

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES

VOLUME III

JANUARY 1965

NUMBER I

CONTENTS

<i>Burrill, Donald R.</i> , Religion, Science and Philosophical Discourse	1
<i>Coffman, Carl</i> , The Practice of Beginning the Sabbath in America	9
<i>Kraft, Robert A.</i> , Some Notes on Sabbath Observance in Early Christianity	18
<i>Kubo, Sakae</i> , The Influence of the Vulgate on the English Translation of Certain Psalms	34
<i>Vaucher, Alfred-Félix</i> , Les 1260 jours prophétiques dans les cercles Joachimites	42
<i>Walther, Daniel</i> , Marguerite d'Angoulême and the French Lutherans: II	49
<i>Zurchev, Jean R.</i> , The Christian View of Man: II	66



ANDREWS UNIVERSITY, BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN, USA

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
SEMINARY STUDIES

The Journal of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
of Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

SIEGFRIED H. HORN
Editor

EARLE HILGERT DANIEL WALTHER
Associate Editors

LEONA G. RUNNING *Editorial Assistant*

W. G. C. MURDOCH E. HEPPENSTALL R. LITKE V. N. OLSEN
J. W. PROVONSHA A. P. SALOM W. F. SPECHT
Editorial Consultants

SAKAE KUBO *Circulation Manager*

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES publishes papers and short notes in English, French and German on the following subjects: Biblical linguistics and its cognates, textual criticism, exegesis, Biblical archaeology and geography, ancient history, church history, theology, philosophy of religion, ethics and comparative religions.

The opinions expressed in articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES is published in January and July of each year or as a double issue in July. Annuals subscription rates of \$2.50 are payable to Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104, USA.

Subscribers should give full name and postal address when paying their subscriptions and should send notice of change of address at least five weeks before it is to take effect; the old as well as the new address must be given.

RELIGION, SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE

DONALD R. BURRILL

California State College at Los Angeles, California

There are abroad in the world today two tacit answers to the perennial question, "What is the meaning of life?" Characteristic of one answer is the claim that life's meaning is only understood through revelation. Without revelation, we are warned, life is meaningless, it leads only to nihilism. Current revelations are both sacred and secular, sometimes divine and sometimes demonic. This answer is called the "religious" answer. The second answer is that only a life of reason can be meaningful or hold any promise—and by reason, one usually means a life directed by the judgments of science. Now let me not mislead the reader into thinking that the way of religion is irrational or that the way of science does not have its revelations, its flashes of insight, its moments of ecstasy. I only wish to make clear what seems to me to be the *sine qua non* of each.

Philosophy is not, however, satisfied with either answer. Each, accepted separately, seems to rob man of those elements of his nature which characterize his humanness, i.e., both answers taken in isolation remove from him the responsibility of being an individual. It is necessary of course to defend this claim. But at the risk of sounding platitudinous, I must say that we all now live in an age which ill affords any collective dehumanization of man. The continuous stockpiling of attitudes (in the form of "systems of belief" which fall into one "camp" or another) fares well to man's tragic extinction. Thus it seems to me that philosophy's primary task today is to struggle to re-establish communication between the "religious" and the "scientific" answers in order to foster our survival. The burden of this paper is to trace the path which

philosophy seeks to sail if it is not to founder and lose its significance on the Scylla of religion or in the Charybdis of science.

I

Karl Jaspers once wrote that philosophy—even as Christianity—has its “saints.” Socrates, Boethius, Bruno—all were martyred for steering a philosophical course. They are never considered great philosophers, nor are their philosophical conclusions particularly important, but they have always been the “holy,” the “set-apart” ones because they perished for their philosophical commitment. When the scientist Galileo recanted of his heliocentric universe theory, he needed merely to bide his time until science revealed the foolishness of his tormentors. His was, it seems to me, an easy truth. It lay within the context of “objectivity.” Objective truth demands objective answers. “The book is on the table.” Is it, or is it not? To affirm the claim or to deny it ends the case for objectivity. But, when Giordano Bruno refused to recant, he died on the martyr’s pyre. His was a difficult truth—philosophical truth, not scientific truth. Both men acted in keeping with the truth to which they were committed and for which they had to stand; but one truth would suffer by retraction, the other would not.

Galileo’s objective truth is a truth which stands without Galileo. It has the Platonic character of universality about it; its validity is unhistorical and timeless. However, we should not allow such a truth to beguile us as it did Plato. It is not absolute; rather, it depends on finite premises and a method of attaining knowledge which involves stipulative procedures and pragmatic ends. On the other hand, Bruno could not recant; for when he reached that point where he believed that he had plumbed the depths of reality, to deny this fact would have been to deny his inward sense of integrity; and what is more fundamental, it would have been completely alien to his sense of what was true to his experience—in a

phrase, it would have robbed him of his freedom to seek truth. Galileo acted as a scientist—Bruno acted as a philosopher.

Let us observe what is peculiar to Bruno's philosophical truth. (1) Philosophical truth is belief accruing from knowledge. To think—and to think free from contradiction—is basic. "Cognition" is the primary instrument of philosophy. The philosophical procedure is never intended to be irrational; philosophy stands unreconciled to the attempt of any who would establish the truth upon the irrational. The irrational is, at its core, merely negation. Therefore there must be nothing which is not questioned, no secret which is withheld from inquiry, nothing which is permitted to veil itself. It is through the process of critique that meaning, and hence knowledge, is to be acquired. (2) The result of such a procedure frequently acts as a descriptive iconoclasm. Philosophers consciously seek to pull down man's irrational idols. In a certain measure they are asking man to analyze his "reason for his reasons." We might say, man as a philosopher carries on a dialogue with the "gods," but as a philosopher, one is frighteningly aware of the fact that the dialogue is onesided—the conversation proceeds only as he speaks. The gods remain silent. Therefore, in a subordinate sense, philosophy is a therapy one conducts with himself as long as he lives (Wittgenstein)—and this therapy has for its basic principle the conviction that health (salvation) is only acquired when man rigorously struggles to apply that uniqueness of his nature which sets him off from the brutes—his capacity to think. (3) Finally, philosophy acts as a liaison between the "ideologists" and the "scientists," in the manner of a translator of alien languages. He seeks to keep open the lines of communication between idealism and realism, between the eternal and the temporal.

II

Let us consider the philosopher's conversation with both the religious and the scientific man, beginning with his confrontation with religion.

There are at least four significant relationships between religion and philosophy. Initially, there is the common quest of both after what is called the "monotheistic abstraction" (Schrödinger), i.e., the pursuit of unity, the rejection of desultory idols and of superficial asides, a dogged tracking of the final answer, the right answer, the "truth," and the commitment to this "truth," one's ultimate allegiance to the highest value. Religion traditionally labels its answer with the honorific title, "God." Philosophers have had many names for their answer—the good, the true, the beautiful, the absolute, reality, being.

On the one hand, to the religious, the philosopher's God is pale, vapid, threadbare—as Blaise Pascal says, the philosopher's God is never the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. But on the other hand, philosophy distrusts religious images of God because they are frequently seductive idols, magnified into proportions which fit the picture world of its pious followers. Sometimes, in the eyes of the philosopher, religion can have a cultic aspect—an intense devotion to its conception of the holy, to its community of believers and to its priesthood, all combining to make many of the religiously indoctrinated terrifyingly certain of their beliefs. Frequently the apologists of such cultic manifestations find any disagreement with their conviction merely the aberrational mutterings of untransformed pagans. Philosophers must guard themselves against such cultic commitment—rather, they must accede to the individual's complete freedom in his search of knowledge.

A second relationship important to both religion and philosophy is the principle of faith; but philosophy has a rather restricted use for the term "faith." Faith, philosophically,

means the willingness to hold a belief which reaches beyond the structures of phenomenal verification. Sometimes philosophers refer to this as the "risk of faith" (Kierkegaard). Philosophical faith involves such a risk—an intellectual gamble, or a learned surmise. And the philosopher is very much aware that his claims might be demonstrated at some future time, by the process of objectivity, to be sheer nonsense. However, the philosopher does not intend that such a faith be understood as a rearguard retreating action, i.e., an attempt to hold to certain types of unsubstantiated nonsense until empirical research finds us out. Rather, philosophical faith is the awareness in man as an autonomous creature that overbelief (James) is the indispensable basket in which all descriptions of reality must be carried. Man's overbeliefs sustain him psychologically and provide for him goals which protect him from stagnation. Faith acts as a catalyst for creativity and is the conceptual foundation of values; ostensibly faith is the ground of man's idealism.

Also it seems to me that the conception of prayer exhibits a third possible relationship between religion and philosophy. Prayer is, philosophically, the personification of one's quest after the absolute answer. Prayer is the legitimate mode of "hyostatizing" what one considers ultimate—that which demands our worship, that which we are prepared to kneel before. Einstein once called this act "my reverence for the mystery of the Universe." Thus the act of prayer, philosophically, has the effect of making man a devoted and responsive adventurer in his quest for understanding, rather than indolent and passive.

Finally, the principle of revelation, which is commonly described by the religious as the immediate and objective utterance of God—"the light for the path" (Tillich)—need not be utterly rejected by the philosopher. He too seeks the final confirmation of reality—of God, if you wish. That is to say, he also responds to the ecstasy of the "truth," the confirmation of his thought concerning what must be—what *is*—

that which is not alien to his conception of what is indeed the "light on his path."

III

Obviously much more should be said about philosophy's dialogue with religion, but now I must turn briefly to the philosopher's dialogue with science. Philosophy and science are permanently wedded in one respect—each establishes reason and the empirical process as basic to its methodology. And yet, philosophy is, on frequent occasions, the critic of science. Space will not permit me to engage in a lengthy analysis of all the points of contact which these two disciplines maintain (even if I could), so I shall limit myself to a single issue: Man's nature.

What is man? How should he be understood? Science shows us remarkable and highly important things about man; but as science offers more and more clarity and precision concerning man, it becomes more and more evident that this insight compounds the mystery of man's final definition. Science's need of precision forces it to abandon scope. All of the variables necessary for an explanation of man (even if they were all known, which they certainly are not) cannot be subsumed in a single calculus. Some of these variables must be sacrificed if any results are to be secured. Man is always more than he knows about himself. In a biological sense, man is perhaps best described as a central nervous system with electrical impulses charging up and down certain vascular conduits. And yet, this definition only partially describes man—never is it adequate for understanding man as a mower of lawns, or a woman under the hair dryer. In so far as we make our conception of man scientific, we confine ourselves to the world of masses in motion. We deliberately sacrifice our conception of man as an individual. But if we seek to preserve a "something more" about man's nature by reaching beyond the categories of science, have we actually added anything more to our understanding of man? It is my convic-

tion that we have. We should not be reluctant to define man in extra-scientific categories; in fact, to confine our definition of man to the precise claims of science is to subtract much of the experience which we all apprehend to be part of man. To the question, "What is man?" the answer, "Only a sophisticated ape," is inappropriate. But why? Because, this explanation necessarily fragmentizes man, i.e., biology only answers some of the questions which torment us concerning our own nature. All explanations—mathematical, physical, biological, psychological, theological—only encompass segments of our experience.

It is necessary to understand man in a broader, a multi-descriptive sense. The task has fallen to philosophy, first to listen to science's explanations of man, recognize the significance of its objective "truth," then to listen to religion's—or any other discipline's—reply, and thus to translate each system's conclusions in the terms of the other, taking great care not to destroy the actual description of man through too severe a bifurcation, or too extreme a reduction.

But while doing this, philosophy must not forget its iconoclastic role. Frequently, for example, philosophy finds it necessary to question some of the assumptions of religion or science. Consider the problem which arises concerning science's inability to give final explanations. Because science cannot demonstrate phenomenally the origin of the Universe, it does not in itself provide for religion a logical basis for its metaphysical explanation. An argument *ad ignorantiam* proves nothing. On the other hand, the scientist's constant obsession with reductionism must also be resisted by the philosopher. To suggest that man is adequately understood as a series of electrical impulses is to reduce man to the status of a mechanism, wholly abstracted from his existence as a spiritual being. In truth, man must include the religious nature, the man of the spirit, as well as the biological man.

Essentially, then, the philosopher can neither determine how the theologian or the scientist must answer his questions,

nor what these answers will be. Rather, the philosopher is the interpreter and the critic (as Socrates has urged) who constantly calls each discipline to account for its assertions. Perhaps Herman Melville's most lyrical lines depict the philosopher's place in our contemporary age:

Doubts of all things earthly, and intuitions of some things heavenly; this combination makes neither believer nor infidel, but makes a man who regards them both with equal eye.

