliness of its message. Certain emphases in its theology reflect the needs of that age and the spirit of both intellectual and practical relevance in succeeding centuries.

Among the cardinal principles of protestantism which Methodists stress are: (1) the authority of Scripture; (2) the right of private judgment, with its implications for the idea of tolerance and religious liberty; (3) justification by faith; (4) freedom of will (breaking sharply here with predestination); (5) the sanctity of the common life; and (6) faith as both a human and a divine act, stressing moral and rational elements in faith, the divine initiative through grace, and the importance of religious experience.

The preaching of John Wesley was an Arminianism that announced salvation as available to all men and not simply to an elect few. Christ died for all men, and any man is free to [p. 159] accept this salvation. All could become actual sons of God. To the gospel of God's grace was added the idea of conscious salvation. Those whose sins God forgives, he assures by an inner voice that they are his children. God's grace is constantly available to men and endows them daily with strength for the work of life. There is thus a great stress on the work of the Holy Spirit. Along with a doctrine of justification by faith, Wesley laid on his converts the responsibilities of love. The new life in Christ could be made perfect in love, sanctification as well as justification being embraced in salvation. Forgiveness and sanctification are the two cardinal factors in the idea of salvation. Forgiveness, based on atonement, is the ground of the Christian life; yet sanctification dominates Wesley's thought because salvation is seen as a process directed to the perfect, real change of the individual. As justified by faith, man is accepted by God as one of His children; but this experienced judgment of grace stands in tension with the coming judgment of works, the final salvation for which the maturing power of sanctification will qualify him.

Methodism owes much to the Church of England. Not least is the fact that her Articles of Religion are the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England reduced to twenty-five. The Articles of Religion, however, are not a confining theological fence.

They provide a significant historical point of reference; but they are also a starting point of theological exploration. Taken by themselves, they do not fully express the experimental spirit of Methodism as an individual and social force.

One of the summaries of distinctive Methodist emphasis which Wesley formulated says:

What was their fundamental doctrine? That the Bible is the whole and sole rule both of Christian faith and practice. [p. 160] Hence they learned, (1) That religion is an inward principle; that it is no other than the mind that was in Christ; or, in other words, the renewal of the soul after the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness. (2) That this can never be wrought in us, but by the power of the Holy Ghost. (3) That we receive this, and every other blessing, merely for the sake of Christ: and (4) That whosoever hath the mind that was in Christ, the same is our brother, and sister, and mother.

In 1777, John and Charles Wesley prepared a hymnal intended for “the Use of Christians of all Denominations.” Its preface sounds a significant ecumenical note:

The ease and happiness that attend, the unspeakable advantages that flow from, a truly catholic spirit, a spirit of universal love (which is the very reverse of bigotry), one would imagine, might recommend this amiable temper to every person of cool reflection. And who that has tasted of this happiness can refrain from wishing it to all mankind? ... It is with unspeakable joy, that these observe the spirit of bigotry greatly declining (at least, in every Protestant nation of Europe), and the spirit of love proportionably increasing. Men of every opinion and denomination now begin to bear with each other. They seem weary of tearing each other to pieces on account of small and unessential differences; and rather desire to build up each other in the great point wherein they all agree—the faith which worketh by love, and produces in them the mind which was in Jesus Christ. It is hoped, the ensuing collection of Hymns may in some measure contribute, through the blessing of God, to advance this glorious end, to promote this spirit of love, not confined to any opinion or party. There is not a hymn, not [p. 161] one verse, inserted here, but what relates to the common salvation; and what every serious and unprejudiced Christian, of whatever denomination, may join in.

The Wesleys may have been in error in some details of theological selection in the verses and hymns, but the spirit which animated their evangelical fervor has left a deep imprint on Methodist readiness for ecumenical experience.

In addition to doctrinal dependence, we may note other significant factors of indebtedness to the Church of England which help in understanding the order and organization of Methodism. There is, first of all, a rich churchly heritage and tradition which assisted Methodism from being confined as a merely sect institution. The fervor of evangelical Christianity was fed by the many-sidedness of the great Anglican tradition. Secondly, Methodism inherited a dignified worship and historic liturgy. The rituals of baptism, marriage, ordination, burial ceremonies, and the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper owe much to the Prayer Book of the Church of England. So also is the tradition of an official and dignified hymnody. Thirdly, the form of church government is based on the Low Church Anglican concepts of church polity. Wesley held with Luther that there is no form of church government prescribed in Scripture, but held that the episcopal form was not contrary to Scripture. The conception of ministerial orders and the nature of their functions are Anglican. Methodism approved, adopted, and used the forms and methods of a historic ministry. These it adapted to the social and historical circumstances of the

people whom it served. Thus, for example, the episcopacy has never in Methodism been considered a “third order,” but rather the investiture of an “elder” with certain definite executive functions and powers. As a consequence, the Methodist [p. 162] bishops “not only have no power to ordain a person for the episcopal office till he be first elected by the General Conference, but they possess no authority to ordain an elder or a traveling deacon till he be first elected by a yearly Conference.”

The functioning organization of the Methodist Church comprises a General Conference for the entire church, Jurisdictional Conferences for the church in the U.S.A., Central Conferences for the church outside the United States of America, and Annual Conferences as the fundamental bodies in the church. The General Conference meets quadrennially and is composed of not less than six hundred or more than eight hundred delegates, equally divided among ministers and laymen (including laywomen), all elected by Annual Conferences. The General Conference has full legislative power over all matters distinctively connectional. The bishops are elected in Jurisdictional Conferences, which otherwise are functional auxiliary bodies to promote the general interests of the church. The Annual Conference—composed of both ministers and laymen—is the basic body in the church. As such, it has reserved the right to vote on all constitutional amendments, on the election of all delegates to General, Jurisdictional, and Central Conferences, on all matters relating to ministerial relations and ordination, except that lay members may not vote on matters of ordination, character, and Conference relations of ministers. In addition to the Conferences, there are the episcopacy and the Judiciary. A council of bishops provides administrative leadership and presidential supervision for the jurisdictions and areas. The Judiciary functions as a supreme ecclesiastical court...

There are about nine million members of the Methodist Church in the U.S.A., served through about forty thousand preaching places. In all, there are twenty-three bodies in the [p. 163] country bearing the Methodist name. Most of these represent schisms or withdrawals from other Methodist bodies. In addition, there are about a dozen groups which may be termed quasi-Methodist sects. They profess to be Wesleyan in doctrine, they were organized by Methodists and drew their original members mainly from the Methodist constituency. About two dozen other sects espouse the sanctification doctrine promulgated by early Methodist preachers. The fifty or more sects traceable to Methodism have a combined membership of nearly ten million persons. The Methodist Church is widely distributed over the nation, with special strength in the middle western and southern states.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Methodist Church, whose 9,815,460 members (1959; see *YAC*, 1961, p. 256) constitute the largest Protestant denomination in the United States, was formed by the union, in 1939, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant Church. For their history, see *b*, *c*, and *d* below. For Presbyterian proposal that the Methodist enter a further interdenominational merger, see Nos. 664, 665.]

b. The Former Methodist Episcopal Church

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1096–1101.

[p. 1096] *History*. The first interest of the Wesleys in America was connected with a philanthropic movement started by Governor Oglethorpe in Georgia in 1733. They had apparently attracted his attention by their manner of life at Oxford, and in 1735 he invited them to come as spiritual advisers to his colony. Both accepted the invitation, and John Wesley remained until 1738, though Charles Wesley returned earlier. It was at this time

that they first came into relations with the Moravians, through the colony established in the same vicinity by Count Zinzendorf.

In 1760 Philip Embury, a Wesleyan local preacher from Ireland, landed in New York with members of his Irish class, and 6 years later he gathered for regular worship a company of Methodists, who in 1768 erected and dedicated a [p. 1097] chapel, since known as the "John Street Church." About the same time Robert Strawbridge, also an Irish Wesleyan preacher, assembled a small company in Frederick County, Md. Subsequently itinerant preachers were sent over by John Wesley, among them Thomas Rankin and Francis Asbury, and in 1773 the first annual conference was held in Philadelphia. During the Revolutionary War, notwithstanding the general adverse circumstances and the fact that Asbury alone of all the preachers sent over by Wesley remained in this country, the membership increased from 1,160 in 1773 to 14,988 in 1784. The declaration of peace found the societies still connected with the Church of England, though without leaders or church privileges, as many of the clergy had left their parishes, and consequently neither baptism nor the Lord's Supper was administered. On representation being made to Wesley, he set apart Dr. Thomas Coke, a presbyter of the Church of England, as superintendent and commissioned him to ordain Francis Asbury as joint superintendent with himself. Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey were also ordained as presbyters (or elders) for America. They arrived in America in the latter part of 1784, and on December 24 what has been known as the "Christmas conference" began in Baltimore, Md., 60 preachers meeting with Dr. Coke and his companions. A letter from Wesley was read announcing the preparation of a liturgy to be used by the traveling preachers, and the appointment of "Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury to be joint superintendents over our brethren in North America, as also Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey to act as elders among them by baptizing and administering the Lord's Supper." It was also stated that as "our American brethren are now totally disentangled both from the state and the English hierarchy, we dare not entangle them again, either with the one or with the other. They are now at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the Primitive Church."

The conference then proceeded to form a Methodist Episcopal Church, and elected both Coke and Asbury superintendents or bishops. The Order of Worship and Articles of Religion prepared by Wesley were adopted, one article being added, recognizing allegiance to the United States Government; the rules and discipline were revised and accepted; and a number of preachers were ordained.

The first General Conference was held in 1792, and after that it was held quadrennially...

The church has not been free from disagreements. In 1792 James O'Kelley, of Virginia, with a considerable body of sympathizers, withdrew because of objection to the episcopal power in appointing the preachers to their fields of labor, and organized the "Republican Methodists," who later joined with others in what has become known as the "Christian Church" [now part of the United Church of Christ]. Between 1813 and 1817 many of the Negro members in various sections of the Middle Atlantic States, believing that they were not treated fairly by their white brethren, withdrew and formed separate denominations of Negro Methodists, such as the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Union Church of Africans (now the Union American Methodist Episcopal Church), and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.

In 1830 the Methodist Protestant Church was organized as the outcome of a movement against episcopal power and for lay representation in church government. In 1843 the Wesleyan Methodist Connection was organized in the interests of a more emphatic protest against slavery and in objection to the episcopacy. Two years later the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, withdrew because of the antislavery agitation. The latest division was that of the Free Methodists, in 1860, on differences concerning secret societies, discipline, and certain doctrines, particularly sanctification. The other Methodist denominations in the United States arose otherwise than as secessions from the parent Methodist body...

In 1935 the Committee on Union, appointed by the General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal, the Methodist Episcopal, South, and the Methodist Protestant churches submitted a plan of union [completed in 1939]...

[p. 1099] *Doctrine*. In theology the Methodist Episcopal Church is Arminian, and its doctrines are set forth in the Articles of Religion, Wesley's published sermons, and his Notes on the New Testament. These emphasize belief in the Trinity, the fall of man and his need of repentance, freedom of the will, sanctification, future rewards and punishments, and the sufficiency of the Scriptures for salvation. The doctrine of sanctification or Christian perfection, as held by Methodists, and which is regarded as distinctively a Methodist doctrine, does not imply an absolute and sinless perfection, but "a freedom from sin, from evil desires and evil tempers, and from pride." It is regarded as not usually, if ever, attained at the moment of conversion, but as being attainable by faith and that only, and members are exhorted to seek it in this life.

Two sacraments are recognized: Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The first is administered both to infants and adults; as to the mode, sprinkling is preferred, though in the case of adult converts, choice of sprinkling, pouring, or immersion is given. The one condition required of those who seek admission to church membership is "a desire to flee from the wrath to come and to be saved from their sins." Each applicant is expected to evidence this desire by a variety of proofs, indicating the purpose to lead an honorable, peaceful, modest life, abstaining from anything that "is not for the glory of God." There are certain special advices to church members in regard to temperance, marriage and divorce, amusements, etc...

[p. 1100] The General Conference is the highest body in the church and is the general legislative and judicial body... It convenes quadrennially and is composed of ministerial and lay delegates in equal numbers.

c. The Former Methodist Episcopal Church, South

SOURCE: *CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1144, 1145.*

[p. 1144] *History*. The early history of Methodism in America was closely identified with slave-holding sections. The southern colonies furnished the majority of the young men who entered the ministry of the church during the Revolutionary War, and out of approximately 15,000 members of the Methodist societies in 1783, only about 2,000 resided in what, in later years, were known as the "free States." All the conferences between 1776 and 1808 were held either in Baltimore or in that region, and six out of the nine bishops elected previous to 1844 had been natives of slaveholding States. Nevertheless, the Methodist preachers of the time were, with practical unanimity, opposed to human bondage.