And so it is that philosophical truth has a strange way of melting away. For philosophical truth in a sense goes beyond philosophizing—it is found in experience which is not philosophical but scientific or religious. And when the philosopher speaks to this experience he is in reality no more, it seems to me, the philosopher but the scientist or the theologian—and that is another story.

THE PRACTICE OF BEGINNING THE SABBATH IN AMERICA

CARL COFFMAN

Pacific Union College, Angwin, California

During and since the early American colonial period, varied concepts of the proper time for beginning and ending the weekly day of worship have existed side-by-side, both among closely related, and other religious groups in the United States. With the passing of years, actual belief and practice in this respect has experienced a variety of changes, in some cases within the same religious group.

Many colonial Sunday-keepers in America observed their day of worship from evening to evening, beginning on Saturday evening. Cotton Mather, grandson of the Puritan clergyman John Cotton who had fled from England to Massachusetts in 1633, wrote of John:

The sabbath [Sunday] he began the evening before: for which keeping of the sabbath from evening to evening, he wrote arguments before his coming to New England: and I suppose 't was from his reason and practice, that the Christians of New England have generally done so too. When that evening arrived, he was usually larger in his exposition in his family, than at any other times: he then catechised his children and servants, and prayed with them, and sang a psalm; . . . ¹

Another illustration of this practice is found in a law issued by the General Court (or Assembly) of the New Haven Colony on January 31, 1647, which states:

Whosoever shall, within this plantation, break the sabbath [Sunday] by doing any of their ordinary occasions, from sunset to sunset, either upon the land or upon the water, extraordinary cases, works of mercy and necessity being excepted, he shall be counted an offender, and shall suffer such punishment as the

¹ Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana, or the Ecclesiastical History of New England* (Hartford, Conn., 1820), Bk. 3, chap. 1, sect. 30 (Vol. 1, p. 253).

particular court shall judge meet, according to the nature of his offense.²

However, the sunset, or evening, beginning time for the day of worship has been associated more closely with various groups who observe the seventh day of the week, or Saturday, as Sabbath, than with Sunday keepers. Seventh-day Sabbath-keeping was introduced in America by Stephen Mumford, who came from England and joined the Baptist church in Newport, Rhode Island, in 1664.³ As a result Seventh Day Baptists organized their first church in Rhode Island in 1671.⁴

The German Seventh Day Baptists in the Ephrata community of Pennsylvania, in the eighteenth century kept their Sabbath from six o'clock to six o'clock, beginning on Friday evening. Note that they used the term, sunset, in connection with six o'clock:

The Sabbath was ushered in with the first hour of the sixth day (Friday, 6 P.M.) and closed at the end of the twelfth hour of the seventh day (Saturday, 5: 59 P.M.), as before stated the peculiar reckoning was adopted so as to conform to the very letter of the law in the New Testament, wherein it states that the disciples broke bread upon the first day . . . It will be noted that, according to the Ephrata reckoning the Sabbath ended at sunset (6 P.M.) of the seventh day.⁵

The Ephrata method of daily reckoning began with the first hour of night at six o'clock in the evening, and ended at the close of the twelfth hour of the day which began at five o'clock the following afternoon.⁶

In 1843, W. H. Fahnestock wrote a formulation of the beliefs of the German Seventh Day Baptists which included

² [No author,] *Records of the Colony and Plantation of New Haven from 1638 to 1649* (Hartford, Conn., 1857), p. 358.

³ *Seventh Day Baptists in Europe and America* (Plainfield, New Jersey, 1910), I, 122.

⁴ Benson Y. Landis (ed.), *Yearbook of American Churches* (New York, 1961), p. 24.

⁵ Julius Friedrich Sachse, *The German Sectarians of Pennsylvania, 1742-1800* (Philadelphia, 1900), pp. 184-85.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

the statement, "the Sabbath terminating at sunset of the Seventh Day, . . ."⁷

In a brief summary of the actions of the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference sessions throughout the nineteenth century, entries frequently occur with reference to the time for the beginning of the Sabbath. In 1827, the minutes note that "it was declared to be the sense of the Conference that the Sabbath begins at evening."⁸ Following this, in 1843, the Conference stated that, "according to the Scriptures, the Sabbath begins on what is commonly called Friday evening."⁹ A clearer statement is found in the minutes of 1849, affirming "the beginning of the Sabbath at sunset on sixth-day."¹⁰ The Conference recorded the statement in 1863 of "the need of more public teaching in regard to the time and manner of Sabbath observance."¹¹ Some still apparently were inquiring into the subject as late as 1880, when the minutes state, in answer to a letter of inquiry, that the Conference declared its belief "that night and the following daylight constitute the day of Scripture."¹²

Several other references to the problem occur after the middle of the nineteenth century from Seventh Day Baptist writers. One, in 1852, reflects the argument of a writer in *The Sabbath Recorder*, a periodical of the Seventh Day Baptists, with some who oppose the evening-to-evening view, and advocate that the Sabbath should be only twelve hours in length.¹³ Another writer for the same paper, in the following year, shows an acquaintance with the six o'clock to six o'clock time, in a discussion of the keeping of the Sabbath on a round world.¹⁴ A

⁷ *Seventh Day Baptists in Europe and America*, II, 1203.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 176.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 186.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 210.

¹³ [No author,] "Time for Commencing the Sabbath," *The Sabbath Recorder*, reprinted in *Review and Herald*, III (December 9, 1852), 113.

¹⁴ [No author,] "Rotundity of the Earth and the Sabbath," *The Sabbath Recorder*, reprinted in *Review and Herald*, III (April 28, 1853), 197.

writer of the American Tract Society in 1854, in a discussion of Acts 20 : 7, makes the statement that the Jews commenced the day at sunset.¹⁵ Another Seventh Day Baptist, writing in 1870, in reference to Mt 28 : 1, says plainly that the "Sabbath closed at sunset."¹⁶

During the first months of 1844, Rachel Preston, a Seventh Day Baptist, introduced the Sabbath to Adventists in Washington, New Hampshire. She had shortly before visited the home of Cyrus K. Farnsworth in Washington, and, having become deeply interested in the Adventist views of the soon coming of Christ, accepted their teachings. In turn, she instructed the advent believers in the Sabbath truth. About forty accepted the Sabbath as a result of her witness, and began to observe the seventh day.¹⁷

About this time, T. M. Preble, an Adventist minister, accepted the Sabbath and began to teach it.¹⁸ His first essay on the Sabbath doctrine appeared in the *Hope of Israel* of February 28, 1845, published in Portland, Maine.¹⁹ Preble did not discuss the time for the beginning and ending of the Sabbath in his first tract. However, he shortly rewrote it, and, in a short supplement at the end of the enlarged revision which also appeared in 1845, he introduced the time element:

Therefore, though the sun may rise at a different time in Palestine from what it does here, yet it will make no difference in the time of our beginning the Sabbath. "The evening and the morning were the first day." Therefore, we should begin the Sabbath on Friday evening, and end on Saturday evening.²⁰

¹⁵ [No author,] "The American Tract Society, versus the New Testament," *Review and Herald*, V (August 1, 1854), 202.

¹⁶ A. H. Lewis, *The Sabbath and the Sunday* (Alfred Centre, New York, 1870), p. 58.

¹⁷ James White, *Life Incidents* (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1868), p. 268.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ J. N. Andrews, *History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week* (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1887), p. 507.

²⁰ J. H. W[aggoner], "T. M. Preble on the True Sabbath," *Review and Herald*, XXXIV (December 21, 1869), 203.

It was from the writing of Preble that the attention of Joseph Bates was called to the matter of the Sabbath.²¹ Among early Adventists in, and for a short time after, 1846, much of the discussion relative to the time to begin and end the Sabbath came from Bates' pen. From his background as a former sea captain, and from his study of the Bible on the subject, he concluded that the proper time to begin and end the day was at six P.M. In his tract, published in 1846, Bates gives the reader insight into his reasoning for the six o'clock time:

"And God said let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night, and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and for years." [Gn 1:] 14v. 16v. says, "the greater light to rule the day,"—from sunrise to sunset. Now there are many modes invented for computing time. We say our day begins at 12 o'clock at night; seamen begin theirs twelve hours sooner, at noon; the Jews commence their days at 6 o'clock in the evening, between the two extremes. Are we all right? No! Who shall settle this question? God! Very well: He called the light day, and the darkness he called night, and the evening and the morning were the first day. Gen. 1:5. Then the twenty-four hour day commenced at 6 o'clock in the evening. How is that, says one? Because you cannot regulate the day and night to have what the Saviour calls twelve hours in the day, without establishing the time from the centre of the earth, the equator, where, at the beginning of the sacred year, the sun rises and sets at 6 o'clock. At *this* time, while the sun is at the summer solistice [*sic.*], the inhabitants of the north pole have no night, while at this same time at the south it is about all night, therefore the inhabitants of the earth have no other right time to commence their twenty-four hour day, than beginning at 6 o'clock in the evening. God said to Moses "*from even, unto even, shall you celebrate your Sabbath.*" Then of course the next day must begin where the Sabbath ended. History shows that the Jews obeyed and commenced their days at 6 o'clock in the evening.²²

There is no evidence that Bates formed his six o'clock beginning time from any knowledge of the earlier practice of the German Seventh Day Baptists at Ephrata. Rather, he came to these conclusions as a result of his knowledge of a

²¹ Andrews, *op. cit.*, p. 508.

²² Joseph Bates, *The Seventh Day Sabbath, a Perpetual Sign, from the Beginning, to the Entering into the Gates of the Holy City, According to the Commandment* (New Bedford, 1846), pp. 31-32.

seaman's computation of equatorial time. This type of reasoning, the result of his life background, was typical of the articles which Bates wrote on the subject, and was accepted by many Adventists for several years. It was from the reading of this tract by Bates, and from listening to, and questioning his arguments, that James and Ellen White, early Adventist pioneers, decided to begin keeping the Sabbath.²³

Bates' six o'clock time, however, did not convincingly satisfy many of the early Adventists. James White, writing a review of the entire matter in the year 1868, states that the "six o'clock time was called in question by a portion of believers as early as 1847, some maintaining that the Sabbath commenced at sun-rise, while others claimed Bible evidence in favor of sunset."²⁴ As the Bible was carefully studied, the articles appearing in the early Adventist journals advocated more and more that sunset was the correct beginning time.

It was in the atmosphere of this continuing, unsettled problem that Joseph Bates wrote, in 1851, adding fresh arguments for his six o'clock equatorial, beginning time. He was aware of the various views which opposed his six o'clock time and stated:

Much has been said in relation to the time of the commencement of the Sabbath. Some say it should commence at sunset (Mark i, 32) while others contend that it should not commence until midnight. And still there are some who say the morning is the proper time.²⁵

When Bates visited the church in Ashfield, Mass., in the summer of 1853, he found some there advocating the commencing of the Sabbath in the morning, while others, he said, "adhered to the Bible rule to commence all days in the week with evening, or even, the twelfth hour of the day."²⁶

²³ Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White, Messenger to the Remnant* (Washington, D.C., 1959), pp. 34-35.

²⁴ James White, "Time to Commence the Sabbath," *Review and Herald*, XXXI (February 25, 1868), 168.

²⁵ Bates, "Time to Begin the Sabbath," *Review and Herald*, I (April 21, 1851), 71.

²⁶ [A Letter] "From Bro. Bates," *Review and Herald*, IV (July 7, 1853), 30.

Seeing the need for a thorough study of the subject, to clarify the time problem and to unify the Adventist believers and churches, James White, upon meeting J. N. Andrews in the summer of 1855 in Maine, urged him to make a careful study of the subject and write an article which might be presented to the believers.²⁷ On his way to Iowa in the autumn, Andrews stopped to see James White in Battle Creek, Michigan, and left with him a copy of the manuscript which presented the results of his prolonged and diligent study. Andrews' article was read before a Conference held in Battle Creek on November 17, 1855. The *Review and Herald* of December 4 stated that "a most thorough examination and discussion of the time to commence the Sabbath," was conducted. The sunset time was accepted by almost all who were present at that conference.²⁸

Andrews' article appeared soon afterward in the *Review and Herald*. In his study of the time to begin the day, and the Sabbath, he reviewed favorable and opposing evidence to the sunset view. In addition, he discussed and evaluated new support from the Bible, from which he showed that both the day, and the Sabbath, began at sunset. In summary, he stated that "there is no Scriptural argument in support of six o'clock, as the hour with which evening commences," and also that "the Bible, by several plain statements, establishes the fact that evening is at sunset."²⁹

In the following numbers of the church paper, several letters appeared in comment on the problem in general, and on the article of J. N. Andrews in particular. For the most part, they expressed confidence in, and gratitude for, the sunset position.