The "Christmas Conference" of 1784, which organized the scattered congregations into the Methodist Episcopal Church, enacted a specific rule which required all

slaveholding members, under penalty of expulsion for noncompliance, to emancipate their slaves; but it stirred up so much strife, and proved to be so impracticable of execution, that in less than 6 months it was suspended. After various and somewhat conflicting measures had been adopted, the General Conference of 1808 provided that thereafter each annual conference should deal with the whole matter according to its own judgment. In 1816 this provision was modified by another statute which remained in force until 1844, to the effect that no slaveholder should be appointed to any official position in the church, if the State in which he lived made it possible for him to liberate his slaves. This compromise proceeded upon the supposition that, while slavery was an evil to be mitigated in every possible way, it was not necessarily a sin.

In 1844 a new issue was raised. Bishop James O. Andrew, of Georgia, a man of high Christian character and “eminent beyond almost any living minister for the interest that he had taken in the welfare of the slaves,” became by inheritance and by marriage a nominal slaveholder. Under the laws of Georgia it was not possible for him or his wife to free their slaves. He was therefore exempt, as scores of other southern ministers were, from the operation of the law of 1816. In the General Conference of 1844, held in New York, a preamble and resolution were adopted calling attention to the embarrassment which would result from this connection with slavery in the bishop’s exercise of his office as an itinerant general superintendent, and declaring it “the sense of this General Conference that he desist from the exercise of his office so long as this impediment remains.” The southern delegates resented this action, which virtually deposed him from the episcopacy, and entered a protest against it. They said that if Bishop Andrew had violated any law of the church they did not object to his being put upon trial for the offense; but they did object to his deposition by mere majority vote, and without any specific allegation based upon the law of the church being brought against him. Such action they regarded as a flagrant violation of the constitution of the church, according to which, as they interpreted it, the episcopacy was not a mere office subject to the control of an omnipotent General Conference, but a coordinate and independent branch of the church government. The result was that after long debate, conducted for the most part in an admirably Christian spirit, a provisional plan of separation was adopted, to become effective whenever the southern conferences should deem it necessary. A convention of representatives from the southern conferences was held at Louisville, Ky., and on May 17, 1845, by an almost unanimous vote, the plan of separation was approved, and the annual conferences in the slaveholding States were erected into a distinct ecclesiastical connection, separate from the jurisdiction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the name chosen for the new body being the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Its first General Conference was held at Petersburg, Va., in 1846...

[p. 1145] The southern church began with 2 bishops, Joshua Soule and James O. Andrew, and 16 annual conferences. In 1846 there were 1,519 traveling preachers, 2,833 local preachers, 327,284 white members, 124,961 Negro members, and 2,972 Indian members, or a total of 459,569...

The Civil War of 1860–65 wrought havoc. Hundreds of church buildings were burned or dismantled, college buildings were abandoned, and the endowments were swept away. During the war the annual conferences met irregularly or in fragments; the General Conference of 1862 was not held; and the whole order of the itinerancy was interrupted...

By 1866 the membership had been reduced to 511,161, showing a loss of 246,044. Three-fourths of the Negro members had joined either the African Methodist churches, or the Methodist Episcopal Church, whose representatives were to be found everywhere throughout the South. The remainder formed, in 1870, an independent organization, the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, cooperating in that organization.

In spite of these facts the work of reconstruction was begun at once... In 1874 the first fraternal delegation from the Methodist Episcopal Church was received...

Doctrine and Organization. In doctrine the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is in agreement with other branches of Methodism throughout the world, putting special emphasis upon the universality of the atonement, the witness of the Spirit, and the possibility of holiness in heart and life.

In polity it is in close accord with the Methodist Episcopal Church and emphasizes the episcopate.

d. The Former Methodist Protestant Church

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936 Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 1115, 1116.

[p. 1115] *History.* The general revolt against ecclesiastical rule which characterized the earlier years of the last century was the occasion for the organization of the Methodist Protestant Church. The Methodist Episcopal Church at that time vested an unlimited legislative, executive, and judicial power in the ministry, to the exclusion of all the lay members...

In 1827 a convention was called which formally petitioned the General Conference of 1828 to concede the principle of lay representation in all the conferences of the church. The reply was unfavorable and the petitioners were charged with being disturbers of the peace of the church... [p. 1116] A number of local independent societies were organized, and a convention was held in Baltimore in November 1828, where a provisional organization was formed under the name of The Associated Methodist Churches. Two years later another convention was held at the same place, and the Methodist Protestant Church was formed, enrolling 83 ministers and about 5,000 members...

Doctrine and Organization. In doctrine the Methodist Protestant Church stands on the same basis as the Methodist Episcopal Church. In polity, however, there are certain radical differences. The Methodist Protestant Church has no bishops or presiding elders and no life officers of any kind. It makes ministers and laymen equal in number and in power in the legislative bodies of the church.

1048. Methodists—Wesleyan Methodist Church (Formerly, Connection) of America

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936 Vol. 2, pp. 1124, 1125.

[p. 1124] *History.* The various divisions of Methodism have separated from the parent body on questions of ethics, polity, and nationality, and not for doctrinal reasons; and the Wesleyan Methodist Connection (or Church) of America shares with the other Methodist bodies the inheritance of its history and literature from the period of John Wesley's conversion to the date of its own organization as a separate denomination in 1843.

As the question of the enslaving of the colored race in America began to compel attention not only in political life, but in church life, there arose within the Methodist Episcopal Church many earnest opposers of slavery. Their activities were opposed by some of the ecclesiastical authorities of the church, resulting in the expulsion of a number

of persons and the withdrawal of others. [p. 1125] The stand taken by these persons was that the Bible and early Methodist authorities united in declaring slavery to be wrong, and the church should not condemn liberty of testimony and free discussion. These persons joined forces, and in 1841 a conference was formed in Michigan which took the name of Wesleyan Methodist. The next year a paper was issued in Massachusetts called "The True Wesleyan," with Rev. Orange Scott as editor. In November 1842 Rev. J. Horton and Rev. L. R. Sunderland became identified with this movement and in December were joined by Rev. Luther Lee and Rev. L. C. Matlock. The result was the formation

on May 31, 1843, in Utica, N. Y., of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection (or Church) of America. About 6,000 members united in this organization. At first these churches were all located in the northeastern States, but missionary and evangelistic activities have since built up churches throughout the United States and in eastern Canada.

With the passing of slavery in the Civil War, one of the issues that called the church into existence ceased to exist. Numerical losses were sustained in this period, but the conviction prevailed that other important issues of a spiritual and reform character should continue to be maintained, chief of which were the advocacy of the experience of entire sanctification and the prohibition of the liquor traffic.

Doctrine. In doctrine the church is in accord with historic Methodism. It holds that man is not only justified by faith in Christ, but also sanctified by faith. Special emphasis is placed upon this experience, and it is defined in the Discipline in the following manner:

Article of Religion XIV—Entire Sanctification

Entire sanctification is that work of the Holy Spirit by which the child of God is cleansed from all inbred sin through faith in Jesus Christ. It is subsequent to regeneration, and is wrought when the believer presents himself a living sacrifice, holy, and acceptable unto God, and is thus enabled through grace to love God with all the heart and to walk in His holy commandments blameless. Entire sanctification as a separate Article of Religion, distinct from that of regeneration, appeared in the Book of Discipline in 1849.

The great cardinal doctrines of Christianity as interpreted in the general standards of Methodism are received by this church. Briefly stated, the Wesleyan Methodist Connection (or Church) of America believes: (1) In one God revealed in the Holy Trinity: The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; (2) in the divine inspiration of the authority of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, and that they contain all things necessary to salvation; (3) that man is born with a fallen nature, and is therefore inclined to sin and that continually; (4) that the atonement through Christ is for the whole human race, and that whosoever repents and believes on the Lord Jesus Christ as his Saviour is justified and regenerated and saved from the dominion of sin; (5) that believers are sanctified wholly subsequent to conversion through faith in Christ; (6) in the bodily resurrection of Christ, and His return, in the resurrection of the dead, and in the final judgment.

Organization. Though it is not an episcopal body, this church conforms in its general features to the polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with a quarterly conference,

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

annual conferences, and a ... General Conference, which meets every 4 years, [and] is the lawmaking body of the connection, limited by a constitution.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 43,392 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 256).]

1049. Millennium—Definition (Word Not in Bible)

SOURCE: Philip Mauro, *Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1933), p. 579. Copyright 1933 by Philip Mauro. Used by permission.

Preliminary we note that the word “millennium” does not occur in the Bible. It is a coined word, which, however, has obtained the sanction of general usage because it has proved a convenient substitute for the phrase “thousand years”, which phrase occurs six times in the first seven verses of Revelation XX.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Merriam-Webster unabridged dictionary defines the word *millennium* literally as “a thousand years,” and notes that “some believe that” Christ will reign on earth during that period. In *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Vol. 7, p. 374) the word is presented in terms of the popular view that the millennium is a reign of Christ and the saints *on earth* for a thousand years or an unmeasured period before the end of the world.]

1050. Millennium, Earthly Kingdom During, Not in Scripture

SOURCE: MacCulloch, “Eschatology,” in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1928), Vol. 5, p. 388. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

In spite of the fact that, save in the Apocalypse, the NT did not speak of the Millennium, and that Christ does not connect the Parousia with the establishment of an earthly Kingdom, this belief had an extraordinary hold on the minds of [early] Christians. Doubtless a misunderstanding of the Apocalypse gave the belief a certain authority, but it is rather from its Jewish antecedents that its popularity and the elaboration of its details are to be explained.

1051. Millennium, Earthly Rule of Christ in, Not Scriptural

SOURCE: Philip Mauro, *Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1933) p. 590. Copyright 1933 by Philip Mauro. Used by permission.

There is not a word or hint to warrant the idea that the thousand years [of Revelation 20] were to be a period during which Jesus Christ would reign in bodily presence over the world and with Him the people of God in their resurrection bodies.

Surely if the current millennial doctrines were right as to their essential features there would be something to support them in the millennium passage itself; and conversely, since they find not a word of support therein, we are bound to reject them as unscriptural, unless other Scriptures afford clear proof that Christ and His resurrected people will reign during the thousand years over the earth peopled with unregenerate Jews and Gentiles, the Jews being restored to their ancient territory and invested with world supremacy.

[EDITORS' NOTE: In other works Mauro shows the “other Scriptures,” namely, the kingdom prophecies, commonly adduced for such a doctrine do not support it. See also No. 1052.]

1052. Millennium, Jewish-Kingdom View of, Not in Prophecies

SOURCE: Philip Mauro, *Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans 1933), p. 580. Copyright 1933 by Philip Mauro. Used by permission.

Moreover, to many of those who look for an earthly millennium, such as indicated above, it will be characterized prominently by the fulfilment of the ancient Jewish dreams of restored nationalism, the destruction of all natural enemies and world-hegemony for the Jewish nation. Those Jewish expectations, which are founded upon a miscalled “literal” interpretation of certain OT prophecies, include the re-birth of “Israel after the flesh”; their reoccupation of the territory promised to Abraham (from the great sea to the river Euphrates); and their national exaltation to the place of world-supremacy and

lordship over the nations; the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem, and the restoration of the Aaronic priesthood together with the sacrifices, feasts and ceremonies of the Mosaic ritual.

As to these views and expectations it will suffice to say at this point that there is not the slightest support for any of them in the millennium passage itself [Rev. 20:1, 7], for that short passage says not a word concerning the conditions of human life on earth during the thousand years. The facts in that regard are: first, that the current millennial doctrines derive absolutely nothing from that passage except the name; and second, that the prophecies, which are supposed to predict a coming era of national glory for Israel and of blissful conditions of life for the Gentiles, contain nothing whereby that supposed era can be identified with the thousand years of Revelation XX.

1053. Millennium—Not a Halfway Mortal-Immortal State Between Present Conditions and Eternal State

SOURCE: Philip Mauro, *Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1933), pp. 622, 623. Copyright 1933 by Philip Mauro. Used by permission.

[p. 622] The pre-millennialist is fully supported by Scripture in holding that there cannot be an era of earthly blessedness before the second advent of Christ...

[p. 623] Likewise the A-millennialists are right in holding that there is no earthly millennium of universal brotherhood of man—a half way state between the natural condition of man and the eternal bliss of the redeemed—intervening between the day of grace and the day of glory. This is perhaps the most distinctive feature of current millennialism and undoubtedly is the hardest to reconcile with the whole body of “the doctrine of Christ”, as set forth in the Scriptures. Whether placed before or after the Second Advent, the difficulty of finding room for such an era in the future history of mankind as foreshown in Bible prophecy is not to be overcome by any reasonable process. That earth’s population should be for a thousand years under the absolute sway of Him Who put away sin and vanquished death and yet be subject in a measure to both those dread powers; that the nations should be almost saved but not wholly, and other like ideas, are so incongruous and so destitute of scriptural support as fully to justify the extreme a-millennial position, were there not another view [see No. 1052] and one that avoids the described difficulty.

1054. Millennium, Theories of—History of Millennialism

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 58, 59. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 58] The Kingdom of God in the first two centuries was universally held to be eschatological and often millenarian. Origen interpreted it spiritually and Augustine identified it with the present reign of Christ in the world through his church; and thus both Origen and Augustine eliminated the millenarian interpretation. Medieval theologians identified the kingdom of God with the visible church, and the Reformers equated it with the invisible church. This interpretation of the Reformers may still be seen in contemporary scholars such as Vos and Allis who adhere to the Reformed Faith.

Under the influence of Ritschl the kingdom was viewed as a present spiritual reality in a way that was consonant with evolutionary philosophy. The activity of the Gospel in the world was interpreted in line with the movement of evolutionary progress which was destined to make the world the scene of the realization of the fullness of God’s kingdom.

A reaction arose in liberal scholarship with Schweitzer and Weiss who represented Jesus as teaching that the kingdom was only eschatological and apocalyptic and that the

world was immediately to come to its end when God would set up the kingdom. Most subsequent liberal studies have retained the view that the Gospels represent Jesus as teaching that the world would end apocalyptically within a generation and that at this point Jesus was in error. Critics have attempted to obviate this difficulty either by excising the apocalyptic element as unessential, irrelevant to the kernel of Jesus' true teaching, or by setting it aside as unauthentic by literary and historical [p. 59] criticism. Others have attempted to find some solution which would admit a present kingdom in his teachings as well as a future apocalyptic kingdom.

Recent conservative students have concerned themselves particularly about the pros and cons of the millennial interpretation of the kingdom. Premillennialism in America has been largely identified with the dispensational view, which distinguishes between the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God and ignores the purpose of Jesus to establish a present spiritual kingdom. A strong reaction to this type of premillennialism has arisen in amillennialism, which interprets the kingdom largely in terms of a present spiritual reality in the invisible church and denies any future millennial kingdom.

From this review of the history of interpretation, several important conclusions are to be noted. 1. Many conservative students have withdrawn from the movements of contemporary criticism and have not been concerned with the problems which have been raised by the many recent critical discussions. 2. The problem of whether the kingdom of God is both present and future has challenged both liberals and conservatives. The search still goes on to find a key which will provide an essential unity between these two aspects and which will do justice to the data of the Gospels. 3. Most conservative studies have been concerned with only one aspect of the kingdom, viz., the character of its eschatological phase, whether it will involve an earthly reign of Christ or not. Amillennialists deny the future earthly reign of Christ; premillennialists, at least of the dispensational persuasion, tend to minimize if not to deny a present spiritual kingdom inaugurated by Christ.

1055. Millennium, Theories of—History of Millennialism

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 234–236, 238, 239. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 234] Whatever there was of chiliasm in the ancient Church was overwhelmingly premillennarian...

[p. 235] Medieval chiliasm was just as uniformly of the postmillennarian type as ancient chiliasm had been of the premillennarian type...

The connection of the status of the Church with the form which chiliastic ideals assumed was close indeed. Its closeness can be gauged by the fact, that ancient Premillennialism began to wane as soon as the persecutions ceased, and that medieval Postmillennarianism appeared only when the dangers and the limitations of hierarchical absolutism became undeniably manifest. This connection receives further illustration from the fact that ancient Premillennialism needed no repression but died of itself when the Church had won social recognition and political standing; while medieval Postmillennialism had to be driven out by the one dominant Church and had to be forced into hiding and even then did not die but lived on, deriving continually new strength from the persistence and increase of the evils which it condemned and against which it was the protest.

[p. 236] The modern age has fallen heir to both, the ancient political-social and the medieval ecclesiastical interpretation of the Christian hope for human history. There may

have been little actual continuity in the traditions, but the fact remains that, no sooner had the Reformation begun, but the double attempt was made of turning it in the direction of the realization of the Pure Church of the Holy Spirit and the Saints and at the same time employing it in the services of economic amelioration and political revolution. It is significant for the mind of the Reformers, that they rejected and resisted both attempts; it is also significant, that both attempts originated with one and the same group, the Anabaptists.

For thus it fell out, that this double heritage from the Christian past became the rather characteristic possession first of all of the sects, while in the established Churches there was no room for it. There was, moreover, a significant difference as to the possibility of realization between the two parts of this double heritage: the premillennial hope for the social-political realm had first to be transmuted into a postmillennial form before it allowed of human attempts to realize it; but the ideal of the Pure Church of the Spirit was postmillennial in its origins and as such had no need to wait for the visible return of the Lord but permitted directly of attempts to realize it. As a consequence, the sects and dissenters in the main continued the social-political ideal as a hope, while they in the main developed a tendency to present themselves as the realization of the ecclesiastical-religious ideal...

[p. 238] If we want to understand the later prevalence of Christian chiliasm among American Protestants, we must above all bear in mind this fundamental fact, that in virtue of its beginnings and early history America was predisposed to just such a development. The actual detailed forces which brought Christian chiliasm to the fore in our country wrought their effects, and can therefore be understood, only against that larger background...

[p. 239] A factor which affected America specifically was, of course, the fact that American hospitality had already attracted and was continuing to attract to our shores all kinds of European chiliasts for the purpose of escaping from their unfavorable situations. Moreover, it is said that after 1843 American evangelism and revivalism has never lost the premillenarian note; and the revivalists and evangelists have widely influenced and brought down to a common level the orthodoxy of the Churches of Calvinistic provenance here...

Finally, the fact is well known, that modernism or neoprottestantism has adopted the Christian concept of the kingdom as the symbol for its own cultural hopes and has thereby temporarily given great encouragement and deceitful friendship to the Postmillenarians. When neoprottestantism at the beginning of the present century began its triumphant march through America, the association of liberalism with Postmillennialism and, by way of reaction, of fundamentalism with Premillennialism became practically unavoidable.

1056. Millennium, Theories of—Medieval Augustinian View

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 147, 148. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 147] Augustine, bishop of Hippo, ... sought [p. 148] a new philosophy of history with which to meet the puzzling crises of his own day. The Roman empire, which had been the organizing and stabilizing power of the world, was slowly tottering to its complete collapse. The sack of Rome by Alaric in 410 and the subsequent invasion of North Africa, Augustine's own country, by the barbarian hordes prompted Augustine to rethink the whole position of the Christian church. In his famous work, *The City of God*,

he advanced the doctrine that the city or commonwealth of the world was doomed to perish, whereas the “city of God,” the church, was continuing and taking its place. He taught that the “city of God” was identical with the church, and that as the latter grew in power and influence it would gradually bring all men under its sway and would introduce the reign of righteousness.

This doctrine of Augustine became the basis for the temporal claims of the Roman church. If the kingdom was to grow irresistibly until it dominated the earth, and if the visible church was identical with the kingdom, then the visible church could rightfully assume political power, and could make its conquests by force.

A second consequence of Augustine’s teaching was the concept that the church must gradually increase in numbers and in possessions until it should achieve world dominion. The fact that it had become the state religion of the empire seemingly corroborated this thought. When the political structure of the empire crashed, Augustine felt that stability and survival could be achieved by the church as the “city of God.” The system of the world might be passing away, but the church, being divine in origin, would endure.

To reach this conclusion Augustine had to employ an allegorical method of interpretation that divested Scripture of literal meaning and that emptied it of any certain significance. He taught that the millennium is the era beginning with the first advent of Christ and continuing to the second advent; that the “first resurrection” is spiritual; that the binding of Satan has already been completed; and that the reign of Christ is now in progress.

Since Christ must reign “till he hath put all his enemies under his feet” (1 Cor. 15:25), from this philosophy one would deduce logically that the present era must continue until the church is triumphant. Augustine’s view was later adopted by Thomas Aquinas, and became the official teaching of the Roman church.

1057. Millennium, Theories of—Medieval Chiliasm

SOURCE: Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (Fair Lawn, N.J.: Essential Bks., 1957), pp. xiii, xiv. Used by permission of Oxford University Press, Inc., New York.

[p. xiii] The Middle Ages had inherited from Antiquity—from the Jews and early Christians—a tradition of prophecy which during those same centuries took on a fresh and exuberant vitality. In the language of theology—which seems here the most appropriate language—there existed an eschatology, or body of doctrine concerning the final state of the world, which was chiliastic in the most general sense of the term—meaning that it foretold a Millennium, not necessarily limited to a thousand years and indeed not necessarily limited at all, in which the world would be inhabited by a humanity at once perfectly good and perfectly happy. Offering so much solace of a kind which the official teaching of the medieval Church withheld, this eschatology came to exercise a powerful and enduring fascination. Generation after generation was seized at least intermittently by a tense expectation of some sudden, miraculous event in which the world would be utterly transformed, some prodigious final struggle between the hosts of Christ and the hosts of Antichrist through which history would attain its fulfillment and justification. Although it would be a gross over-simplification to identify the world of chiliastic exaltation with the world of social unrest, there were many times when needy and discontented masses were captured by some millennial prophet.

1058. Millennium, Theories of—Modern Amillennialism

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 151–154. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 151] The amillennial interpretation holds that the passage in Revelation 20:1–8 does not refer to a period to come *after* the conquest of the world by the gospel, but that it is either a description of the current period before the return of the Lord, or else that it has no particular significance. The argument of the amillenarians is that the passage in Revelation is highly figurative, that it occurs only in one place in the most symbolic book of the Bible, and that its main concept of the thousand years is never found elsewhere in Scripture. It is therefore a relatively unimportant aspect of eschatology which cannot be used to establish any chronological sequence of events or any very definite scheme of the last things.

Amillennialism has been adopted in the last twenty-five years by those who have not found the postmillennial position tenable, but who are not fully satisfied with premillennialism. Amillennialism is not strictly novel, either. It can be traced back as far [p. 152] as Augustine, and perhaps earlier. It asserts the personal return of Christ to claim His church, to overthrow antichrist, and to judge the world, but it does not regard the millennium as a period of definable length intervening between the appearing of Christ and the establishment of the eternal state. Augustine contended that it was equivalent to the present era, in which Satan is restrained while the gospel is preached. Mauro advanced the theory that it represents the spiritual triumph of the martyrs who are now reigning with Christ an opinion echoed by others including Hamilton, who adds that the believers are now reigning upon the earth.

The defense of the amillennial position is both negative and positive. Negatively the amillennial objects to what he calls the crass materialism of the premillennial system...

[p. 153] The kingdom in Revelation is treated as already existent (1:6, 9), and should not therefore be relegated to the distant future, subsequent to the return of Christ. Jesus came “preaching the kingdom” (Mark 1:14, 15; Matt 4:23; John 3:5), a ministry which was continued by His successors, notably Paul (Acts 20:25). From this the amillennial argues that Jesus did establish the kingdom in a spiritual sense, and that the reference to “reigning” in Revelation 20 is to be understood in the same way...

The amillennial customarily interprets the “first resurrection” of Revelation 20:5 as figurative... [p. 154] Thus the second resurrection of Revelation 20:12–15 becomes the final physical resurrection of all the dead righteous and unrighteous alike, from all eras...

It should be said that the advocates of the amillennial view generally believe in the personal return of Christ, and that they are much less likely than the postmillennial school to equate it with the achievement of an evolutionary goal or with the acme of social progress. Amillennialism does not necessarily reject the concept of a real return of Christ at the consummation of the age.

1059. Millennium, Theories of—Modern Amillennialism, Definition and Emphasis of

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 55, 56. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 55] The most recent volume [setting forth amillennialism] has come from Professor Louis Berkhof, President-Emeritus of Calvin Theological Seminary, entitled *The Kingdom of God*. This study is of especial interest to the present survey because its two final chapters deal with the kingdom of God as a millennial hope. In them Professor Berkhof insists that there is no biblical ground for a belief in a literal earthly millennial phase of the kingdom, and he raises five objections to the chiliastic interpretation which

constitute one of the most concise and sane criticisms of the position to be found in contemporary literature because they are addressed to the basic premillennial position rather than to the special dispensational interpretation of it [see Nos. 1071, 1072].