Bro. B. M. Adams writes from Philadelphia, Dec. 30th, 1855:

²⁷ James White, "Time of the Sabbath," *Review and Herald*, VII (December 4, 1855), 78.

²⁸ [No author,] "The Conference," *Review and Herald*, VII (December 4, 1855), 75.

²⁹ Andrews, "Time for Commencing the Sabbath," *Review and Herald*, VII (December 4, 1855), 78.

—"I am, most truly, glad to see in a late No. of the paper that Bro. J. N. Andrews, and the other brethren, have, at last, reached the definite Scriptural time of commencing the Sabbath: at the evening, sunsetting, instead of 6 of the clock: which latter view I never could see had any Scriptural ground."³⁰

Ellen G. White, writing to the believers late in 1855, pointed them to the Bible for solution to the problem, the source from which the sundown position was clarified by J. N. Andrews. She said:

I saw it was even so, "From Even to Even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath." Said the angel: "Take the word of God, read it, understand, and ye cannot err. Read carefully, and ye shall there find *what* even is, and *when* it is."³¹

Following the appearance of Andrews' study, as the years passed, comments by the various writers of the church paper manifested a decisive, clear witness for the sundown time wherever a question was asked, or an article referred to the matter. For example, J. H. Waggoner, in a tract in 1857, said clearly that "those who observe the seventh day commence the day at sunset."³² James White, discussing Acts 20 : 7 in a tract sometime after 1863, the year in which the Seventh-day Adventist church was officially organized, clearly says that "each day commences at sunset, according to God's division of time."³³

James White, on two occasions, and J. N. Andrews, in his 1855 article, suggested an answer as to why it took so long for a solution to be found, in order that general agreement might exist among Adventists on the sundown beginning time. In a short article which accompanied Andrews' presentation in December of 1855, James White said: "The subject has

³⁰ [No author.] "Extracts of Letters," *Review and Herald*, VII (January 10, 1856), 119.

³¹ E. G. White, *Testimony for the Church* (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1855), p. 4.

³² J. H. Waggoner, *A Review of a Series of Discourses Delivered by N. Fillio, in Battle Creek, Mich., March 31st to April 4th, 1857, on the Sabbath Question* (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1857), p. 33.

³³ James White, *The Sabbath in the New Testament* (Battle Creek, Michigan, [n.d.]), p. 7.

troubled us, yet we have never found time to thoroughly investigate it.”³⁴ Andrews, in his article in the same issue, stated that “the Seventh-day Baptists have always held to this doctrine, but I have never happened to meet with their views. Had I done so, I should not have remained in error on this subject.”³⁵ Later, in 1868, James White indicated another reason as he wrote of Joseph Bates that “his decided stand upon the question, and respect for his years, and his godly life, might have been among the reasons why this point was not sooner investigated as thoroughly as some other points.”³⁶

Following careful study on this point of the Sabbath doctrine by early Adventists, the leaders and members of the church accepted the results, particularly as pointed out by J. N. Andrews in 1855. Since the organization of the Seventh-day Adventist church in 1863, the sunset beginning time for the Sabbath has always been observed by its leaders and membership.

³⁴ James White, “Time of the Sabbath,” *Review and Herald*, VII (December 4, 1855), 78.

³⁵ Andrews, “Time for Commencing the Sabbath,” *Review and Herald*, VII (December 4, 1855), 78.

³⁶ James White, “Time to Commence the Sabbath,” *Review and Herald*, XXXI (February 25, 1868), 168.

SOME NOTES ON SABBATH OBSERVANCE IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY

ROBERT A. KRAFT

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

In the inaugural issue of *Seminary Studies*, W. B. Bishai has attempted to shed some light on the development of the custom of observing Sunday as a rest day in addition to the seventh-day Sabbath in early Coptic (and related) Christianity.¹ He suggests that it may have been under the influence of the first Council of Nicea (A.D. 325) that this situation first came about:

It seems possible that Sabbath observance among the Copts in Egypt and Ethiopia may have passed through three stages: 1) Only the seventh-day Sabbath observed—from apostolic times until the Council of Nicea; 2) Sunday and the seventh-day Sabbath both observed—from the Council of Nicea until perhaps a century or two later; and 3) only Sunday designated as a day of public worship—a practice still observed today (p. 31).

Bishai is not unaware of the fact that he is struggling with an extremely complicated problem when he seeks to base this "preliminary study" on evidence drawn from the *Statutes of the Apostles*, commonly known in many publications as the *Apostolic Constitutions* or *Canones Ecclesiastici*.² He speaks

¹ "Sabbath Observance from Coptic Sources", *AUSS*, I (1963), 25-31. Strictly speaking, by "Sabbath observance" Bishai apparently means the observance of a day of *rest*—see p. 27, n. 5: "Reference to the Sabbath in the Greek and Latin versions concerns itself merely with assembling the believers and not abstaining from work." Because the available sources are not always so tidy in stating what is or is not done on Sabbath (or on Sunday), the following notes usually will be concerned with the religious function of Sabbath/Sunday in general, without attempting to distinguish between resting from secular labor and assembling for worship.

² P. 26. Actually, the work commonly referred to as the "Statutes of the Apostles" or "Canones Ecclesiastici" is not entirely identical with the (Greek) "Apostolic Constitutions," as we shall discover.

of the variety of languages and forms in which this material has come down to us, and of how "difficult" it is "to date the original form" of this literature. Nevertheless, he feels safe in assuming with certain "scholars who have examined these various documents" that the Coptic-Arabic-Ethiopic versions (his "southern group" as opposed to the Greek-Latin-Syriac "northern group") of the *Statutes of the Apostles* derive from a recension of the "original *Vorlage*," which recension was made in "the later part of the fourth century, i.e., after the Council of Nicea and probably before the Council of Ephesus" (p. 26). He then proceeds to cite passages from these Coptic-Arabic-Ethiopic versions as evidence for the practice of the post-Nicene Coptic Church with respect to Sabbath-Sunday observance.

Unfortunately, Bishai does not seem to realize how really complicated his source problem is. His statement that all of the "collections of various church laws and ecclesiastical orders" to which he refers "share enough resemblances to warrant the supposition of a common lost *Vorlage*" (p. 26) has missed the point of decades of modern scholarship—including some of the literature he cites in his notes.³ A "common lost *Vorlage*" is *not* the answer to this literary labyrinth: instead, there are *at least* three different and originally separate tradition-units which have been welded together to form the most comprehensive of the works to which Bishai refers, the Greek *Apostolic Constitutions*:⁴ (1) the *Didascalia*

³ See esp. the works listed on p. 26, nn. 2, 3 (including such pioneer studies as those by P. A. de Lagarde, H. Achelis, and G. Horner), p. 27, n. 6 (J. Leipoldt), and p. 29, n. 12 (R. H. Connolly). Perhaps Bishai has been confused by the arguments of Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici* (London, 1904), that the differences between the various versions of the "Statutes" may suggest "the possibility of there having been a lost Church Order" (p. viii)—here Horner is *not* referring to the *entire* tradition known as the *Apostolic Constitutions*, but only to certain material now embedded in Book VIII of that work!

⁴ On the *Apostolic Constitutions*, see O. Bardenhewer, *Patrology* (Translated from the German, 2d ed.; St. Louis, Mo., 1908), § 75.

tradition ⁵ (embedded in *Ap. Const.* I-VI); (2) the *Didache* tradition ⁶ (included in the first part of *Ap. Const.* VII); and (3) the "Egyptian Church Order" or *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus ⁷ (in *Ap. Const.* VIII).⁸

Although he shows no awareness of this fact, Bishai is primarily concerned with the last of these divisions, the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus as it circulated in Coptic-Arabic-Ethiopic garb (under the name *Statutes of the Apostles*, etc.). Only once in his main line of argument does he inadvertently (and thus somewhat irrelevantly) move outside this tradition to "prove" a point by referring to the *Didascalia* material.⁹ Partly because of his oversimplified view of the

⁵ For a relatively up-to-date discussion and bibliography, see J. Quasten, *Patrology*, II (Utrecht, 1953), 147-52.

⁶ See Quasten, *Patrology*, I (Utrecht, 1950), 37f. Actually, this "Didache" tradition can be further subdivided into the "Two Ways" catechism (*Did.* 1-6, *Barnabas* 18-20), which once seems to have circulated separately (see the Latin *Doctrina*) and which became incorporated, in part, into the first section of the "Apostolic Church Order" manual in the East (see Quasten, *op. cit.*, II, 119-20); and the more specifically ecclesiastical materials (*Did.* 7-15) which resemble much more closely the usual subject matter of related church manuals (*Didascalia*, *Apostolic Traditions* of Hippolytus, remainder of the "Apostolic Church Order," etc.).

⁷ See Quasten, *op. cit.*, II, 180-94; also B. S. Easton, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* (New York, 1934); G. Dix, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome* (New York, 1937).

⁸ The prayers (and other materials) of *Ap. Const.* VII. 33ff could also be included here as a 4th (5th, 6th, etc.) tradition which has been incorporated into the present document; see, e.g. J. M. Harden, *The Ethiopic Didascalia* (New York, 1920), pp. x-xi.

⁹ "Comparing this attitude of the southern group of churches [i.e., observance of both Sabbath and Sunday] to that of the northern group as illustrated by the Syriac version of the *Statutes of the Apostles* [*sic!*], we find a sharp difference of opinion" (p. 29). Actually, he cites from the *Latin* and *Syriac Didascalia* (not *Statutes*) here. It is true that the *Latin* passage refers only to the Lord's Day observance and does not mention Sabbath here (section 13), but the parallel *Greek* material in *Ap. Const.* II. 59 includes reference to both Sabbath and Sunday assemblies (is this what Bishai alludes to in n. 5 on p. 27?), while the main textual tradition of the *Ethiopic Didascalia* (12; Harden, *op. cit.*, p. 78) speaks only of the "Christian Sabbath which is (the day of) his holy resurrection [thus, probably Sunday, although

sources, however, he fails to see that the evidence he is adducing has only secondary relevance for an examination of Coptic Christianity. That is to say, granted that the circulation of this material in the Coptic language implies that many Copts may have agreed with its contents, it is clear that the Coptic (-Arabic-Ethiopic) is a translation from a *Greek* original.¹⁰ Thus there is something suspicious in Bishai's appeal to this translation in support of his theory that the practice of "the non-Hellenistic southern churches of Egypt and Ethiopia" differed significantly from the practice of the "Hellenistic Christians" with regard to Sabbath/Sunday observance in pre-Nicene times (p. 30 and n. 17).

This suspicion is borne out by a closer look at the passages adduced—the "Coptic statute regarding Sabbath observance" which Bishai cites as prime evidence (p. 27) is in fact a verbatim translation from *Greek* and is preserved in a parallel Greek form in *Ap. Const.* VIII. 33.2:

*Greek Ap. Const.*¹¹

ἐργαζέσθωσαν οἱ δοῦλοι
πέντε ἡμέρας

*Sahidic "Statutes"*¹²

Let the slaves¹³ work
five days,

elsewhere this version of *Didasc.* argues that Jesus actually rose on Passover *Sabbath* (!) and appeared on Sunday—see esp. sec. 30, 36, 38]—another Ethiopic manuscript mentions both Sabbath and Sunday in this passage! Bishai's "northern"/"southern" distinction is frustrated here.

¹⁰ See Quasten *op. cit.*, II, 181f: "Of these oriental versions, the Sahidic alone is based directly on the Greek. . . . It contains many transliterated Greek words, so that the original terms are obvious. . . . The Arabic was derived from the Sahidic. . . . The Ethiopic . . . is thrice-removed from the original, having been done from the Arabic" (or from an older form of the Arabic). Perhaps this is also the place to note that, in fact, the Coptic "version" to which Bishai refers itself contains two different Coptic versions of the "Egyptian Church Order" material; see Horner, *op. cit.*, p. vii—"The Saidic, Arabic, and Ethiopic preserve two forms of these same canons."

¹¹ Cited from the ed. by F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Paderborn, 1905).

¹² Translated literally from the Coptic text given by Bishai, p. 27 (from Leipoldt's ed.). I have italicized Greek words which are simply transliterated in the Coptic.