Throughout these amillennial books runs a negative emphasis. Far more effort is expended in denying the premillennial view and in attacking its weaknesses than there is upon the positive position which these authors espouse. This position has come to be known as amillennialism. The kingdom of God will not involve a reign of Christ on earth for a thousand years, as Revelation 20 seems to teach, after the second [p. 56] advent of Christ and before the final judgment. The Old Testament prophecies which seem to envisage such an earthly kingdom are not to be interpreted literally but spiritually. They realize their fulfillment in the church, the new people of God, which has now entirely supplanted Israel as a nation so far as God's redemptive purposes are concerned. The kingdom of God is entirely a spiritual thing, a present reality. The millennial reign of Christ in Revelation 20 is also to be interpreted spiritually. It may refer to the present reign of Christ in the world through the church and in the lives of God's people, a view which originated with Augustine; or it may refer to the souls of Christians who have been martyred as they now reign with Christ in heaven in the intermediate state.

1060. Millennium, Theories of—Modern Amillennialism, Definition and Views of

SOURCE: Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 35–37. Copyright 1942 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 35] The third generic view [besides pre- and postmillennialism] of the interpretation of the facts of Scripture relating to eschatology, is called *Amillennialism*. The name itself is unfortunate in that it would seem to indicate that its advocates do not believe in the thousand year period of Revelation 20. The name literally means “no millennium,” while as a matter of fact its advocates believe that the millennium is a spiritual or heavenly millennium, rather than the earthly one of a literal reign of Christ on earth before the final judgment. From one point of view it might be called a variety of postmillennialism, since it believes that the spiritual or heavenly millennium *precedes* the Second Coming of Christ. The only mention in the Bible of a kingdom of Christ limited to a 1000 years is in the 20th chapter of the Revelation where it is said that the “souls” are seen reigning with Christ during the 1000 years. A thousand, the number of perfection or completion, is held to be the symbolic reference to the perfect period, or the complete period between the two comings of Christ.

The picture of eschatological events, without any discussion at present of the supporting any discussion at present of the supporting Scripture passages, is as follows. Like the premillennialist we [the amillennialists] view the world as a mixture of good and evil up to the time of the Rapture [see No. 1521]. We have no hope or expectation that the whole world will grow better and better until it is all converted to Christianity. We expect that wars will continue [p. 36] right up to the time of the end when Christ comes to set things right. We expect the elect to be gathered out of an evil world, though we do believe that the command of Christ to preach the gospel to the whole world must be obeyed, and that it is our duty to endeavor to establish a Christian society as far as it is in our power to do so, but while we have the obligation to do this, we by no means expect that the whole of society will be Christianized. In fact, we expect the forces of evil to grow more and more violent in their opposition to Christianity and Christians. This is no

way excuses us from the attempt to propagate Christian principles as well as the gospel in the world.

At the close of the present age we expect the forces of evil to head up in a powerful combination of political, economic and religious power led by the Antichrist. At the close of the reign of the Antichrist or Man of Sin, he institutes a terrible persecution against the Christian Church (not against the Jews as some premillennialists assert). In this terrible tribulation vast numbers of Christians are killed, but at the climax, when the hosts of Satan seem to be on the point of complete victory, during the battle of Armageddon, Christ appears in the Shekinah glory, the resurrection of all men takes place, and the transfigured bodies of the dead and living saints are caught up to welcome their Saviour. Then, as a terrible outpouring of the wrath of God occurs, smiting the unbelieving nations of the world into destruction, the Jewish people look “on Him whom they pierced,” repent and believe instantaneously in their Messiah. Simultaneously with their conversion and regeneration by the Holy Spirit, as they see Christ coming on the clouds, they too are transfigured with the living Church of Christ, and join in the rapture [i.e., the catching up] of the united body of the elect church of Christ of the ages. This completes the number of the elect, and from that point onward there is no more salvation for men.

As soon as the rapture is consummated, Christ and His Church return to earth for the Great White Throne Judgment, or, since [p. 37] the descriptions of the Judgment in the Bible do not *necessitate* believing that it occurs on the earth, perhaps this judgment occurs in the air after the rapture. It is not clear from Scripture as to what happens to the resurrected bodies of the wicked. Certainly they are revived if not transfigured, and since they gather instantaneously after their resurrection before the Great White Throne, for the final Judgment, and since eternal punishment concerns the soul rather than the body of man, there is reason to believe that the resurrected bodies of the wicked have superhuman qualities, though they certainly are still sinful bodies, filled with corruption and evil, marred by the deformities of sin. At any rate they “hear the voice of the Son of Man and live,” at the same time as the righteous dead.

After the Judgment, the eternal kingdom of God is established in the new heaven and on the new earth, for the old heaven and the new earth are passed away. The chief characteristics of the new heaven and the new earth will be the absence of sin and evil, the eternal manifestation of the presence of the Triune God before the eyes of the Redeemed, and the perfection of the glorious new earth. This will continue through all eternity.

1061. Millennium, Theories of—Modern Amillennialism, Variations in

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 258, 259, 261–263. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 258] The amillennial millennium is of an entirely different order than either the premillenarian or the postmillenarian millennium, which are both conceived as still future periods of human history next to the present and the prechristian periods of history on this earth...

[p. 259] There is need of recognizing variations in Amillennialism. It is far from being a perfectly unified system or scheme of eschatology. It is quite clear that Hamilton limits the thousand years of the reign with Christ to the disembodied spirits in heaven; but it is equally certain, that this is not what Augustine, the father of the amillennial view, did. He embraced in that reign also the believers who do battle here on earth with lusts, and the elders who rule in and over the churches. In a sense, the elimination of these two

modes of ruling with Christ may be hailed as a simplification and improvement upon the Augustinian Amillennialism; but it should at any rate be recognized, that it is not the only type of Amillennialism...

[p. 261] Again, it is very much to be doubted, whether all Amillenarians of today are agreed with Hamilton's representation of the amillenarian position of the subject of the conversion of the Jews. It is to be feared, that some are not ready to concede such a conversion at the end of time at all, and that many will not agree either with him or among themselves as to the details even when they do expect a national conversion of Israel...

[p. 262] In his [Hamilton's] judgment Amillennialism is in general agreement with Premillennialism in its conception of what precedes the rapture [see No. 1521] and of the order in which it precedes the rapture, and that it is [p. 263] in general agreement with Postmillennialism in its conception of what follows the rapture and of the order of those later events. This is no doubt correct in the main, and to understand this relationship will help us to correlate the three main eschatological views.

1062. Millennium, Theories of—Post- and Pre-millennialists Both Have Future Millennium

SOURCE: Philip Mauro, *Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1933), p. 579. Copyright 1933 by Philip Mauro. Used by permission.

Both pre- and post-millennialists hold that the millennium is a definite era of earth's future history [see editors' note below], a golden age, presenting the greatest possible contrast to all previous ages in that peace, health and prosperity will prevail during the whole millennial period throughout the world. Both schools are in agreement that it will be the long looked for era in which the lion will lie down with the lamb, and the nations of the world will beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning hooks, and will not learn war any more.

[EDITORS' NOTE: In attributing the belief in an *earthly* millennium to "both pre- and post-millennialists," Mauro apparently is unaware that Seventh-day Adventists, though premillennialists, are exceptions to this generalization (see No. 7n).]

1063. Millennium, Theories of—Post-millennialism, as Defined by Hamilton

SOURCE: Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 31–33. Copyright 1942 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 31] Post-millennialism ... teaches that a thousand years of peace and righteousness will precede the Second Coming of Christ. The postmillennialist looks for the conversion of practically the whole world through the preaching of the Gospel in this dispensation. Then, with the establishment of justice and righteousness throughout the world, with the elimination of war and evil, the world will enter into the Golden Age when righteousness shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea and every knee shall bow and every tongue confess Jesus as Lord and Saviour. They expect the world to become better and better, until at last truly Christian government is established all over the world, the hosts of Satan are defeated, and Satan himself vanquished from the earth.

As a part of the universal reign of righteousness the teaching of the New Testament that the Jews will be converted to Christianity, (Rom. 11:26), follows as a logical corollary. The postmillennialists deny that there will be any national restoration of the Jews as a nation in Palestine [see No. 1073n]. All that the New Testament teaches is that

the Jews will be saved, not that they will again become a separate nation. If that should occur it would be entirely apart from the fulfillment of prophecy.

Postmillennialists do not dwell much on the question of the binding and loosing of Satan, mentioned in the 20th chapter of the Revelation. What is to occur would be purely figurative, referring to the limiting of Satan's power through the triumphs of [p. 32] Christ and the Gospel ushering in the millennium preceding the coming of Christ. They would declare that it is quite possible that at the close of the 1000 years of peace there might be a flare up of Satanic power to be destroyed by the appearance of Christ on the clouds in glory.

They hold that when the prophecies of the end time are fulfilled, at the sound of the trumpet, all the dead, both saved and unsaved, will be raised, while the righteous will be raptured with glorified bodies of living believers, to meet the Lord in the air during the battle of Armageddon. After the welcome, the vials of God's wrath will be poured out on the earth, destroying the wicked, overturning the armies of the Antichrist at the conclusion of the battle of Armageddon, (which begins just before the coming of Christ in the clouds), and Christ will judge the earth in the judgment of the Great White Throne. This judgment will be the same as the judgment of the sheep and the goats, and the judgment scene of II Thes. 1:7–10.

After the final judgment, Christ turns over the kingdom to the Father, and the eternal kingdom of Christ will be established. The new heavens and earth will come into existence with the coming to earth of the new Jerusalem pictured in Rev. 21–22...

[p. 33] World War No. I, shattered the hopes of the advocates of peace through international cooperation, in the Hague Peace Congress. The failure of the League of Nations and the breaking of World War No. II, have given the final death blow to any hopes of the ushering in of an era of universal peace and joy through the interplay of forces now in action in the world.

1064. Millennium, Theories of—Post-millennialism Created by Whitby and Vitringa

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 32, 33. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 32] A new and different interpretation was created by Daniel Whitby (1706) who thought that the world was to be [p. 33] completely evangelized and the Church to rule the world. Vitringa (d. 1722) applied this view to the interpretation of the Revelation producing postmillennialism. He followed the historical interpretation for the first nineteen chapters and interpreted the first part of chapter twenty as a future era when the Church would reign over the world after the destruction of anti-Christian Rome. The millennium was thus placed in the future but before the return of Christ; and the meaning of "postmillennialism" is that Christ's return would occur only after the millennial period. One of the most famous exponents of this view was David Brown (1891), one of the co-editors of the widely used Jamieson, Fausset and Brown's *Commentary on the Bible*.

1065. Millennium, Theories of—Post-millennialism, Development and Decline of

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 147, 149–151. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 147] The postmillennial school interprets the passage [Rev. 20:1–8] as figurative, and asserts that a return of Christ to judge the earth and to set up the eternal kingdom comes at the end of the millennium. Its teaching assumes that the gospel of Christ will slowly but surely subdue all nations; that the kingdom of God is identical with the church; and that when the church has done its work of extending the spiritual sway of Christ over the entire earth that His personal advent may be expected.

The postmillennial school had its roots historically in the teaching of Augustine, bishop of Hippo [see No. 1056]...

[p. 149] The form of postmillennialism which is more familiar today began in the eighteenth century with Daniel Whitby, a Unitarian commentator who shared in the production of the *Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament* published in London in 1703 in collaboration with Patrick, Arnold, Lowth, and Lowman. Whitby's principles can be stated in four general propositions:

1. The "first resurrection" is not to be taken as a literal physical resurrection of the dead. It is a revival of the genuine spirit of the martyrs in the church, and is ecclesiastical, spiritual, and national.
2. The millennium is yet to come. It will be preceded by a triumph over the papacy and heathenism in general, and will begin with the conversion of the world at large. At this point Whitby differed from Augustine, who identified the millennium with the present age. In this respect Augustine was more nearly an amillenarian than Whitby.
3. Satan will no longer trouble men. He will be bound and inactive.
4. The church will triumph completely, and will fill the earth with its benevolent rule. At the close of the period there will be a short rebellion; the final judgment will take place; and Christ will establish His eternal kingdom.

Whitby's view, although admittedly a new hypothesis, became very popular and prevailed in American Protestantism throughout most of the nineteenth century.

To those living in that "Great Century" from the close of the Napoleonic wars in 1815 to the opening of the first world war in 1914, the postmillennial view seemed to be justified by historical events. The increase of colonies and protectorates established by "Christian" nations in Africa and in Asia opened new doors for propagation of the Christian faith. The growth of a sense of missionary responsibility led to the founding of new societies and to expansion into the South Sea Islands, China, India, Africa, and other places. The agitation for the international peace table at the Hague convinced many people that war would shortly be outlawed, and that the settlement of disagreements by force of arms would cease. Literacy and education increased. All of these factors produced a feeling of optimism which was embodied in the preaching that "the kingdom is coming."

The liberal wing of Christianity that had adopted the philosophy of evolution modified the postmillennialism of its orthodox [p. 150] forbears by substituting social change and a general triumph of righteousness for the personal return of Christ. Judgment was interpreted to be the inexorable working of the social process by which evil would be surmounted and ultimately discarded. On both sides of the theological fence men felt that the age of righteousness was about to be ushered into existence...

The spectacle of so-called [p. 151] Christian nations bent on the destruction of each other, the curtailment of missionary endeavor which was the inevitable result of war, the rise of Communism in Russia which transformed a former "Christian" nation into an

atheistic state and which has brought 800,000,000 people behind the iron curtain, the wholesale murder of entire populations such as the Jews in Germany and the farmers of the Ukraine in Russia, demonstrate quite clearly that human nature has not become Christian and that the millennium has not yet arrived...

The old optimism has been eclipsed by a hopelessness that is quite its opposite, and the postmillennial concept of a world rapidly on its way to realizing the kingdom of God as the latter is defined in the New Testament has proved illusory.

1066. Millennium, Theories of—Postmillennialism Fifty Years Ago and Now

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 46–48. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 46] Fifty years ago, it was possible to look upon the kingdom of God as a new principle, supernatural to be sure, which had been set at work in the hearts of men, which was destined to permeate like leaven all human relationships and slowly but steadily transform human society on this earth so that eventually God's will would be done among all men in all areas of life, and thus God's kingdom would come. B. B. Warfield was sure that a golden age was ahead for the church when the Gospel of Christ had conquered the world. "The earth—the whole earth—must be won to Christ before He comes..."⁶ [Note 6: *Biblical Doctrines* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1929), p. 663. These words are taken from his essay, "The Millennium and the Apocalypse" which was originally published in *The Princeton Theological Review* in 1904.] "There is a 'golden age' before the Church—at least an age relatively golden gradually ripening to higher and higher glories as the Church more and more fully conquers the world and all the evil of the world" (p. 664). This interpretation [p. 47] has come to be known as postmillennialism, for it is held, as Warfield indicates, that Christ will not return to earth until after a golden age or millennium on earth when Christ through his Church has conquered the world...

This interpretation of the kingdom has not sustained itself after two world wars, a world-shaking depression, and the veritable incarnation of satanic evils which the present generation is witnessing. However, an article appearing recently in a scholarly journal defending the postmillennial interpretation [p. 48] of the Scriptures as a necessity to bolster a sound Christian optimism indicates that the position is not altogether dead.¹⁰ [Note 10: Cf. Allan R. Ford, "The Second Advent in Relation to the Reign of Christ," *The Evangelical Quarterly* XXIII (1951), pp. 30–39.]

1067. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism—Early Church View

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, p. 31. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

In this survey of the early centuries we have found that the Church interpreted the book of Revelation along futurist lines [see editors' note below]; i.e., they understood the book to predict the eschatological events which would attend the end of the world. The Antichrist was understood to be an evil ruler of the end-times who would persecute the Church, afflicting her with great tribulation. Every church father who deals with the subject expects the Church to suffer at the hands of Antichrist. God would purify the Church through suffering, and Christ would save her by His return at the end of the Tribulation when He would destroy Antichrist, deliver His Church, and bring the world to an end and inaugurate His millennial kingdom. The prevailing view is a posttribulation premillennialism. We can find no trace of pretribulationism in the early church; and no

modern pretribulationist has successfully proved that this particular doctrine was held by any of the church fathers or students of the Word before the nineteenth century.

[EDITORS' NOTE: To the early-church premillennialists the fulfillment of most of these prophecies was necessarily future in their day, but they saw them as already begun and in progress. For the vast difference between this view and what is today understood as futurism, see No. 1255. Although most premillennialists in the various churches today are Futurists, such an outlook is a modern development.]

1068. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism—Early Expectation of a Golden Age on Earth

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, p. 48. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

We have seen that the earliest interpretation of the kingdom of God was primarily an eschatological one and promised a golden age on the earth [see No. 1050] *after* the glorious return of Christ. This premillennial interpretation, as it is now called, has persisted throughout the history of the church although it has never been dominant since the second and third centuries A.D.¹¹ [Note 11: Cf. D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1945) for a history of the millennial interpretation of the kingdom.]

1069. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism—Early Fathers' Interpretation of Revelation 20

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 154, 155. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 154] The premillennial interpretation of eschatology in general [see No. 1073] and of Revelation in particular holds that the passage in Revelation [p. 155] 20:1–8 should be treated as a definite link in a chronological chain of text, and that it should be interpreted as literally as possible. Chapter 19 is the climax of the present age, when the Lord Jesus Christ returns in person to judge the earth and to defeat the armies of the antichrist who have received his mark and who have worshiped his image. At the consummation Satan is bound, and is cast into the abyss of darkness for a period of one thousand years, while the antichrist and his religious associate, the false prophet, are remanded to the lake of fire. The saints, now triumphant, will reign with Christ upon the earth, and the martyrs will be resurrected to share in the victory.

At the end of the thousand years Satan will be loosed from his imprisonment to test the strength of the new order. He will succeed in gaining a following from those nations on the periphery of the kingdom who have perhaps never given to Christ more than a grudging obedience. Their invasion of the kingdom and their siege of the capital city, presumably Jerusalem (“the beloved city”), will be terminated by swift and summary retribution. The utter doom of Satan and the judgment of the dead at the great white throne will follow immediately, and the descent of the eternal city of God will conclude the process of redemption.

The history of the premillenarian position is at least as old as either of the other views and in general it seems to accord better with such eschatological allusions as can be found in the earliest writings of the church fathers.

1070. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism, “Historic,” and Its Variations

SOURCE: Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 21–23. Copyright 1942 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 21] There have been many premillennialists in the past who have held to the view which we will call “historic premillennialism” [see No. 1073n]... [p. 22] The view ... is as follows:

1. Preceding the Second Coming of Christ the Antichrist will gather his followers for a great assault on the church of Christ. For some time he appears to be practically victorious, and institutes a great tribulation for the church, which passes through the tribulation.
2. At the close of this tribulation period Christ is suddenly seen appearing on the clouds of heaven, the dead in Christ rise first, the living elect are transfigured and the people of Israel look on Him whom they have pierced, repent and are saved, and the whole elect people of God are then raptured [i.e., snatched away] to meet the Lord in the air.
3. Christ then descends to the earth with His Bride, the Church, destroys the Antichrist and at the judgment of the Sheep and Goats, separates the righteous from the unrighteous, condemning the latter to eternal punishment.
4. Christ then sets up His millennial kingdom, ruling over the nations with a rod of iron, after the binding of Satan at the beginning of the millennium.
5. At the close of the millennium Satan is loosed from his prisonhouse, gathers the nations, in numbers as the sands of the seas, to war against the saints, but they are destroyed by fire from heaven.
- [p. 23] 6. Then follows the resurrection of the wicked, and the great White Throne Judgment (Rev. 20:11–15).
7. This in turn is followed by the new heaven and the new earth (Rev. 21), and the setting up of the eternal kingdom of God.

Even among these who hold to the “historic premillennialism,” there is little agreement as to many details of the theory. Some hold that the millennial kingdom will be predominantly Jewish, with Christian Gentiles in a rather subordinate place, while others hold that the martyrs, and those who worshipped not the beast nor his image nor had his mark upon their forehead and hand, will occupy the ruling place during the millennium. Others believe that the Jews reign as unconverted Israelites during a restoration of the Jewish kingdom of Palestine, under a theocracy, with the church in heaven. Others hold that the whole church of Christ will reign during the millennium, with no distinction between Jews and Gentiles. There is a great deal of confusion as to the place of the restored temple worship during the millennium, while the premillennialists in general experience much difficulty in reconciling Old Testament eschatological prophecies with New Testament prophecies concerning the Second Coming. There is also much confusion as to the relationship between the transfigured saints with spiritual bodies, and the untransfigured “nations” over whom Christ reigns, during the millennium.

1071. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism, “Historic,” and Vagaries of the System

SOURCE: C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1958), pp. 109, 110. Copyright © 1958 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

[p. 1109] In 1888 S. H. Kellogg wrote an article defending premillennialism in which he pointed out that many of the doctrines which were associated with the premillennialist position by its critics were merely vagaries of the system. He summed up the fundamental theological position of historic premillennialism [see No. 1073n] in four

succinct points, and even a cursory reading of these shows clearly that dispensational distinctions are not a vital part of the doctrine. These four points are as follows:

- (1) The Scriptures teach us to expect on the earth a universal triumph of the gospel, and a prolonged supremacy of righteousness and truth.
- (2) They also teach that we are to expect a personal, visible return of the risen and ascended Christ, in the glory of his Father.
- (3) The teachings of the Scripture forbid us to place the predicted reign of righteousness on this side of the personal [p. 110] advent; they therefore compel us to place it on the other side of that event. Whence it follows that we must conclude that—
- (4) The purpose of the return of Christ to the earth is to set up and administer the promised kingdom of righteousness, by establishing over the whole earth a theocratic government, vested in the Son of man and his risen and glorified people who shall have believed on him up to the time of his appearing.

Kellogg considered such doctrines as “the restoration of Israel, and the position of that nation in the expected new order of things; the interpretation of the prophecies concerning the anti-christ; the distinction in time between the resurrection of the righteous and that of the wicked, etc.,” to be doctrines more or less associated with this position. All of these, of course, are very closely associated with dispensationalism. It is into this category of peripheral doctrines that all the rest of the dispensational distinctions must also be classified. Premillennialism can be defined as a theological entity distinct from its dispensational trappings; and historically, it has been so defined and defended apart from dispensationalism. This interpretation of the relation between the two positions has been verified by recent developments within the premillennialist camp. I refer to the growing awareness among them that the dispensationalist interpretation of the Kingdom and Church is not entirely satisfactory. In spite of the long-standing claim made by some contemporary dispensationalists that all premillennialist must of logical necessity be dispensationalist, the opinion to the contrary seems to be gaining ground.

1072. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism, “Historic,” Versus Dispensationalist Alterations

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 252, 253. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 252] Modern alterations in what is historically known as Premillennialism give one pause to think and to wonder. In the first place, they include several details which the general run of Christians, even of premillenarian Christians, fail to discover in Holy Writ. In the second place, as far as these alterations have their beginnings with the Catholic Apostolic Church [“Irvingites”] and the Plymouth Brethren, the question may legitimately be raised, whether those new details whose scriptural basis is not apparent have been discovered at all in an honest and unadulterated attempt to understand the Scriptures. One may not overlook the fact, that the first group harbors prophetism of so high a rank as to authorize it to revive an apostolate and to institute what is difficult to class except as a new sacrament. And, though the Plymouth Brethren apparently go not so far toward inspirationalism, they also without question lean in that direction in virtue of the all sufficient guidance which they claim to receive of the Holy Spirit...

In how far can the Pretribulationists and the Ultradispensationalists [or dispensationalists] rightfully demand to be classed with the Historic Premillenarians and to be viewed as the legitimate continuation of ancient Premillenarianism? We lack no

evidence for the difference of the latter from such an ancient Premillenarian as Ireneus, who laid the foundations for the Reformed doctrine of the Covenants in his defense of the unity of the Bible over against the Gnostic heresy. And the theory of the former, that the believers will be raptured [taken up] before the anti-christian tribulation, flatly contradicts specific utterances of Ireneus and Lactantius and [p. 253] finds extremely little support, if any, among the other ancient Premillenarians.

It is this assumption of a pretribulation rapture of the saints, which introduces in modern Premillennialism a futurism which definitely separates it from the understanding of the Apocalypse which prevailed among the ancient Premillennialists. That assumption compels them to date the antichristian persecution and tribulation and the anti-christian power itself, it would seem, somewhere in the indefinite future as long as the first resurrection and the rapture have not yet occurred. Here is the place where the feature of the imminence of the return of Christ plays its role in these systems. This return is imminent in the sense that it may happen at any time; but by that same token the appearance and rule of antichrist is not imminent, and its presence now can not be thought of, since it follows upon the rapture of the saints. But such an idea of the antichrist the ancient Premillennialist definitely did not cherish, since they all with one accord saw the antichristian power already manifest and at work in persecuting the Christians: to them it was the pagan Roman imperial rule.