¹³ Certainly not "servants (of the Lord)" as Bishai renders it

σάββατον δὲ καὶ κυριακὴν	<i>But on the Sabbath and the Lord's Day</i>
σχολαζέτωσαν	let them devote themselves
ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ	to the <i>church</i>
διὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν	that they may be instructed
τῆς εὐσεβείας.	in piety.
τὸ μὲν γὰρ σάββατον	The <i>Sabbath, indeed</i> , because
εἶπομεν	God himself rested on it when
δημιουργίας λόγον ἔχειν,	he completed all the creation,
τὴν δὲ κυριακὴν	<i>and the Lord's Day</i> because
ἀναστάσεως.	it is the day of the
	<i>resurrection</i> of the Lord.

Thus the statement that such passages are exclusive to the "southern group" (Coptic-Arabic-Ethiopic) as opposed to the "northern group" (Greek-Latin-Syriac) is incorrect. On this point alone, the framework of Bishai's argument collapses—which is not to say that his conclusions are necessarily false, but only that they do not follow from the evidence he cites.

Additional evidence that what Bishai refers to as Coptic practice also obtained in certain Greek-speaking "Hellenistic Christian" communities in the 4th century is abundant. In fact, Bishai himself claims that Athanasius, "who was a chief Egyptian delegate at Nicea, in his canons dated around A.D. 366 points out the necessity of observing both days" (p. 30); but the "Egypt" which Athanasius represented was "Hellenistic" (Alexandria), not primarily Coptic!¹⁴ Similarly,

(p. 27). The context of both Greek and Coptic requires here "slaves" or "workers" in an economic-social sense.

¹⁴ Does Bishai think that Athanasius wrote in Coptic? Note his reference on p. 31, n. 18, to "the Coptic original" as contrasted with "the Arabic version" of the so-called *Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria* which were edited and translated from the Arabic and Coptic versions by W. Riedel and W. E. Crum (London, 1904). It is not clear that these canons actually are derived from a work of Athanasius, although Riedel favors that view (Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. XXVI); in any event, the canons were originally written in Greek and must be dated within the period 350-500 (Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. XIV). For similar material attributed to Athanasius, see the Greek *Syntagma Didascalias* 2 (Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, XXVIII, 835ff) which forbids "guarding" (φυλάττειν) Sabbath (as a day of rest?) but does speak of both Sabbath and "Lord's Day" as special days of worship.

Timotheus, Bishop of Alexandria in 381-85, speaks of the necessity of abstaining from sexual relations (*κοινωνία γάμου*) on "the Sabbath and the Lord's Day [Sunday] . . . because on these days the spiritual sacrifice [the eucharist] is offered to the Lord."¹⁵ Epiphanius of Salamis (Cyprus) also bears witness to the special place of the Sabbath alongside of Sunday as a day of Christian gathering—see his "Exposition of the Faith" 24 at the end of his *Panarion* (finished c. 380).¹⁶ The Greek form of the *Didascalia* tradition, which probably dates from the 4th century (from Syria?), exhorts the people not to forsake the daily assemblies, especially the Sabbath and Sunday days of rejoicing.¹⁷

Various other sources supplement this material by giving us a more precise picture of what was (or was not) involved in "Sabbath observance." The 29th canon of the Synod of Laodicea (c. 380) argues against a "judaistic" manner of keeping the Sabbath—i.e., in idleness:

For it is not necessary that Christians judaize and have leisure on the Sabbath, but let them work on that day, and give precedence to the Lord's Day—if indeed they are able to have leisure as Christians.¹⁸

But the same Synod prescribes that "the Gospels along with other scriptures be read on the Sabbath" (Canon 16), and recognizes the special nature of the two days, Sabbath

¹⁵ *Responsa Canonica* (Migne, *op. cit.*, XXXIII, 1305): ἐξ ἀνάγκης δὲ τὸ σάββατον καὶ τὴν κυριακὴν ἀπέχεσθαι δεῖ διὰ τὸ ἐν αὐταῖς τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν ἀναφέρεισθαι τῷ κυρίῳ (with reference to 1 Cor 7: 5).

¹⁶ Migne, *op. cit.*, XXIV, 832A: ἐν τισὶ δὲ τόποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς σάββασι συνάξεις ἐπιτελοῦσιν.

¹⁷ *Ap. Const.* II.59.3 (see above, n. 9): μάλιστα δὲ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου καὶ ἐν τῇ τοῦ κυρίου ἀναστασίμῳ τῇ κυριακῇ σπουδαιοτέρως ἀπαντᾶτε. Note also *Ap. Const.* V.20.19: πᾶν μέντοι σάββατον ἄνευ τοῦ ἐνὸς [τοῦ πάσχα] καὶ πᾶσαν κυριακὴν ἐπιτελοῦντες συνόδους εὐφρανεσθε· ἔνοχος γὰρ ἁμαρτίας ἔσται ὁ τὴν κυριακὴν νηστεύων, ἡμέραν ἀναστάσεως οὖσαν . . .

¹⁸ Synod Laodicea, Can. 29: ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανούς ἰουδαΐζειν καὶ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ· τὴν δὲ κυριακὴν προτιμῶντας, εἴ γε δύναιντο σχολάζειν ὡς Χριστιανοί. εἰ δὲ εὐρεθῆεν ἰουδαῖσται ἔστωσαν ἀνάθεμα παρὰ Χριστῷ (ed. Mansi).

and Lord's Day, during Lent (Canons 49, 51). A similar attitude is attested by the Christian editor (from Antioch-Syria?) who expanded the Ignatian Epistles at about the same time:

Therefore let us no longer observe the Sabbath in a judaistic way and rejoice in idleness. . . . But each of you should observe Sabbath in a spiritual way, rejoicing in study of laws. . . . And after keeping the Sabbath, let every lover of Christ celebrate the festival of the Lord's Day—the resurrection day, the royal day, the most excellent of all days.¹⁹

Finally, if we are allowed for the moment to treat the *Apostolic Constitutions* as somewhat of a unity representing 4th-century Hellenistic Egyptian Christianity, we will find that it not only refers to the Sabbath and Sunday festal gatherings which commemorate creation and resurrection respectively,²⁰ and advocates rest from usual labors on these two days (see above on Bishai's main text, *Ap. Const.* VIII.33.2), but it also guards against leaving the impression that a person should be *idle* on the Sabbath—for creature as for creator, Sabbath rest means study of the laws, not idleness of hands.²¹ The *Apostolic Constitutions* and related literature are also quite clear that one is not to *fast* on the Sabbath, except at Passover/Easter time in memory of the Lord's death/burial (see *Ap. Const.* V.14.20; 18.1f; 20.19 [above, n. 17]; VII.23.3f; etc.)—an attitude which is widely attested by other contemporary witnesses such as Basil of Cappadocia (*De jejunio*, hom. I.7,10; II.4.7), John Chrysostom of Antioch (*In Gen.*, hom. 13.2), and even Augustine of Hippo (Ep. 36, *ad Casulanum* 2.4).

¹⁹ Pseudo-Ignatius, *Magnesians* 9.3-4 (ed. Funk-Diekamp): μηκέτι οὖν σαββατιζῶμεν Ἰουδαϊκῶς καὶ ἀργίαις χαίροντες . . . ἀλλ' ἕκαστος ὑμῶν σαββατιζέτω πνευματικῶς, μελέτη νόμων χαίρων . . . καὶ μετὰ τὸ σαββατίσαι ἑορταζέτω πᾶς φιλόχριστος τὴν κυριακὴν, τὴν ἀναστάσιμον, τὴν βασιλίδα, τὴν ὑπατον πασῶν τῶν ἡμερῶν. See also *Trallians* 9: 5-6.

²⁰ *Ap. Const.* VII.23.3 f.: τὸ σάββατον μέντοι καὶ τὴν κυριακὴν ἑορτάζετε, ὅτι τὸ μὲν δημιουργίας ἐστὶν ὑπόμνημα, τὸ δὲ ἀναστάσεως.

²¹ *Ap. Const.* VII.36: . . . ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατέπαυσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων εἰς μελέτην τῶν σῶν νόμων . . . σαββατιεῖς . . . σαββατισμὸν μελέτης νόμων, οὐ χειρῶν ἀργίαν . . . σαββατιζεῖν ἐνετείλω, οὐ πρόφασιν ἀργίας διδοῦς.

This is not to deny that the widespread practice of Coptic Christianity at this time was also to observe both Sabbath and Sunday. Bishai is on solid ground here, as the numerous passages listed by C. Butler in his edition of the *Lausiac History of Palladius* show.²² But it should be emphasized that this is *not* a practice limited to Coptic Christianity. Both Hellenistic Egypt and the rest of the Hellenistic Christian East knew of the dual observance of Sabbath and Sunday in the 4th century, and had recorded its interpretation of what was meant by "Sabbath observance," in terms of "rest" and idleness. There was no "sharp difference of opinion" (p. 29) between Bishai's "northern" and "southern" groups at this time—at least, not in the sources he has selected.

Is it possible to move behind the 4th century to determine how ancient this dual observance of Sabbath/Sunday may have been? Unfortunately, sources for Coptic Christianity prior to that date are not readily available. But if we can trust those scholars who trace the "Egyptian Church Order" tradition back to Hippolytus and his *Apostolic Tradition*, the dual observance in Hellenistic Christianity may be at least as old as the early 3d century and probably much older.²³ Although it is not possible to determine with precision from what portion of early 3d-century Christianity Hippolytus had derived his traditions, it is probable that he spent his early life somewhere in the Hellenistic East (Alexandria or An-

²² C. Butler, *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, II ("Texts and Studies, VI," Cambridge, 1904), 198 f, refers to such passages as *Vita Pach.* 20 and *Asceticon* (or *Paralipomena*) 15; *Hist. Mon.* 23; *Apophthegmata*, Poemen. 30 and Sisoë 2; *Vita Schenuti* (ed. Leipoldt, *op. cit.*, p. 132); *Vita Onuphrii* 11; etc., along with the references in the *Lausiac History* itself (7.5; 14.3; 20.2; 25.4; 48.2). See also L. M. O. Duchesne, *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution* (5th ed., New York, 1923), pp. 230ff.

²³ Quasten, *op. cit.*, II, 181, dates the writing of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* to "about the year 215." Of course, there is no guarantee that the dual observance was part of the original form of the *Ap. Trad.*, but the burden of proof would seem to rest on the person who *denies* this; in any event, the dual observance was already in the Greek form of the tradition, as we have seen.

tioch?) before he came to Rome.²⁴ Thus the dual observance may have been an established Eastern (Hellenistic) practice at the end of the 2d century.

There are, indeed, a few additional clues from 2d-century Christian literature which suggest that some Christian communities habitually kept the Sabbath at that early date. (1) *Didache* 8:1 retains the Jewish name *παρασκευή* ("day of preparation" before the Sabbath) for Friday, which might indicate that Sabbath was still observed. It could be argued, per contra, that *παρασκευή* here has simply become a standard designation for the 6th day of the week and does not carry any implications concerning Sabbath observance. The Jewish-Christian flavor of the *Didache* in general, however, along with the apparently anti-Pharisaic polemic in 8:1f and the preservation of the *Didache* tradition by the Eastern communities which maintained the dual observance (it is embedded in *Ap. Const.* VII) argue against such a neutral use of *παρασκευή*. In 14:1, the Didachist also speaks of observing the eucharist on the *κυριακή*—the weekly Lord's Day (or does it mean Easter Sunday?)—showing that the first-day observance also seems to have been practiced by the communities which the *Didache* tradition represents (Syria? Egypt?). (2) The *Martyrdom of Polycarp* also uses the designation *παρασκευή* (7:1) and does not hesitate to record that Polycarp's death fell on (and was commemorated on?) a "Great Sabbath" (8:1; 21:1), despite the hostile attitude to the Jews exhibited elsewhere in that document (see 12:2; 13:1). Thus it may be that the churches of Asia Minor among whom the *Martyrdom* circulated also retained some contact with Sabbath observances in the later 2d century. Although neither the *Martyrdom* nor the preserved *Epistle* of Polycarp makes mention of Sunday observance, it would be difficult to conclude from

²⁴ See Quasten, *op. cit.*, II, 163: "There are many reasons for believing that he was not a native Roman nor of Latin origin at all. . . . His entire mentality . . . indicates that he came from the East," possibly from Alexandria.

this that Polycarp and those who revered him did not in fact also observe the Sunday day of gladness. (3) There probably is more than symbolic significance to logion 27 of the *Gospel of Thomas*: "If you do not fast to the world, you will not find the Kingdom; if you do not keep the Sabbath as a true Sabbath, you will not see the Father."²⁵ These sentiments circulated in the 2d century in Greek, and some years later they were translated into Coptic also. They would seem to find their life-setting in a community which in some way observed the seventh-day Sabbath, although it is not at all clear whether this community also observed Sunday.

Furthermore, the 2d century provides us with another type of evidence that certain Christians may have continued to observe the Jewish Sabbath; namely, by the occasional polemic *against* such a practice. (1) In the opening years of that century, Ignatius of Antioch warns the Magnesians in Asia Minor not to live "in accord with Judaism" but to follow the insight which even the divine prophets of old had received through God's grace and to live "in accord with Christ Jesus," God's Son and God's Logos sent to man.

If, then, those who walked in the ancient customs [i.e., the aforementioned prophets] came to have a new hope, no longer 'sabbatizing' but living in accord with the Lord's life—in which life there sprang up also our life through him and through his death — . . . how shall we be able to live apart from him, of whom the pro-

²⁵ *G. Thom.* 86.17-20 as known from Pap. Oxyrhynchus 1.2: ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσῃται τὸν κόσμον, οὐ μὴ εὑρηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σαββατίσατε τὸ σάββατον, οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸ <ν> π(ατε)ρα. In this connection, note that Justin, *Dial.* 12. 3, presents a moral = spiritual interpretation of "keeping the Sabbath" (right conduct) which is in general accord with the approach of *Barnabas* 15 (see also Tertullian, *Adv. Judaeos* 4). "Sabbath" also became a symbol in the Gnostic tradition which preserved the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas*, as *Gospel of Truth* 32.18ff shows—the "Sabbath" means the "Day" in which it is not fitting for salvation to be idle. Nevertheless, it does not necessarily follow that the *Gospel of Thomas* logion is irrelevant in discussions concerning the literal observance of the seventh-day Sabbath in some branches of 2d-century Christianity, especially in view of other "Jewish-Christian" tendencies which are embodied in the *Gospel of Thomas*.

phets also were disciples, since they had received him as teacher in the spirit? Wherefore, he whom they justly awaited when he arrived, raised them from the death. . . . Thus, we should be his disciples—we should learn to live in accord with Christianity. . . . It is absurd to proclaim Jesus Christ and to 'judaize'. For Christianity has not placed its trust in Judaism, but vice-versa.²⁶

It is certainly illegitimate to see behind this context a simple (!) Sabbath/Sunday controversy. It is rather a contrast of two different ways of living—one apart from 'grace' ('judaizing'), the other in the power of the resurrection life. Nevertheless, one of the sets of slogans used to characterize the conflicting positions does focus on *at least* the Jewish Sabbath observance—it is not so clear whether Sunday as a day in contrast to Sabbath is in the picture at all. Probably the contrast intended is that between Sabbath *solemnity* and *idleness* (as later Christians often alleged) and the resurrection life (*re-creation*) of the Christian. As we have seen (above, n. 19), the later editor (and expander) of the Ignatian corpus interpreted this passage in terms of Sabbath/Sunday issues, but this is by no means decisive for the meaning of the passage in the 2d century. (2) Less ambiguous is the *Epistle of Barnabas*, which possibly reflects the situation in the outlying districts around Alexandria a few years later. The author condemns "the present (Jewish) Sabbaths" as unacceptable to the Lord, and exhorts his readers to "observe the 8th day with gladness, on which Jesus also rose from the dead and, when he had been manifested, ascended to heaven."²⁷

²⁶*Magnesians* 8-10 (compare *Philadelphians* 5-6). The most pertinent words, in *Magn.* 9: 1, are: εἰ οὖν οἱ ἐν παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν ἀναστραφέντες εἰς καινότητα ἐλπίδος ἦλθον, μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες, ἐν ἧ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. . . . I am indebted to the recent article of F. Guy, "The Lord's Day' in the Letter of Ignatius to the Magnesians," *AUSS*, II (1964), 1-17, for the light it has shed on this passage by calling attention to the fact that the text-critical grounds for reading κυριακὴν instead of κυριακὴν ζωὴν (as the best Greek witness has) are indeed slim. As the above translation shows, I do not take κυριακὴ here in the technical sense of 'Lord's Day' which it came to acquire (see below, n. 28).

²⁷ *Barnabas* 15.9: διὸ καὶ ἀγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην

Bishai's remarks on the arguments of Justin (representing Ephesus-Rome?) and Tertullian (North Africa) in favor of the excellency of Sunday worship rather than Sabbath observance during the 2d century are also relevant here.²⁸ Nevertheless, as we have seen, this anti-Sabbath attitude was not characteristic of *all* Greek-speaking Christians in the 2d (or 3d, or 4th) century.

The central thesis of Bishai's argument, however, still remains to be considered: Did *Coptic* Christianity observe *only* the Sabbath rest until the mid-4th century, when Sunday observance was added under the influence of Nicea? The failure of adequate evidence from Coptic Christianity prior to the 4th century makes it impossible to discuss this hypothesis with precision. An important aspect of the problem is the date at which one can speak of "Coptic" Christianity as an entity to be compared with other types (e.g., "Hellenistic") of Christianity—Bishai implies that such a distinction is possible "from apostolic times" onward (p. 31), but this is open to serious doubt. Certainly there were Coptic and Ethiopian Christians soon after Christian missionary work began, but no distinctively Coptic Christian community

ἐν ἧ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοῦς.

²⁸ P. 30. See esp. Justin, *Apology* 67. 3-7 (Christians assemble on the "day of the Sun" in which God began creation and Christ both rose and appeared), *Dialogue* 24.1 (the Christian mystery of the "8th day"), *Dial.* 41.4 (the "8th day" on which Jesus rose is the best of all days), *Dial.* 138. 1 (the "8th day" in which Christ appeared after he had risen); also the anti-Sabbath polemic in *Dial.* 10.1; 18.2f; 47.2; etc. Obviously Justin's type of Christianity did not observe the Sabbath, but only Sunday. Sunday also is important for the 2d-century author of the *Gospel of Peter*, who uses κυριακή as a technical designation for the Lord's Day (sec. 9, 12)—there does not seem to be any anti-Sabbath sentiment here, however. By contrast, the "Epistle" to *Diognetus* is clearly anti-Sabbath (4:1-3), although the Lord's Day is not explicitly mentioned in comparison. Tertullian argues for worship on "die solis" (e.g., *Ad Nationes* 1.13.1ff) and against Jewish Sabbath solemnities (e.g., *Adv. Jud.* 4; *De jejuniis* 14:1ff), but also admits that some Christians continued to keep Sabbath in some sense (*ibid.*, 14:3—the Passover Sabbath?).

emerges until the middle of the 3d century.²⁹ Prior to that time, it would seem that whatever Christian communities did exist in "non-Hellenistic" Egypt used primarily Greek and not Coptic as their *official* language; since Greek was the political language of Egypt at this time, as well as the language of the Egyptian Church, organized around Alexandria, they were not particularly isolated from "Hellenistic Christianity."³⁰

This, plus the fact that the multitude of Coptic texts which refer to the observance of both Sabbath and Sunday in 4th-century Egypt give no hint that this is a *new* practice, seriously undercuts Bishai's thesis. It would seem that as peculiarly Coptic Christianity developed (in the 3d century?), it adopted and translated certain traditions current in the Hellenistic East—like the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. Thus from its very beginnings, "Coptic Christianity" observed both Sabbath and Sunday, because such was the practice taught in its adopted traditions!

Furthermore, Bishai's reference to "the fact that the Coptic bishop who represented the Copts at Nicea is known to have agreed to hold the Easter festival ["Pascha"?] on Sunday instead of the Jewish passover" (p. 29) is of much less relevance than he supposes, since it deals with an entirely separate (though remotely related) issue—namely, the perseverance of Quartodeciman views in Egypt over a century after a similar debate had been resolved in Hellenistic Asia Minor. There are numerous passages in the *Didascalia* as well as in the "Egyptian Church Order" tradition which

²⁹ See Quasten, *op. cit.*, III, 146ff; A. von Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (Translation; 2d ed.; London, 1908), Vol. II, IV. 3.3.7 (esp. pp. 175ff); J. Lebreton and J. Zeiller, *The History of the Primitive Church III* (Translated from the French; New York, 1946), I.19.1.

³⁰ Note, for example, the numerous Greek papyri containing certificates of sacrifice and connected with the edict of Decius around the year 250 (A. Bludau, *Die ägyptischen Libelli und die Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Decius*, "Römische Quartalschrift Supplement," Vol. XXVII, 1931); the Council of Alexandria in 320/21 at which some 100 Egyptian bishops were represented also illustrates this fact.

reflect this practice of Syrian and Coptic Christianity, to observe (Jewish) Passover on 14 Nisan as part of (if not the climax of) the Easter Season.³¹ Bishai's reasoning that "it does not seem sensible that [the Copts] should have honored the resurrection day itself [i.e. Easter] on the Jewish passover if they [regularly] observed Sunday as a weekly rest" (p. 29) is rather strange in the light of the earlier Quartodeciman controversy.³² As far as can be determined from the sources, the Quartodecimans were not at all considered strange for their *weekly* observances—apparently they kept the Lord's Day as did their opponents.³³ But on the annual Easter festival, they retained the Jewish mode of lunar calculation to determine Passover (14 Nisan), no matter on what day of the week it might fall, while their opponents centered the Easter observance around the *fixed* day of Sunday following the Jewish Passover. The Eastern Christian sources with which we are dealing reflect a compromise position in which both the Passover fast (including Passover Sabbath) and the Easter festal celebration (on Sunday) were observed in commemoration of the Lord's death and resurrection respectively (e.g. *Ap. Const.* V. 17ff; VII.23; see n. 31 above).

By way of summary, it seems that the following conclusions are in line with the evidence: (1) Sunday observance was being

³¹ E.g., Syr. *Didasc.* 21; Eth. *Didasc.* 29f; *Ap. Const.* V.13-14, 17-20; Sahidic *Statutes* 55 and 75; Arabic *Statutes* 66; Eth. *Statutes* 67; *Ap. Const.* VIII.33.3f. Earlier Eastern evidence for this tradition is found in the 2d-century *Epistle of the Apostles* 15 (or 26).

³² For a discussion of the 2d-century controversy, see F. E. Brightman, "The Quartodeciman Question," *JThS*, XXV (1923/24), 254-70; C. W. Dugmore, "A Note on the Quartodecimans," *Studia Patristica* IV ("Texte und Untersuchungen," LXXIX [Berlin, 1961]), 411-421.

³³ They may have kept both Sabbath and Sunday, although if this were true we might also have expected some reference to it in the sources. Note that Polycarp was a Quartodeciman according to Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, V.24.4 and 14. We have already made some enquiry concerning Polycarp's attitude to the Sabbath/Sunday question (above, pp. 26f.). Another alleged Quartodeciman, Melito of Sardis (see Eus., *Hist. Eccl.*, V. 24.5), is said to have written a treatise "On the Lord's Day" (Eus., *Hist. Eccl.*, IV. 26.2).

urged *instead of* Sabbath rest as early as the beginning of the 2d century;³⁴ (2) at the same time, a considerable segment of the Christian population continued to observe the (Jewish) Sabbath in some form or other—apparently this continued to be a live issue on into the 4th century in some areas; (3) some Christian communities observed *both* Sabbath *and* Sunday at least from the 3d century, and probably earlier, but there was a widespread attempt to divorce Sabbath observance from the ideas of solemnity (fasting) and idleness by making it a day of meditation and rejoicing (like Sunday)—that is, Sabbath “rest” was interpreted in a much wider sense than Rabbinic Judaism would permit. In the 4th century, when the Church and the Roman Empire were rapidly moving towards alliance, thus allowing the “ecumenical” Church to emerge visibly (and vocally), the official observance of Sunday rest gained political as well as religious overtones. This is clear from Constantine’s law of 321 which commanded all the urban population to “rest on the venerable day of the Sun” while allowing those who pursue agriculture to sow or plant on whatever day is suitable;³⁵ and from the various Church Councils of the 4th century which spoke on this problem—of Elvira, Can. 21

³⁴ For further details, see S. V. McCasland, “The Origin of the Lord’s Day,” *JBL*, XLIX (1930), 65-82; and more recently W. Rordorf, *Der Sonntag* (Zürich, 1962); Dugmore, “Lord’s Day and Easter” in Cullmann *Festschrift* (Suppl. to *Novum Testamentum*, VI [1962]), pp. 282-92. No doubt the complex problem of the separation of Church and Synagogue in the 1st and 2d centuries, with its inevitable antagonisms, was a factor here; also the anti-Jewish edicts of emperors like Hadrian would have provided added incentive for Christians to dissociate themselves from certain Jewish practices. On the Sabbath issue, appeal was made to the words and deeds of Jesus by the early church; see F. W. Beare, “The Sabbath Was Made for Man?” *JBL* LXXIX (1960), 130-36. But Beare has certainly gone too far with his statement on p. 136 that “one thing . . . is clear, . . . that the Christians did not keep the sabbath, and . . . their attitude brought upon them the fiercest attacks.”