1073. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism—Literalist

Interpretation

SOURCE: Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 38–40, 42–44. Copyright 1942 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 38] One of the principal teachings of premillennialism is that the prophecies of the Old Testament must be interpreted literally unless the language of the Bible clearly indicates that a figure of speech is used by the author. Since the Old Testament contains definite promises of certain blessings to Israelites, it is claimed that those literal blessings must be given to the racial Israelites and to them alone, regardless of their rejection of Christ as Saviour. Since the Messiah is promised a reign upon the throne of David, it is held that the throne of David will again be established in Jerusalem, and all the nations of the world will go up to Jerusalem to worship, during a thousand year millennial kingdom...

[p. 39] Let us look for a moment at the various features of this kingdom which come from a literal interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies. Israel is to be restored to Palestine; other nations exist elsewhere but they are subservient to the Jews, (Is. 60:1–22); people will have mortal bodies, live in houses, eat of physical vineyards, bear children, be subject to sickness and death, though not to the same degree as at present, (Zech. 14); the temple and the temple service will be restored with bloody sacrifices as sin-offerings to make atonement for the people, (Ezek[.] 45:17); the temple priests will teach the people the difference between clean and unclean things; the tribes of the earth will come up to Jerusalem yearly to keep the feast of the tabernacles. To this picture obtained from a literal interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies [see No. 1052] the premillennialists add that while the Messiah will reign in righteousness and every knee will bow to Him and confess Him as Lord, the nations of Gentiles will, in the main, be rebellious at heart, so that Christ reigns over them with a rod of iron, until they all rebel at the close of the millennium. This is the picture of a physical, earthly kingdom which a

literal interpretation of all the prophecies of the Old Testament gives. The premillennialist insists that if we do not believe in this picture of the future, we [p. 40] reject the “plain teaching of Scripture,” and are guilty of distorting the Word of God...

[p. 42] We must dwell still further upon this incongruous spectacle, in order to emphasize the hopeless maze of difficulties into which a literal interpretation of *all* the Old Testament prophecies plunges us. According to a literal interpretation of Ezekiel 40–48 the whole ceremonial law is to be again set up in Israel. There will be meal-offerings, trespass-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings, as well as burnt-offerings, (Ezek. 42:13; 45:17). The pass- [p. 43] over and the feast of unleavened bread will again be celebrated, (Ezek. 45:21–22). The priests will have to observe the elaborate ritual of changing their robes before and after ministering in the temple holy place, “that they sanctify not the people with their garments” (Ezek. 44:19). The whole precious doctrine of the individual priesthood of believers will apparently have to be discarded then, for only the priests can approach and enter the holy place in the temple before the Holy of Holies, where God’s Shekinah glory dwells, (Ezek. 42:14)... “No foreigner, uncircumcised in heart and *uncircumcised in flesh*, shall enter into my sanctuary, of any foreigners that are among the children of Israel”! (Ezek. 44:9)... Is it not plain that the principle of literal interpretation of *all* Old Testament prophecies is reduced to an absurdity by the mere contemplation of such a prospect during the alleged millennium? Christ Himself provided the true memorial of His death, in the Lord’s Supper, and that was to be observed only “till He come,” when the need for a memorial would be done away, and it, together with all other “former things have passed away” (Rev. 21:4).

But if the premillennialist admits that we are not to expect *all* these prophetic details, including even circumcision, to be fulfilled during the millennium, then the whole argument for the literal fulfillment of all Old Testament prophecies must be abandoned, for there is nothing to indicate that these last eight chapters in Ezekiel are figures of speech. However, if it is admitted that there is a possible symbolic interpretation for even a few of these passages, then certainly the same principle of interpretation can be used for other similarly difficult prophecies.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Not all premillennialists hold all these literalist views, but “historic,” or traditional, premillennialism (see Nos. 1070, 1071) has always included a millennial reign of saints with the returned Christ over the still-mortal nations, on a partly renovated earth, ending with the close of human probation. This form of premillennialism is characterized, in varying degrees, by a literalism that often holds that ancient prophecies apply to Israel in the future, but the system is to be distinguished from the ultraliteralist Jewish chiliasm (as in the above extract) which is a central doctrine of the modern futurist-dispensationalism, and which many regard as the normal type of premillennialism. It must also be differentiated from the distinctive historicist (both Millerite and Seventh-day Adventist). The Millerites, holding that the Second Advent closes probation and that there will be no one on earth during the millennium except the glorified saints (see No. 1077), naturally rejected the Literalists’ “Judaizing” view (see No. 896) of a return of the Jews as preliminary to a leading role in the millennium (see No. 1052). To speak in the 1840’s of “rejecting the return of the Jews” or “advocating the literal return of Israel” meant merely rejecting or accepting the *doctrine* that such a return was foretold in prophecy, for the prospect of an actual Jewish state in Palestine was not yet visible. The “nonrestorationist” view sees the present Jewish state in Palestine as a political and social phenomenon unrelated to the restoration prophecies (see Nos. 897, 1063), which envision something quite different—a Messianic theocracy, the kingdom of Christ. The Millerite view, namely, that the restoration prophecies were either (1) conditional, (2) fulfilled in the return from ancient exile, or (3) applicable to the gathering of the spiritual seed of Abraham (both Jew and Gentile) to the new earth (see Nos. 893, 895, 1078, 1084), was adopted by the Seventh-day Adventists (see *SDACom* 4:25–38; 7:884–887), who, however, shifted the saints’ inheritance of the new earth from the beginning of the millennium to the end.]

1074. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism—Millerite View

SOURCE: G. F. Cox, *Letters on the Second Coming of Christ* (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), pp. 26, 27.

[p. 26] Those [Bible] passages usually relied on to prove a millennium of *any character*, point evidently to a period and a state in which.—

1. All other kingdoms, and of necessity their works, will be destroyed, so that no other kingdom or adverse power can be left upon the earth.
2. It has been shown that this kingdom of Christ will be *perpetual*, everlasting, “forever, even forever and ever.”
3. That this kingdom excludes “warfare” to the church and individuals, and “war” from the world.
4. That death is destroyed in that kingdom, or is swallowed up in victory.
5. That there will be ONE FOLD and ONE SHEPHERD, in a sense that has never yet existed, and in a sense that cannot exist with the present organized state of man.
6. God’s will is to be done in that kingdom AS it IS in heaven—in EARTH as in heaven...

The millennium state includes *a* resurrection from the dead, and *a* coming of Christ.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The Millerites saw in the millennium the beginning of the eternal kingdom of the immortalized saints, on the renewed earth (see Nos. 1077, 1078, 1085). The Seventh-day Adventists inherited the Millerite view with this exception: they teach that the saints are in heaven during the thousand years, and that the earth, renewed at the end of the period, becomes their eternal home.]

1075. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism Versus

Postmillennialism in America

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 231–234. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 231] If we wish to understand American chiliasm, we must pay attention not so much to the peculiar sects which America has produced nor to the groups which have found a refuge here from oppression, but to this diffused chiliasm in the American evangelical churches.

Most prominent is the chiliasm of the premillennial type. From time to time it has held interdenominational or undenominational conferences which went by the name of prophetic conferences because [p. 232] their main concern was with the as yet unfulfilled prophecies of the Bible...

Here was the setting up of an interdenominational creed in which members of various denominations united, though they belonged to creedally widely differing churches. And their declaration of belief in the imminence of Christ’s return suggests, that they were Premillenarians of a very definite and specific type [that is, mostly futurist, and largely dispensationalist], since not all Premillenarians speak of Christ’s return as imminent...

Postmillennialism probably was not so long ago the equal to Premillennialism in extent and influence in America. Indeed, American Christian sentiment long appeared to be so completely divided between these two types of chiliasm, that the impression was abroad that as a matter of course every Christian is a chiliast, and that many American writers took very little note, if any, of the amillenarian position. On this point so well informed a postmillenarian writer as Dr. James H. Snowden, agreed with the representative premillenarian writer W. E. Blackstone, whom otherwise he earnestly opposed. Of the two types, the [p. 233] premillenarian is apt to attract the bulk of public attention, because it expects and announces catastrophic events to usher in the kingdom, while the Postmillenarians expect the kingdom to come gradually and unspectacularly through the operation of the preaching of the Gospel and the work of the Holy Spirit...

Now, there can be no doubt about the mutual attraction which fundamentalism and Premillenarianism on the one hand and modernism and Postmillenarianism on the other have for each other. It is true, the attraction implies distinction: Postmillenarians need not subscribe to modernism; in fact, if they do, they are bound to drop the hope of Christ's return from their thought and thereby to lose their Christian faith. And fundamentalists need not be Premillenarians: they can equally well live and labor under the amillenarian banner. Yet the fact of the affinities mentioned above can not be denied.

What binds Premillenarianism and fundamentalism together is the fact that both are bound to be strongly supernaturalistic, since both look forward to the visible return of Christ, of which His Supper is a constant reminder. Modernism banishes the supernatural, and Postmillenarianism can and does postpone all [p. 234] obtrusively supernatural occurrences until the glorious final state of the Church shall have run its course. In so far it holds little or nothing that would clash with the modernistic outlook upon future earthly human history. In fact, if the return of Christ be dropped from the postmillenarian scheme, what remains can with a minimum of alteration pass for evolutionary humanistic modernism. These facts will tend to operate in the direction of fraternization between modernism and Postmillennialism and of an alliance between fundamentalism and Premillen[n]ialism. But they make such fraternization and alliance by no means safe and wise.

1076. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialists in England in 1831

SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Civil Disabilities of the Jews," in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 1, pp. 145, 146.

[p. 145] The Christian believes as well as the Jew, that at some future period the present order of things will come to an end. Nay, many Christians believe [in 1831] that the Messiah will shortly establish a kingdom on the earth, and reign visibly over all its inhabitants. Whether this doctrine be orthodox or not we shall not here inquire. The number of people who hold it is very much greater than the number of Jews residing in England. Many of those who hold it are distinguished by rank, wealth, and ability. It is preached from pulpits, both of the Scottish and of the English church. Noblemen and members of Parliament [p. 146] have written in defence of it. Now wherein does this doctrine differ, as far as its political tendency is concerned, from the doctrine of the Jews? If a Jew is unfit to legislate for us because he believes that he or his remote descendants will be removed to Palestine, can we safely open the House of Commons to a fifth-monarchy man, who expects that before this generation shall pass away, all the kingdoms of the earth will be swallowed up in one divine empire?

1077. Millennium, Theories of—Three Views (in 1841) Summarized

SOURCE: A[lexander] C[ampbell], "The Coming of the Lord," *The Millennial Harbinger*, 5 (Jan., 1841), 8, 9.

[p. 8] *Mr. Begg's Theory* [James Begg of Scotland, a "Literalist" premillennialist].—Israel shall return to their own land. Jerusalem will be rebuilt. The Lord will descend from heaven and dwell in Jerusalem—"Then the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." He will continue his personal presence on earth certainly 1000, and probably 365,000 years. The nations will go to see him, and to worship in Jerusalem, and keep the annual feasts. The Man of Sin shall be destroyed by the Lord in person or by the brightness of his coming, and the race of evil doers shall generally be cut off. A resurrection of the saints and martyred witnesses of Christ precede[s] the millennial

reign. This is the first resurrection, and shall precede the second from 1000 to 365000 years. The earth and the atmosphere will be changed. A more genial climate and a more fruitful soil will reward the labors of the husbandman. Still the earth's identity and its present localities shall continue; and "although it will be a period of unprecedented holiness and happiness, neither sin nor death will be wholly excluded." "The child shall die a hundred years old; and the sinner being a hundred years old, shall be accursed." And, therefore, during the millennial dispensation this world will be the abode of men in the flesh, who will have intercourse with the immortal men who are reigning with Christ. But of the nature of the employment of the reigning saints, and of their intercourse with mortal men, he has no knowledge.

A short apostacy will succeed the Millennium. Satan will be set free from his captivity, but will ultimately be destroyed. Then comes the general resurrection of all that died during the Millennium, and those who were not raised at its commencement, which will be followed with the general judgment and eternal rewards and punishments.