³⁵ *Cod. Justinianus* III.12.3 (*Corp. Jur. Civ.* 2.127)—translated in H. S. Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church* (2d ed.; London, 1963), p. 26.

(c. 306); of Laodicea, Can. 16, 29 (see above, n. 18). Here was a matter for Christian and Roman unity. Nevertheless, much of Eastern Christianity in the 4th and 5th centuries continued the older practice of observing both Sabbath and Sunday. Thus it was that Coptic Christianity inherited an older (Eastern) "Hellenistic" practice which had received only limited recognition in western Christianity, and it does not seem to be the case that the Council of Nicea (or related 4th-century councils) seriously modified the attitude of the Copts in the 4th century on this issue.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE VULGATE ON
THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF CERTAIN PSALMS

SAKAE KUBO

Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

The quotations of the OT in the book of Hebrews are taken from the LXX and not from the Hebrew Bible. This means that at times there is some variation between the English translation of an OT citation and that of the OT passage itself. This is true in any secondary translation, for the translation of a translation will differ, sometimes considerably, from the original. However, there are three instances where an OT passage and its citation have been translated in the same way by the AV when clear differences would be expected in the translation. Superficially these look like definite attempts at harmonizing the OT passage with its citation in the NT; however, a closer look reveals a different cause.

The first of these passages is Ps 104 : 4, which is quoted in Heb 1 : 7. The AV reads, "Who maketh his angels spirits: his ministers a flaming fire." Heb 1 : 7 reads the same except that it has "flame of fire" instead of "flaming fire." The latter is accounted for by the fact that the Hebrew has the reading אֵשׁ שֶׁלֵּהֵט , which the LXX has translated literally by $\pi\tilde{\upsilon}\rho \phi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu$, while Heb 1 : 7 reads $\pi\upsilon\rho\delta\varsigma \phi\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\alpha$. But the significant thing in this case is that AV has translated Ps 104 : 4 as "who maketh his *angels spirits*." The Hebrew and the Greek for "angels" and "spirits" are both ambiguous. The former ($\text{מַלְאָכִים} = \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota$) can mean any ordinary messengers or angels, i.e., heavenly messengers. The latter ($\text{רוּחֹת} = \pi\nu\acute{\nu}\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$) can mean either "winds" or "spirits."

In Heb 1 : 7 the context is clearly speaking about "angels" and not "messengers." The author is contrasting Christ and

the angels in this chapter, so ἀγγέλους can only mean "angels." "Spirits" for πνεύματα is permissible, but again the context clearly calls for "winds," which is the translation in RV, RSV, and NEB. The word "winds" corresponds to "flame of fire" in the parallelism. The translation "spirits" was probably due to the influence of Heb 1 : 14 where the expression, "ministering spirits," is found. Ps 104 : 4, on the other hand, is clear in suggesting "messengers" and "winds" instead of "angels" and "spirits" since the previous verse speaks about the use that God makes of the forces of nature to accomplish His ends. Even the AV of verse 3 has "who maketh the clouds His chariot: who walketh upon the wings of the wind" (רוּחַ). RV and RSV both have "winds" and "messengers."

Here is an interesting case where the Hebrew and the Greek are virtually identical and yet a difference in translation was called for because the NT writer used two words with entirely different meanings from those intended by the OT writer. The deviation is not due to the LXX translator but to the NT writer. Identical translation of the passages was possible only because of the ambiguity of meaning in the two words. Does the fact that the agreement is with the NT passage show that the translation of this passage influenced that of the OT? Did the AV translators follow a policy of harmonization? So it appears on first sight. But that this is unlikely is seen from other citations in the book of Hebrews which could have been harmonized with equal ease, but were not.¹ It is also apparent from the slight differences preserved in these verses under consideration. Besides, Ps 104 : 4 is translated in this manner in all the previous "authorized" English versions (Bishops' Bible, Great Bible, Matthew Bible, and the Coverdale Bible).² The question now must be, "Where

¹ Heb 1 : 5 and 2 Sam 7 : 14; Heb 1 : 8, 9 and Ps 45 : 7; Heb 1 : 10-12 and Ps 102 : 26-28 and others.

² When the revision of the Great Bible was planned by Archbishop Parker, Guest, Bishop of Rochester, was sent the book of Psalms to revise. In his response the Bishop wrote, "Where in the New Testament one piece of a Psalm is reported, I translate it in the Psalms

did Coverdale get his translation?" He did not know Hebrew so he had to rely upon translations of the Hebrew. According to Willoughby, Coverdale used as his main base for the Psalms the Swiss-German Psalter from Zürich, modifying and interpolating it with the Vulgate.³

The Zürich Psalter has *wind* and *botten* while the Vulgate has *spiritus* and *angelos*. Clearly, Coverdale followed the Vulgate.⁴ The book of Psalms in the Vulgate is the Gallican Psalter translated by Jerome from the fifth column (LXX) of Origen's Hexapla.⁵ Coverdale's translation (and so also the AV) is a tertiary translation, i.e., a translation of the Vulgate which was a translation of the LXX which was a translation of the Hebrew.⁶

Our investigation settles down to the question, "Where did Jerome get his translation?" Was he harmonizing with the NT passage or was he misled by the ambiguity of the words

according to the translation thereof in the New Testament, for the avoiding of the offence that may rise to the people upon divers translations." Apparently, however, this alarmed the Archbishop so that the book was sent to someone else to revise, for the initials at the end of Psalms in the Bishops' Bible are T.B., which Dr. Aldis Wright assigns to Thomas Bickley. Cf. Alfred W. Pollard, ed., *Records of the English Bible* (London, 1911), pp. 31, 290-1. This suggests that the official position at least was opposed to such harmonizations.

³ Harold R. Willoughby, *The Coverdale Psalter and the Quattrocentenary of the Printed English Bible* (Chicago, 1935), p. 28. For the OT Coverdale also used Tyndale, Luther, and Pagninus (cf. J. F. Mozley, *Coverdale and His Bibles* [London, 1953], p. 79). Tyndale did not translate Psalms, and Luther differs in his translation of this passage, reading "winds" and "angels."

⁴ Coverdale followed the Vulgate in the numbering of the Psalms since in this and the third instance they are numbered 103 and 94. But the Zürich Bible also follows this numbering. In the Matthew Bible and succeeding Bibles they are numbered 104 and 95.

⁵ B. M. Metzger, "Ancient Versions," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, IV, 753.

⁶ It is interesting to note that the Geneva Bible, which was revised on the basis of the Hebrew text, reads, "Which maketh the spirits his messengers." In the other two passages under consideration, the Geneva Bible forsakes its predecessors more completely and follows the Hebrew.

ἀγγέλους and πνεύματα which are more often translated "angels" and "spirits"? When Jerome later translated this passage from the Hebrew itself, he translated it exactly the same way.⁷ The ambiguity of the Hebrew text, the LXX translation of it, and the use of it in the NT may have combined to give this result.

The second of these passages is Ps 8 : 5 which is quoted in Heb 2 : 7. The AV reads, "For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels." The point of consideration is the translation of the word אֱלֹהִים. The translation "angels" goes back again to Coverdale.⁸ Where did Coverdale get his translation? Again the Vulgate is the source. The Vulgate has *ab angelis* while Zürich reads *van Gott*. The Vulgate is clearly a translation of the LXX παρ' ἀγγέλους.⁹ The question here goes back beyond Jerome to the LXX translators, so the influence of the NT can be entirely discounted. But it is difficult to know exactly why the LXX translated thus. It may be that the transcendental conception of God which was prevalent at this time, with a corresponding increase in angelic mediators, could not allow man and God to be compared with so little difference between them.

The AV translators, if they were not following their predecessors, could have translated אֱלֹהִים as "God," as RV and RSV

⁷ The New Latin Psalter, however, translated from the Hebrew reads, "Nuntios tuos facis ventos, et ministros tuo ignem ardentem." This Psalter was sponsored by Pope Pius XII and published in 1945 (cf. Augustine Bea, "The New Psalter: Its Origin and Spirit," *CBQ*, VIII [1946], 4-35).

⁸ The AV translation follows exactly that of the Bishops' Bible and the Great Bible. While the Matthew Bible and the Coverdale Bible have "angels," their translation had an obviously messianic application with Heb 2 : 7 definitely in mind. They translated this passage thus: "After thou haddest for a season made him lower then the angels, thou crownedest him with honor and glory." Coverdale must have been influenced by Luther in this direction: see Luther's translation below.

⁹ Jerome, translating from the Hebrew, had *a Deo*. The New Latin Psalter reads *angelis*. The Targum and Syriac also read "angels," while Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion read "God."

have done. The Geneva Bible, following the Hebrew rather than the Vulgate, again corrected the former English versions by translating it as "God."

Among recent commentators, only William R. Taylor and W. Stewart McCullough in *The Interpreter's Bible* understand it as "angels."¹⁰ A. Cohen,¹¹ Artur Weiser,¹² H. C. Leupold,¹³ Hans Schmidt,¹⁴ A. F. Kirkpatrick,¹⁵ and Elmer Leslie¹⁶ regard it as "God." Most of these do not even consider any other possibility. They see the expression as an allusion to the "image of Elohim" in Gen 1 : 27. The term *'elōhîm* is nowhere else translated as "angels" by AV.¹⁷

Luther's translation of this passage must have partly affected the translation of Coverdale and Matthew. He translated Ps 8 : 5 thus: "Du wirst ihn lassen eine kleine Zeit von Gott verlassen sein." The passage was considered as directly messianic from its use in Hebrews so that to the difference in degree is added the fact that this difference will be for only a little while, a clear reference to the incarnation. Coverdale and Matthew followed him in this detail,¹⁸ but followed the Vulgate in translating *'elōhîm* as "angels."

The third instance where a difference in translation is

¹⁰ *The Interpreter's Bible*, IV (New York, 1955), 52.

¹¹ *The Psalms*, "The Soncino Books of the Bible" (Hindhead, Surrey, 1945), p. 19.

¹² *The Psalms*, "The Old Testament Library" (Philadelphia, 1962), p. 144.

¹³ *Exposition of the Psalms* (Columbus, 1959), p. 107.

¹⁴ *Die Psalmen*, "Handbuch zum alten Testament" (Tübingen, 1934), p. 13.

¹⁵ *The Psalms*, "The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges" (Cambridge, 1939), p. 40.

¹⁶ *The Psalms* (New York, 1949), p. 133.

¹⁷ Besides "God" and "gods," AV translates it as "judges" in Ex 21 : 6; 22 : 8 (RV and RSV translate it "God" in both places).

¹⁸ RSV and NEB also translate the expression βαρὰχὺ τῷ in Heb 2 : 7 as "a little while." The problem here centers around the question whether the author of Hebrews considered this passage as directly messianic or as an ideal representation of man's destiny which he regarded as at present frustrated but to be realized through Jesus Christ in the future.

expected but is not found is Ps 95 : 8, which is quoted in Heb 3 : 8. AV translated it thus: "Harden not your heart, as in the provocation: and as in the day of temptation, in the wilderness." With very slight differences ("heart" is changed to "hearts" and the second "as" is omitted) the same translation is found in Heb 3 : 8. The point at issue here is the translation of מְרִיבָה and מָסָה. The AV by translating מְרִיבָה as "provocation" and מָסָה as "temptation" in Ps 95 : 8 considers these words as common rather than proper nouns.

What is the reason for this, since wherever these two words occur in the OT, AV has consistently translated them as Meribah and Massah, proper place nouns, except here?¹⁹ Again this translation goes back to Coverdale²⁰ and through the Vulgate to the LXX. For the sections involved the Zürich Bible is the same as the Vulgate, but for the verse in its entirety Coverdale is closer to the Vulgate. RV and RSV translate, "as at Meribah, as on the day at Massah in the wilderness." The dependence upon a secondary translation is apparent. The Vulgate consistently translates מָסָה as *temptatio*, as it does also in Ps 95 : 8. However, while it translates מְרִיבָה as *contradictio* in every other passage, it translates it in Ps 95 : 8 as *inritatio*. The reason for this seems to be that the LXX translated מְרִיבָה here as παραπικρασμός instead of ἀντιλογία, which is the usual translation except for Ex 17 : 7, where it is λοιδορησις.²¹ The Vulgate, following the LXX, translated it *inritatio*²² instead of going back to the Hebrew מְרִיבָה; Coverdale, following the Vulgate, translated

¹⁹ Ex 17 : 7; Num 20 : 13, 24; 27 : 14; Deut 6 : 16; 9 : 22; 32 : 51; 33 : 8; Ps 81 : 7.