Mr. Miller's Theory [William Miller's "Adventist," or Millerite, premillennialism].—This is bolder and more intelligible than any of the moderns. According to this view, the general conflagration, the resurrection of the dead saints, the transformation of the living, and the personal and glorious return of the Lord, must precede the Millennium. "The Millennium is a state of personal, glorious, and immortal reign on the new earth—a new dispensation, new heavens [p. 9], and new earth." The wicked, their counsels and works, will all be destroyed at the coming of the Lord. The thousand years of millennial glory and bliss will transpire "between the two resurrections"—that of the righteous and of the wicked; the latter having been slain at the commencement of the Millennium, and all the living saints changed. There will be neither birth nor death, conversion nor apostacy during one thousand years. Gog, and Magog can be found only in the wicked spirits who lived and died before the Millennium, and who, when reanimated at its close, will lay siege to the New Jerusalem; but will be judged, and cast down to hell by fire from heaven falling upon them in the very act of their rebellion. The Millennium will commence, or rather this world will come to an end, in the year 1843, or 1847 at farthest. The day of judgment will then commence, and will continue for the whole thousand years; at the end of which the wicked shall be raised and sentenced to everlasting ruin.

The Protestant Theory [the then-predominant postmillennialism].—The Millennium, so far as the triumphs of Christianity is concerned, will be a state of greatly enlarged and continuous prosperity, in which the Lord will be exalted and his divine spirit enjoyed in an unprecedented measure. All the conditions of society will be vastly improved; wars shall cease; and peace and good will among men will generally abound. The Jews will be converted, and the fullness of the Gentiles will be brought into the kingdom of the Messiah. Genuine Christianity will be diffused through all nations; crimes and punishments will cease; governments will recognize human rights, and will rest on just and benevolent principles. Conversions will not only be genuine, but early and general. Large measures of divine influence will be vouchsafed. One extended and protracted series of revivals will keep pace with the exigencies of society. The seasons will become more mild; climates more salubrious, health more vigorous, labor less, lands more fertile, and the animal creation more prolific: for the knowledge of the glory of God shall cover the whole earth as the waters cover the channel of the sea. The Millennium is to precede

the coming of the Lord, the general conflagration, and the creation of new heavens and earth.

Such are the chief attributes of the Millennium according to the more prominent theories of the present day. There are others different in some of their accidents; but in the main we have their essential features in those three.

1078. Miller, William, Teaching of, on the Second Advent

SOURCE: William Miller, *Apology and Defence* (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1845), pp. 7–9, 11.

[p. 7] I found it plainly taught in the Scriptures that Jesus Christ will again descend to this earth, coming in the clouds of heaven, in all the glory of his Father: ... that at his coming the bodies of all the righteous dead will be raised, and all the righteous living be changed from a corruptible to an incorruptible, from a mortal to an immortal state, that they will all be caught up together to meet the Lord in the air, and will reign with him for ever in the regenerated earth: ... that the bodies [p. 8] of the wicked will then all be destroyed, and their spirits be reserved in prison until their resurrection and damnation: and that when the earth is thus regenerated, the righteous raised, and the wicked destroyed, the kingdom of God will have come, when his will will be done on earth as it is done in heaven, that the meek will inherit it, and the kingdom become the saints[?]. I found that the only millennium taught in the word of God is the thousand years which are to intervene between the first resurrection and that of the rest of the dead, as inculcated in the xx of Revelation; and that it must necessarily follow the personal coming of Christ and the regeneration of the earth: that till Christ's coming and the end of the world, the righteous and wicked are to continue together on the earth, ... so that there can be no conversion of the world before the advent: and that as the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, is ... the same for which we look, according to the promise of Isa. lxxv. 17, and is the same that John saw in vision after the passing away of the former heavens and earth; it must necessarily follow that the various portions of Scripture that refer to the millennial state, must have their fulfillment after the resurrection of all the saints that sleep in Jesus. I also found that the promises respecting Israel's restoration, are applied by the apostle to all who [p. 9] are Christ's,—the putting on of Christ constituting them Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise...

Another kind of evidence that vitally affected my mind, was the chronology of the Scriptures. I found, on pursuing the study of the Bible, various chronological periods extending, according to my understanding of them, to the coming of the Savior...

[p. 11] Reckoning all these prophetic periods from the several dates assigned by the best chronologers for the events from which they should evidently be reckoned, they all would terminate together, about A.D. 1843.

1079. Millerites—Adherents in All Denominations in America

SOURCE: [Josiah Litch], "The Rise and Progress of Adventism," *The Advent Shield and Review*, 1 (May, 1844), 90

We have no means of ascertaining the number of ministers, and others, who have embraced the Advent faith. We only know that there are several hundred congregations, and a still larger number of ministers, who have publicly professed the faith, besides many who still remain in the churches of the land. Those who have espoused this cause have honestly believed in the coming of the Lord "about A.D. 1843." And, as honest men, they have kept to their work of sounding the alarm. All peculiarities of creed or policy have been lost sight of, in the absorbing inquiry concerning the coming of the heavenly Bridegroom. Those who have engaged in this enterprise are from all the various sects in

the land. Protestant Episcopal, Methodist Episcopal, Methodist Protestant, Primitive Methodist, Wesleyan Methodist, Close Communion Baptist, and Open Communion Baptist, Calvinistic and Arminian Baptists, Presbyterians, Old and New School Congregationalists, Old and New School Lutheran, Dutch Reformed, &c., &c.

1080. Millerites, Claimed Fulfillment of Rev. 14:6, 7.

SOURCE: [Josiah Litch], "The Rise and Progress of Adventism," *The Advent Shield and Review*, 1 (May, 1844), 86, 87.

[p. 86] We look upon the proclamation which has been made, as being the cry of the angel who proclaimed, "*the hour of [p. 87] his judgment is come.*" (Revelation xiv. 6, 7) It is a sound which is to reach all nations; it is the proclamation of "*the everlasting gospel,*" or "*this gospel of the kingdom.*" In one shape or other, this cry has gone abroad through the earth wherever human beings are found, and we have had opportunity to hear of the fact.

²

1081. Millerites — Disappointment (October, 1844), Aftermath of

SOURCE: Joshua V. Himes, "Provision for the Destitute," *The Midnight Cry*, 7 (Oct. 31, 1844), 140.

As many of our brethren and sisters have disposed of their substance, and given alms, agreeable to Luke 12:33, in the confident expectation of the speedy coming of the Lord, I wish to have immediate provision made for the comfort and wants of all such persons, and families, by the advent brethren.

1082. Millerites — Disappointment (October, 1844)—Mistake Admitted

SOURCE: Editorial, "The Present and the Past," *The Midnight Cry*, 7 (Oct. 31, 1844), 140.

We have been mistaken in a belief to which we thought ourselves conducted by the word and Spirit, and Providence of God. But the *Word* stands sure, however we may err: and the promise is true: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." The Lord will lead his obedient children. We have an unwavering trust that He will cause our disappointment and trial to work together for our good. We shall humbly watch the providences of God, and we know he will vindicate his truth and faithfulness. Let him be honored, though we may be humbled.

1083. Millerites, Doctrines of, Briefly Summarized

SOURCE: "Boston Second Advent Conference," in *The Signs of the Times*, 3 (June 1, 1842), 69.

We therefore recommend that . . . all persons who reject the doctrines of temporal millennium and the restoration of the Jews to Palestine [see No. 1073n], either before or after the Second Advent, and who believe the Second Advent of Christ and the *first* resurrection to be the next great events of prophetic history, be invited to enroll their names as member[s] of this conference [the 12th "Second Advent Conference" of the Millerites].

RESOLUTIONS...

Resolved, That the time has fully come for those, who believe in the Second Advent of our Lord Jesus Christ in 1843, to show their faith by their works...

Resolved, That we regard the notion of a Millennium previous to the coming of Christ, when all the world shall be converted, and sinners in great multitudes saved, as a fearful delusion...

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

Resolved, That no portion of the New Testament scriptures give[s] the most indirect intimation of the literal restoration of the Jews to old Jerusalem; we believe that the arguments drawn from the Old Testament prophecies are based on a mistaken view of those prophecies; and that they have been fulfilled in what the gospel has already done, or remain to be fulfilled in the gathering all the spiritual seed of Abraham into the New Jerusalem...

Resolved, That the notion of probation after Christ's coming, is a lure to destruction, entirely contradictory to the word of God, which positively teaches that when Christ comes the door is shut, and such as are not ready can never enter in.

1084. Millerites, Doctrines of, Clarified

SOURCE: "Declaration of Principles" by the Adventists assembled in Boston, Anniversary Week, May, 1843, in *The Signs of the Times*, 5 (June 7, 1843), 107, 108.[p. 107]

TO THE PUBLIC,—

As the principles and views of the Adventists [see No. 7] are so little understood, and have been so often assailed and misrepresented, we deem it proper to present a brief statement of them to the world, together with the position we occupy...

We believe that the Scriptures teach the personal coming of Christ again in the fullness of times to this earth in the glory of his Father, to judge the quick and the dead, and reward every man according to his works.

We believe that the prophecies, the events of which were to precede the final consummation of all things, have been all literally fulfilled and that the closing scenes of this world's history are the only remaining portions of unfulfilled prophecy; and that the advent of our Savior is the next expected event.

We believe that when he is revealed, he will raise all the righteous dead, change the righteous living in the twinkling of an eye, and gather them to himself, destroy the wicked out of the earth, cause the elements of our heaven and earth to melt with fervent heat, and burn up all the works that are therein. Nevertheless, according to his promise, we look for a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

We believe that the earth thus renewed will be the eternal abode of the righteous, where the saints of the Most High will possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever; and that Christ will then sit on the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end...

We believe that none can enter that abode of righteousness without repentance and faith in Christ, nor unless they possess that holiness without which no man can see the Lord...

We believe that in the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the world began, the wilderness will become again like Eden, and the desert like the garden of the Lord; that the tabernacle of God will be with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people...

We believe [that] those portions of the word of God which are adduced in support of the theory of a temporal millennium and the return of the carnal Jews to Palestine, are glorious predictions relating to the renovated earth, and the restoration of the righteous, the true Israel of God, in their resurrection bodies to the new earth...

We also believe the signs foretold, which were to precede and indicate when the coming of Christ was nigh at the door, have been seen, and that the prophetic periods all terminate in the present Jewish year, commencing in 1843. A mere *point* of time, however, is not an essential part of our belief. Our faith rests on the fact that the

fulfillment of prophecy indicates that the Judge is nigh, even at the door; and the coming of Christ will be our constant expectation from this hour, till the parting skies shall reveal him. We believe the vision is yet for an appointed time; but at the end it will speak and not lie; if it appear to tarry, we shall wait it, because, at the time appointed it will surely come, it will not tarry. And, till he come, we expect the way of life will be the same narrow path that few will find; that the Man of Sin will continue to make war with the saints and prevail against them—the tares and wheat grow together, and Christians continue to live as pilgrims and strangers on the earth, and that men will speak ill of them—the friendship of the world being enmity with God.

We have no confidence whatever in any visions, dreams, or private revelations. “What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord.” We repudiate all fanaticism, and everything which may tend to extravagance, excess, and immorality, that shall cause our good to be evil spoken of.

Our sole object in this enterprise, is to spread abroad a knowledge of the truth that the kingdom of God will shortly come, when his will will be done on earth as it is in heaven; and to endeavor, by the blessing of God, to arouse the church and the world to a sense of the nearness of that event, that those who wish for salvation may possess the faith of our father Abraham, who believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness...

[p. 108] As Adventists, we meet on common ground, and accord to all what we claim for ourselves, the right of individual opinion on all questions of denominational interest, and freely act in harmony with all, of whatever name or denomination, who live righteously, soberly, and godly, loving the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. We ask none to lay aside their own views on doctrinal points, nor wish to give prominence to the sectarian belief of any.

[Signed by]

N. N. Whiting Com

[and others]

1085. Millerites, Doctrines of, Versus Postmillennialism and Literalist Premillennialism

SOURCE: [Josiah Litch], “The Rise and Progress of Adventism,” *The Advent Shield and Review*, 1 (May, 1844), 47, 48.

[p. 47] THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN ADVENTISTS [Millerites] AND MILLENISTS [postmillennialists], is,—The ADVENTISTS believe in a pre-millennial and personal advent of Christ from heaven, to glorify his saints and to take vengeance on his foes. While the MILLENISTS believe in the universal spiritual reign of Christ a thousand years, before his second personal advent.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN ADVENTISTS AND MILLENNARIANS [“Literalist” pre-millennialists], is—The MILLENNARIANS believe in the pre-millennial advent of Christ, and his personal reign for a thousand years before the consummation or end of the present world, and creation of the new heavens and earth, and the descent of the NEW JERUSALEM. While the ADVENTISTS believe the end of the world or age, the destruction of the wicked, the dissolution of the earth, the renovation of nature, and the descent of the New Jerusalem, will be at the beginning of the thousand years. *The Millennarians* believe in the return of the Jews, as such, either before, at, or after the advent of Christ, to Palestine, to possess that land a thousand [p. 48] years, while *the Adventists* believe that all the return of the Jews to that country, will be the return of all the pious Jews who have

ever lived, to the inheritance of the new earth, in their resurrection state [see No. 1073n]. Then *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, with all their *natural seed* who have been of the faith of Abraham, together with all *pious Gentiles*, will stand up together, to enjoy an *eternal inheritance*, instead of possessing Canaan for a thousand years.