²⁰ The Bishops' Bible and the Great Bible are identical with AV, but Coverdale and Matthew read, "as when ye provoked in tyme of temptacion in the wildernes."

²¹ The Vulgate omits מְרִיבָה in Ex 17 : 7.

²² Jerome goes back to *contradictio* when he translates from the Hebrew. The New Latin Psalter reads "ut in Meriba, ut die Massa in deserto."

it as a verb, "provoke," and later in the Great Bible as "provocation,"²³ which the Bishops' Bible followed. This translation influenced the translation of $\pi\tau\tau$ as "temptation" instead of "Massah," as it is transliterated elsewhere.

The translation of Heb 3 : 8, 15 is also called into question. Should not $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\pi\iota\kappa\rho\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ here read "Meribah" and $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, "Massah," instead of "provocation" and "temptation"? The problem is somewhat complicated in that the understanding of the author concerning these words must be taken into account. Verses 9 and 16, the former referring to "temptation" and the latter to "provocation," would lose their effect if the translations were not used. Meribah and Massah would not be as appropriate. Moffatt may have chosen the best way to deal with the problem when he capitalized "Provocation" and "Temptation," following the LXX pattern of translating proper nouns. In this way, the effect of verses 9 and 16 would be kept and the words still maintained as proper nouns.

The harmonization in translations of these passages with their corresponding NT passages is not due to a conscious, deliberate policy. Rather, it is due to the influence of the Vulgate which in turn was influenced by the LXX. The Vulgate Psalter, as we have mentioned, is a translation of the LXX, from which the book of Hebrews quotes. Therefore, it can easily be seen how these passages could be translated similarly. This explains the similarity since these passages are all from the book of Psalms. Instead of direct harmonization, we have indirect harmonization, i.e., the passages are not harmonized by comparing directly the English translation of the OT passages with that of the NT, but somewhat unconsciously by translating two passages whose basis is the LXX text.

There are OT passages in modern translations which are

²³ The Geneva Bible alone had "Meribah" and "Massah." It is to the credit of its translators that in the three cases discussed here they went back to the Hebrew text for their translation instead of to the Vulgate.

dependent on the versions instead of the Hebrew text. These are passages where the Hebrew is either obscure or where the versions seem to give a better reading. This study indicates, however, that the AV has some passages where it is dependent upon the Vulgate and indirectly on the LXX where such is not the case. The Hebrew is certainly superior in these three cases cited. The Bishops' Bible and the AV were purportedly brought into harmony with the Hebrew text, and though the latter version had outstanding Semitic scholars on its committees, some of these tertiary translations slipped through. Even the better readings of the Geneva Bible which they had at their disposal did not direct them to the right renderings. At this stage the translation of the NT passages may have had some influence in preserving these readings.

LES 1260 JOURS PROPHÉTIQUES DANS LES CERCLES JOACHIMITES

ALFRED-FÉLIX VAUCHER

Séminaire Adventiste du Salève, Collonges-sous-Salève (Haute-Savoie),
France

Parmi les périodes prophétiques, il en est une qui revient fréquemment dans les deux apocalypses canoniques, tantôt sous la forme de trois temps (ans) et demi,¹ tantôt sous celle de quarante-deux mois,² tantôt sous celle de mille-deux-cent-soixante-jours.³

Un théologien genevois a fait intervenir quatre ordres d'arguments pour justifier ici l'interprétation symbolique:

Premier argument, c'est qu'évidemment ces jours doivent être symboliques, puisqu'ils désignent quelque chose de très long; deuxième argument, c'est que l'Écriture nous déclare souvent ailleurs que, dans son langage prophétique, les jours sont des ans; troisième argument, c'est que des accomplissements de l'histoire ont déjà fréquemment confirmé cette règle prophétique et nous ont montré que les jours sont des ans; quatrième argument, c'est qu'on peut dire en réalité, et non seulement en symbole, que les ans sont des jours. Ce langage est exactement vrai dans l'astronomie.⁴

Un astronome vaudois a fait d'intéressantes recherches sur les chiffres de Daniel en rapport avec l'astronomie. Voici ce qu'a écrit à ce sujet un astronome français:

De CHESEAUX avait découvert le cycle de 315 ans, après lequel le Soleil et la Lune reviennent, à sept ou huit minutes d'arc près, au même point du ciel d'où ils étaient partis. Or, ce nombre 315 est précisément le quart de 1260, nombre de Daniel. De CHESEAUX en conclut que la période de 1260 ans devait être, elle aussi, un cycle

¹ Dan 7 : 25; 12 : 7; Apoc 12 : 14.

² Apoc 11 : 2; 13 : 5.

³ Apoc 11 : 3; 12 : 6.

⁴ Louis Gaussen (1790-1863), *Daniel le prophète*, III (Paris, 1849),

luni-solaire.—En effet, après 1260 années juliennes, le Soleil et la Lune reviennent à un demi degré près au même point de l'écliptique.⁵

Il fut un temps où la plupart des exégètes israélites et protestants, et même quelques catholiques, s'accordaient pour donner au jour prophétique la valeur d'une année solaire. Un savant réformé du XVIII^e siècle pouvait dire: "Tout le monde sait qu'un jour est un an dans le style prophétique."⁶

Un rabbin anglais a fait imprimer à Londres, en l'année 5554 du calendrier juif, un traité dont la seconde partie a pour titre *Une Explication des Temps*.⁷ Saadia ben Joseph (892-942), Salomon bar Isaac (1040-1105), Lévi ben Gershon (1288-1344) et Isaac ben Juda Abravanel (1437-1508) sont mentionnés comme ayant reconnu le caractère symbolique des trois temps et demi de Daniel VII.

Un théologien anglican, l'un des meilleurs interprètes de l'Apocalypse, a montré que bien avant l'époque de l'abbé Joachim, ce mode d'interprétation a été connu:

⁵ Théophile Moreux (1867-1954), *La science mystérieuse des Pharaons* (Paris, 1923), pp. 176, 177. *Les Remarques historiques, chronologiques et astronomiques sur quelques endroits du livre de Daniel*, par Jean-Philippe Loys de Cheseaux (1718-1751), insérées en tête des *Mémoires posthumes sur divers sujets d'astronomie et de mathématique* (Lausanne, 1754), ont été publiées à part, 1777.

⁶ Antoine Court de Gebelin (1725-1784), *Le Monde primitif* (Paris, 1781), p. 90. Plus récemment, le médecin irlandais William Whittla (1851-1933), *Sir Isaac Newton's Daniel and the Apocalypse* (London, 1922), p. 108, croyait encore pouvoir affirmer: "By common consent all Biblical scholars agree that, in symbolic prophecy, the day is to be accepted as a year of 360 days." En réalité, les commentateurs modernes de tendance critique préfèrent l'interprétation littérale prônée par la plupart des auteurs catholiques.

⁷ Eliakim ben Abraham, *Binah la-Itim*. Un exemplaire de ce traité se trouve à la Trinity College Library de Dublin, sous le titre *Intellige tempora: de prophetia Danielis tractatus* (Heb.), avec la date au catalogue 1795. Dans *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, V, 109, Isaac Broyde indique la date: London, 1799. Cet ouvrage a été signalé par William Cuninghame (1776-1849), *A Dissertation on the Seals and Trumpets of the Apocalypse* (4th ed., London, 1843), pp. 509, 510, et par George Stanley Faber (1773-1854), *The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*, I (2d ed., London, 1844), 49.

From Cyprian's time, near the middle of the third century, even to the time of Joachim and the Waldensians in the twelfth century, there was kept up by a succession of expositors in the Church a recognition of the precise *year-day* principle of interpretation, and its application made, not without consideration and argument, to one and another of the chronological prophetic periods of days, including the shorter of those that were involved in the prophecies respecting Antichrist; though not, *so far*, to that of the 1260 predicted days of Antichrist's duration.⁸

Chez les chrétiens, c'est l'abbé Joachim de Flore qui le premier a donné aux 1260 jours la valeur de 1260 années.⁹

L'abbé Joachim entretenait des relations avec des Juifs. On peut donc supposer que c'est à eux qu'il a emprunté l'idée d'appliquer aux 1260 jours prophétiques la règle d'interprétations que d'autres avant lui avaient déjà adoptée pour des périodes plus courtes.¹⁰

On croit généralement que Joachim a compté les 1260 ans de l'an 1 à l'an 1260 de l'ère chrétienne.¹¹ Il semble plutôt

⁸ Edward Bishop Elliott (1793-1875), *Horae Apocalypticæ, or a Comm. on the Apocalypse critical and historical*, III (5th ed., London, 1862), 283.

⁹ Dans son *Expositio super Apocalypsin* (Venise, 1527) p. 131, Joachim établit le principe: parfois, dans l'Écriture, un jour sert à désigner une année. Ce principe, il l'applique aux 1260 jours: "Mulier amicta sole, quae designat Ecclesiam, mansit abscondita in solitudine a facie serpentis, accepto haud dubium die pro anno et mille ducentis sexaginta diebus pro totidem annis" (*Concordia Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, [Venise, 1519], lib. II, tract. I, cap. 16, fol. 12). Voir aussi lib. V, cap. 118, ff. 134, 135. Joachim attachait une grande importance au chiffre 1260. "C'est sur ce chiffre que l'abbé Joachim a fondé toutes ses révélations," disait en 1305 un de ses disciples, Ubertino da Casale, *Arbor Vitae Crucifixæ Jesu*, trad. ital. par Fausta Casolini (Lanciano, 1937), p. 177.

¹⁰ Sur les rapports de Joachim avec des Juifs on peut consulter le moderniste italien Ernesto Buonaiuti (1881-1946), *Gioacchino da Fiore* (Roma, 1931), pp. 114-119, et George La Piana (1879-), dans la revue *Speculum*, VII (1932), 257-282.

¹¹ Ainsi le méthodiste anglais Henry Bett (1876-), *Joachim of Flora* (London, 1931), p. 41: "By 1260 the seventh and last age of the Spirit will begin." Le prof. Antonio Crocco, *Gioacchino da Fiore* (Napoli, 1960), p. 157, affirme que d'après les calculs concordistes de Joachim 1260 devait marquer l'aube de la renaissance spirituelle de l'humanité. "Il distinguait dans l'histoire de l'humanité trois grandes périodes

qu'il a fait aboutir cette période à l'an 1200. Un prélat italien affirmait que "dans ses écrits l'abbé Joachim n'avait rien prédit de particulier pour l'année 1260."¹² Un historien catholique exclut absolument l'année 1260 comme terme des 1260 ans: "C'est un fait qu'en aucun endroit de ses oeuvres authentiques Joachim n'a prédit l'année 1260 comme date de la seconde venue de Jésus pour le jugement final."¹³ Ailleurs le même auteur donne les détails suivants:

Dans son dernier ouvrage Joachim nous a laissé un calcul précis du nombre des générations du second état, les répartissant en trois groupes: il fait partir le premier groupe de Zacharie, père de Jean-Baptiste; avec les quarante-deux générations de trente années chacune il arrive à l'an 1200, après lequel il attend la palingénésie spirituelle (voir *Super IV Evang.*, éd. BUONAIUTI, pp. 73 ss.), et il espère contribuer personnellement à aplanir la voie en vue du nouveau miracle (voir *Concorde*, à la fin). Donc les 1260 années

(*tres status mundi*) dont chacune était l'image de la suivante: l'ère du Père qui avait duré jusqu'à la venue de Jean-Baptiste, l'ère du Fils inaugurée par l'arrivée de Jésus-Christ et qui devait durer, d'après les calculs fondés sur cette exégèse, jusque vers le milieu du XIIIe siècle, où devait enfin commencer la troisième ère, plus parfaite que les autres, celle du Saint-Esprit. La durée de ces ères lui paraissait donnée par le nombre de quarante-deux générations énumérées dans la généalogie du commencement de l'évangile de s. Matthieu. Il admettait pour chacune une durée approximative de trente ans, ce qui conduisait à l'an 1260. Toutefois, il paraît qu'il supposait une transition plus ou moins lente entre la période du Fils et celle du Saint-Esprit. Mais les signes précurseurs de l'approche du terme étaient déjà manifestes." August Eduard Cunitz (1812-1886), art. "Joachim de Flore," *Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses*, VII (1880), 413, 414.