THE MILLENNARIANS [“Literalist” premillennialist] believe a part of the heathen world will be left on the earth, to multiply and increase, during the one thousand years, and to be converted and governed by the glorified saints during that period; while the Adventists believed that when the Son of Man shall come in his glory, ... one part will go away into everlasting (eternal) punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. They cannot see any probation for any nation, either Jew or Gentile, after the Son of Man comes in his glory, and takes out his own saints from among all nations...

The *Millennarians* believe that the saints must have mortal men in a state of probation, for a thousand years, as their subjects, in order for them to reign as kings; for, say they, how can they reign without subjects? To which ... it is replied, Adam had dominion given him, but not a dominion over man. It was a “dominion over all the earth,” and all its creatures. So also the kingdom Christ will give to the saints when he comes in his glory, is “the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world” [see Matt. 25:34]. Just the dominion which Adam had, will belong to the saints.

1086. Millerites — Prophetic Date (1844) Held Correct, Event in Error

SOURCE: Joseph Marsh, Editorial, *Voice of Truth*, Nov. 7, 1844, quoted in *The Advent Review*, 1 (August, 1850), 7.

Since the tenth day of the seventh month has passed, and we are disappointed in not seeing our Lord, it seems necessary to define our position again. This we most cheerfully do. But first please indulge us a few moments, in expressing our great disappointment in not seeing our Lord at the time expected. We did believe that he would come at that time; and now, though we sorrow on account of our disappointment, yet we rejoice that we have acted according to our faith. We have had, and still have, a conscience void of offence, in this matter, towards God and man. God has blessed us abundantly, and we have not a doubt but that all will soon be made to work together for the good of his dear people, and his glory.

We cheerfully admit that we have been mistaken in the *nature* of the event we expected would occur on the tenth day of the seventh month; but we cannot yet admit that our Great High Priest did not *on that very day*, ACCOMPLISH ALL THAT THE TYPE WOULD JUSTIFY US TO EXPECT. WE NOW BELIEVE HE DID.

1087. Millerites, Twofold Message of

SOURCE: “General Conferences on the Second Advent,” *The Signs of the Times*, 5 (May 10, 1843), 75.

It is proposed by the friends of the Advent cause, (if time continue) to hold conferences in New York, Philadelphia and Boston, during the Anniversaries in May. We have large and convenient places secured in each of the above cities, for the meetings.

The object of these conferences will be to give light on the great question of the Advent near, and the nature of the Kingdom of God.

1088. Miracles, and God’s Sovereignty

SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, *The Bible Speaks to You* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955), pp. 83, 84. Copyright 1955 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 83] The Bible speaks a great deal about the “mighty deeds” which the Lord of history performs. And there is probably no greater stumbling block for the modern reader than these miracles. (Here we will deal only with the Old Testament miracles. Chapter 9

discusses Jesus' miracles.) It seems impossible to a twentieth century reader that axheads should float, or that sticks should change to snakes, or that city walls should crumble because a trumpet was blown. What about it? ...

There is a false way of getting at the problem that must be shattered. This is the view that says that to believe in miracles takes a monumental act of faith, while not to believe in miracles is simply common sense, because miracles cannot happen. Notice carefully that the claim, "Miracles cannot happen," is just as dogmatic a statement, just as much an act of faith, as the claim, "Miracles can happen." Each statement implies a whole view of the universe to which the speaker has committed himself. The choice, then, is not a choice between faith [p. 84] or non-faith. It is a choice between rival faiths. One person is saying, "I believe in a universe in which God can work in ways that I may not totally understand." The other person is saying, "I believe in a universe in which nothing can happen that I don't understand."

1089. Miracles, of Christ, Attributed to Psychic Power

SOURCE: Edward Macomb Duff and Thomas Gilchrist Allen, *Psychic Research and Gospel Miracles* (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1902), part 3, chap. 1, p. 211.

§. We believe that the inequity which concludes our last chapter of Part II answers itself. If it is a demonstrable fact that the evangelists represent Jesus as performing superphysical works of the same kind as those performed to-day, and as recognizing and utilizing like conditions, then two facts are proved: evangelical veracity and Christ's inerrant psychic insight.

In this chapter we shall try to make plain from the data supplied by the evangelists that the latter do so represent and report their Hero; viz., as the great psychic healer who was the first to discover those conditions of psycho-therapeutics which twentieth century enlightenment is just beginning to find out new.

1090. Mithraism, and Christianity

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), pp. 210, 211.

[p. 210] The two opposed creeds [Christianity and Mithraism] moved in the same intellectual and moral sphere, and one could actually pass from one to the other without shock or interruption... [p. 211] The religious and mystical spirit of the Orient had slowly overcome the whole social organism and had prepared all nations to unite in the bosom of a universal church.

1091. Mithraism—Devotion of Worshipers Shames Christians

SOURCE: Tertullian, *The Chaplet (De Corona)*, chap. 15, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 103.

Blush, ye fellow-soldiers of his, henceforth not to be condemned even by him, but by some soldier of Mithras, who, at his initiation in the gloomy cavern, in the camp, it may well be said, of darkness, when at the sword's point a crown is presented to him, as though in mimicry of martyrdom, and thereupon put upon his head, is admonished to resist and cast it off, and, if you like, transfer it to his shoulder, saying that Mithras is his crown. And thenceforth he is never crowned; and he has that for a mark to show who he is, if anywhere he be subjected to trial in respect of his religion; and he is at once believed to be a soldier of Mithras if he throws the crown away—if he say that in his god he has his crown. Let us take note of the devices of the devil, who is wont to ape some of God's things with no other design than, by the faithfulness of his servants, to put us to shame, and to condemn us.

1092. Mithraism, Spread of, in Roman Empire

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 59–61. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 59] The most popular of the Near-Eastern cults was that of Mithra which spread over the West at the beginning of our era, reached its zenith in the third century, and ended with Theodosius' repressive legislation at the close of the fourth. Mithra had his origin in Zoroastrianism, for a time the religion of the Persian Empire. Because of its great similarities in organization and doctrines Mithraism became the rival of Christianity among the Eastern religions in the latter's long struggle with Roman paganism. Its appeal was varied: its human qualities of fraternity, democracy, and faith, its antiquity and impressive ritual, its clerical organization, its doctrine of purification from sin, its high system of ethics and, following Zoroastrianism, its doctrine of antagonistic powers of good and evil ever struggling for mastery in the world, and especially its final judgment and clear promise of a blessed hereafter. Furthermore, it was freer of sex impurities than its sister religions. As most of its features are found in Christianity, when the latter became victorious, Mithra's followers easily passed into it or into Manichaeism, which has been called "the final assault made by Persia on the Occident," the heretical faith which assimilated the adoration of Zoroaster with that of Christ, and which reached Italy at the end of the third century and Africa in the fourth, where the youthful Augustine for a season was interested in it. Again, we have no definite evidence that Mithraism became a part of official Roman paganism before the middle of the third century at least, but there are numerous proofs that it enjoyed imperial favor for centuries...

[p. 60] Remains of the struggle are found in two institutions adopted from its rival by Christianity in the fourth century, the two Mithraic sacred days, December twenty-fifth, *dies natalis solis*, as the birthday of Jesus, and Sunday, "the venerable day of the Sun," as Constantine called it in his edict of 321.

When Mithraism reached Italy in the first century B.C. its roots already ran far into the past...

With the Persian conquest Zoroastrianism spread through the Euphrates valley and in Babylon became modified by contact with Chaldean astrology and the worship of Babylonian Marduk. Here Mithra was identified with the Sun-god Shamash, god of righteousness and order... [p. 61] It was in Asia Minor, perhaps during the religious ferment started by Alexander, that the new religion, Mithraism, took the definite form which we know in its Roman period when Mithra was the supreme Sun-god *invictus*, identified by the Romans with Sol or its Genius.

1093. Mockers, Derided

SOURCE: William Blake, "Mock On," in Burton Stevenson, comp., *The Home Book of Quotations* (New York: Dodd, 1947), p. 113:7.

Mock on, mock on, Voltaire, Rousseau;
Mock on, mock on; 'tis all in vain!
You throw the dust against the wind,
And the wind blows it back again.

1094. Modernism, Described

SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," *Christianity Today*, 5 (Oct. 10, 1960), 12. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

The history of the last five decades has been largely under the aegis of a triumphant modernism. Basically, modernism is evolutionary naturalism applied to the Bible and to

Christianity. By it the supernatural in the origins and nature of Christianity was sacrificed by the accommodation of Christian theology to the data of the scientific method and the dicta of the scientific mind. Hence, by presupposition, there could be no Virgin Birth, no miracles, and no Resurrection as the Bible taught. Modernism was based on higher criticism's view of the Bible. The books are redated in accordance with evolutionary naturalism; ethical monotheism is tolerated only later than polytheism, and the writing of the prophetic sections is placed after the events. Modernism developed a new theology concerning Christ, man, sin, salvation, the Church, and the Church's mission. To say the least, the content of modernism was not the content of biblical theology. The departure from biblical concepts was radical.

1095. Monasticism, Koran on

SOURCE: Koran, Sura Ivii. 27, in *The Holy Qur-an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 2, pp. 1506, 1507. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

[p. 1506] We sent after them
Jesus the son of Mary,
And bestowed on him
The Gospel; and We ordained
In the hearts of those
Who followed him
Compassion and Mercy.
[p. 1507] But the Monasticism
Which they invented
For themselves, We did not
Prescribe for them:
(We commanded) only
The seeking for the Good
Pleasure of God; but that
They did not foster
As they should have done.
Yet We bestowed, on those
Among them who believed,
Their (due) reward, but
Many of them are
Rebellious transgressors.

1096. Monasticism, Origin of

SOURCE: Will Durant, *The Age of Faith* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950), p. 58. Copyright 1950 by Will Durant. Used by permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc.

As the Church ceased to be a set of devotees and became an institution governing millions of men, she tended to adopt a more lenient view of human frailty, and to tolerate, sometimes to share, the pleasures of this world. A minority of Christians held such condescension to be treason to Christ; they resolved to gain heaven by poverty, chastity, and prayer, and retired completely from the world. Possibly Ashoka's missionaries (c. 250 B.C.) had brought to the Near East the monastic forms as well as the theory and ethics of Buddhism; and pre-Christian anchorites like those of Serapis in Egypt, or the Essence communities in Judea, may have transmitted to Anthony and Pachomius the ideals and methods of the strictly religious life. Monasticism was for many souls a refuge from the

chaos and war of the barbarian invasions; there were no taxes in the monastery or the desert cell, no military service, no marital strife, no weary toil; ordination to the priesthood was not required of a monk; and after a few years of peace would come eternal bliss.

Egypt, whose climate almost invited monasticism, teemed with anchoritic and cenobitic monks, following the solitary habits of Anthony, or the community life that Pachomius had established at Tabenne. The Nile was banked with monasteries and convents, some containing as many as 3000 monks and nuns. Of the anchorites Anthony (c. 251–356) was by far the most renowned... Only less famous was Pachomius, who (325) founded nine monasteries and one nunnery; sometimes 7000 monks who followed his rule gathered to celebrate some holy day. These cenobites worked as well as prayed; periodically they sailed down the Nile to Alexandria to sell their products, by their necessities, and join in the ecclesiastical-political fray.

1097. Mother Goddesses—Madonna of Sumero-Babylonian Religion

SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, *Semitic [Mythology]* (Vol. 5 of *The Mythology of All Races*. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, Marshall Jones Company, 1931), p. 341. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York.

In the Tammuz hymns Ishtar is repeatedly addressed as “my lady” in Sumerian, and as *bêlti*, “my lady,” in Accadian texts. *Bêlti*, “my lady,” is characteristic of the addresses to Zarbanit, wife of Marduk, and B \square l and B \square lti of Babylon usurped the *rôle* of Tammuz and Ishtar in the late period. Zarbanit is also addressed as *bêlit-ni*, “our lady,” the probably origin of the Syriac title of the goddess who loved Tammuz, namely BaltEn. The Babylonian title “our lady,” for the sister, wife, and lover of Tammuz and Adonis was, therefore, current among West Semitic peoples in the periods preceding and following the rise of Christianity, and may have been transferred to the Virgin Mary as “Our Lady,” Madonna.

3

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