¹² Leone Tondelli (1883-1953), *Da Gioacchino a Dante* (Torino, 1944), p. 20. Voir aussi p. 12: "Joachim voyait déjà à l'an 1200 l'aube de l'ère nouvelle."

¹³ Francesco Foberti (1866-1945), dans la revue *Sophia*, XIX (1940), 536. Cet auteur estimait (p. 537) que les passages de Joachim où figure l'année 1260 doivent être considérés comme interpolés. C'est également à l'année 1200 qu'Alois Dempf, *Sacrum Imperium* (München, 1929), p. 274, situe la fin du second état et le commencement du troisième. En effet, dans *Concordia*, IV, col. 30 ff. 54, 55, Joachim déclare que dans l'Eglise la quarante-unième génération commence en l'an 1201 depuis l'incarnation du Christ. Le prof. Raoul Manselli cite ce passage dans *La Lectura super Apocalypsin di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi* (Roma, 1955), p. 95, et il ajoute en note que la date fatidique de 1260 ne ressort pas précisément des oeuvres authentiques de Joachim.

du second état, dans son calcul exempt de lacunes, aboutissent à 1200; c'est une déformation évidente du joachimisme ancien de placer la fin du Nouveau Testament en 1260, comme le font certaines tables du *Livre des Figures*.¹⁴

Il convient de reconnaître, toutefois, que les passages de Joachim relatifs au calcul des 1260 ans ne sont pas très clairs. On attend encore une édition critique des grands ouvrages de cet abbé.¹⁵ On peut aussi se demander si cet auteur n'a pas varié quelque peu dans ses estimations.

Dans un article non signé, consacré à Joachim, la question a été posée, à propos de l'ère nouvelle annoncée par l'abbé de Flore, qui se considérait comme un simple exégète, mais que ses disciples ont élevé au rang de prophète: "Quand commencera cette ère?" L'auteur déclare:

La réponse de Joachim sur ce point n'est pas cohérente et n'insiste pas sur des données chronologiques constantes; parfois l'ère nouvelle semble imminente ou déjà commencée, tandis que parfois le commencement est placé après un espace de temps indéterminé. Les dates oscillent entre les années 1200 et 1260.¹⁶

¹⁴ Foberti, *Gioacchino da Fiore e il Gioacchinismo antico e moderno* (Padova, 1942), p. 241. Le même auteur (pp. 24, 25) pense que l'année 1260 entre dans les prévisions de Joachim à travers un calcul élastique qui exige d'être clarifié dans les éditions critiques attendues des oeuvres authentiques, en tenant compte du fait que Salimbene exclut la fixation de cette date par Joachim; il voit une interpolation joachimite dans le passage de la *Concordia* qui indique l'année 1260. Il est vrai que quelques tableaux du *Liber Figurarum* annoncent le retour du Christ pour l'année 1260. Mais Foberti, pp. 225-263, est d'avis qu'à part un petit nombre de tableaux authentiques cet ouvrage est l'oeuvre de la fausse littérature joachimite. Quant à Tondelli, qui a soutenu l'authenticité dans la 1ère éd. du *Liber Figurarum*, I (Torino, 1940), 16-24, est obligé d'admettre dans la 2e éd. (1953), pp. 19-27, que ces tableaux ont subi des remaniements.

¹⁵ Les trois grands ouvrages de Joachim dont on attend une édition critique sont l'explication de l'Apocalypse, dont on ne possède qu'une éd. de Venise, 1527, avec le *Psalterium decem-chordarum*, imprimé à la suite, ff. 225-280, et la *Concorde*, publiée au même endroit en 1519. Ernesto Buonaiuti a donné une édition critique de *Tractatus super quattuor Evangelia* (Roma, 1930), et de *De articulis fidei* (1937). Arsenio Frugoni a publié *Adversus Iudeos* (Roma, 1957).

¹⁶ *Enciclopedia Ecclesiastica*, III (Milano, 1949), 612.

Joachim hésitait à préciser une date que Jésus lui-même s'était refusé à fixer.¹⁷

A noter aussi cet aveu de Mgr Tondelli :

Ces calculs de l'abbé étaient formulés d'une manière assez élastique, ce qui permettait aux interprètes de les étendre à diverses dates. Joachim voyait déjà en 1200 l'aube de l'ère nouvelle; les deux générations suivantes, de longueur non mesurée, devaient signifier l'ère de l'Esprit.¹⁸

En 1254 parut à Paris le *Liber introductorius in Evangelium Aeternum*, attribué à Gherardo da Borgo San Donnino, et qui fut supprimé par ordre du pape. L'année 1260 devait marquer la fin du Nouveau Testament.¹⁹

En 1260 le franciscain Gherardo Segalelli, ou Segarelli, fondait, avec la bénédiction de l'évêque de Parma, l'ordre des Apostoliques, qui allait dégénérer en une secte hérétique avec son nouveau chef Fra Dolcino.²⁰

L'année 1260 n'ayant pas apporté ce que l'on attendait, "une profonde crise se produisit dans le camp joachimite en raison de la déception causée par cette vaine attente."²¹

Parmi ceux qui, découragés, renoncèrent aux espoirs entretenus depuis 1200, il faut nommer le franciscain Salimbene degli Adami de Parma (1221-1287), auteur d'une Chronique composée au cours des dernières années de sa vie.²²

Joachim est mort en 1202, sans avoir vu le renouvellement

¹⁷ Mt 24 : 36; Acts 1 : 7. Passages cités souvent par Joachim.

¹⁸ Tondelli, *Il Libro delle Figure*, I (2a ediz., Torino, 1953), 195. Sur le troisième âge, voir Antonio Crocco, *L'età dello Spirito Santo in Gioacchino da Fiore* (Brescia, 1954).

¹⁹ "Quod novum Testamentum non durabit in virtute sua nisi per sex annos proxime futuros, scilicet, usque ad annum 1260." Dans *Collectio Judiciorum de novis erroribus* de Charles Du Plessis d'Argentré (1673-1740), I (Nouv. éd., Paris, 1755), p. 164, col. 2.

²⁰ Sur Segalelli, mort en 1300, et sur Dolcino, brûlé en 1307, voir Felice Tocco (1845-1911), dans *Archivio storico italiano*, XIX (1897), 241-275.

²¹ Tondelli, *Il Libro delle Figure*, I (2a ediz.), 16.

²² *Chronica*, éd. Oswald Holder-Egger, dans *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum*, XXXII (1905-1913), 302: "Annus millesimus ducentusimus sexagesimus est elapsus: dimisi totaliter istam doctrinam et dispono non credere nisi que videro."

attendu. Ses disciples ont continué d'établir des calculs, en déplaçant les dates. Dans les commentaires apocryphes sur Esaïe et Jérémie, composés entre 1240 et 1260, c'était encore sur l'année 1260 que se fixaient les espoirs. Après cette date, les joachimites comptèrent les 1260 années à partir de l'an 34, date présumée de l'ascension du Christ, puis de 96, date supposée de la composition du livre de l'Apocalypse de Jean. Ces renseignements nous sont fournis par le dominicain Jean de Paris, dit Quidort, mort en 1306.²³

Peu à peu on en vint à négliger la période des 1260 jours prophétiques pour s'attacher à d'autres périodes, plus longues, celles des 1290 et des 1335 jours de Daniel XII, enfin à celle des 2300 soirs et matins de Daniel VIII, ce qui permettait de placer les grands événements eschatologiques dans un proche avenir.

²³ Dans son traité *De Anticristo*, écrit en 1300, imprimé à Venise en 1525. Voir fol. XLVIII. Jean de Paris s'en est tenu au sens littéral.

MARGUERITE D'ANGOULÊME
AND THE FRENCH LUTHERANS

A STUDY IN PRE-CALVIN REFORMATION IN FRANCE: II *

DANIEL WALTHER

Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

Before John Calvin came on the scene of action, there existed a French movement of Evangelicals whose efforts coincided with the developments in Wittenberg. Before Luther's attack on Indulgences, a Paris professor, Lefèvre d'Étaples, wrote a commentary on Romans and inspired a "Fabrisian" movement which found a concrete manifestation in the Cénacle at Meaux, where Bishop G. Briçonnet attempted a reform of the clergy. Luther's writings began to be known and read in France shortly after they appeared in Germany. Marguerite of Alençon (later of Navarre), sister of Francis I, encouraged every intellectual and spiritual movement. She wrote hymns, tracts and plays which have a Lutheran accent—yet she was not a Lutheran in the confessional sense.

Because of the attitude of Parliament, Luther's writings went underground in France. So did the presses and the colporteurs. Crespin gave an account of the often forgotten men who brought Lutheran books into France. Among these colporteurs were humble artisans as well as noblemen, often paying with their lives for their dedication. Mace Moreau was burned at the stake, as were Jean Joëry, Nicolas Nail, and Denis LeVair.¹

* The first part of this article was published in *AUSS*, II (1964), 137-155. Research for both parts of this study was made possible with the support of the American Philosophical Society.

¹ Jean Crespin, *Le Livre des Martyrs* (Genève, 1554), I, 302; Daniel Lortsch, *Histoire de la Bible en France* (Genève, 1910), pp. 19-28.

François Lambert

One of the early French insurgents was François Lambert of Avignon (1486-1530), one of the few Frenchmen who went to Wittenberg. His aim was to become a French Reformer. First he translated a number of tracts, such as the *Betbüchlein*, whose rendering was attributed to Louis de Berquin. In Wittenberg he was joined, in 1523, by an obscure individual, Claudius à Touro, and the well-known nobleman Anémond de Coct. Lambert admired the University of Wittenberg, "the first in the world where erudition overflows";² he met Luther, who prefaced his *Evangelical Commentary on the Rule of the Franciscan Minors*. In writing to the Elector, Lambert reported on conditions in France: "Souls are stirred in almost all France, and without a teacher, truth has gained sincere friends."³ Giving his reason for leaving the country, he indicated that his fellow monks molested him and hid from him "those truly evangelical books of Luther." He came to Wittenberg to translate more of them and to become a diligent Bible commentator, because, "while the Word abounds in Germany, the French people are deprived of it." Lambert explained how he left the Franciscan order and shed the "pharisaical robe": "Never would I have left them (the Observantines) if I had been permitted to preserve the freedom of evangelical truth."⁴ But he gave a rather puzzling reason for coming to Wittenberg: "to preach the Scriptures to the scholars in Wittenberg."⁴ Luther failed to

² A.-L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les Pays de Langue Française* (Genève, 1871-1897), I, 122.

³ "Gallia pene omnis commota est, et absque magistro sinceros habet veritatis dilectores," *ibid.*, I, 113.

⁴ "Veni igitur Wittenbergam, ut Verbum sanctum liberet administrum, saltem inter doctos. Aliquid nostri Martini consilio exordiar, vel Oseam prophetam, vel Psalmos, vel Lucam, vel aliquid tale. Sed per Cristum obsecro, ut jubeas mihi aliquod auxilium dari," *ibid.*; also "Mais j'atteste le Seigneur, que jamais je ne les eusse quittés, si en restant au milieu d'eux, j'avais pu conserver la liberté de la vérité évangélique," *ibid.*, pp. 113, 121, 122.

be overly impressed; he wrote that the Frenchman would not last long in Wittenberg because he would soon find his equal. Later on Luther asked Spalatin to arrange for Lambert, who was poor in worldly goods, to leave Wittenberg so that he could go to Zürich, where the proximity of France would offer him a greater opportunity.

Lambert's *Somme Chrestienne*, printed in Marburg, 1529, for Charles V, when he was at the Diet of Augsburg, is one of the rare French tracts published in Germany. This French Lutheran, who deserved this title as much as any other Frenchman (in Strasbourg he was referred to as 'Dr. Welsche'), was not quite pleased with the emphasis placed on the person of Luther; he wrote to Charles V: "Sir, it is truly wrong to call some of us Lutherans, because we do not follow Luther but Jesus Christ. . . . However, we admit that God has at no time used anyone like him to reveal His holy truth."⁵ In Germany Lambert was not only under Luther's influence but also under that of Carlstadt, whose ideas are noticeable in Lambert's concepts on prophetism.

⁵ Luther to Spalatin, January 25, 1523: "Er wird nicht lang hie bleiben, acht ich wohl, denn er seins Gleichen oder Meister wohl finden wird." *Ibid.*, p. 217; also, Luther to Spalatin, August 3 and 14, 1523:

"[Gratia] et paxo Lambertus Franciscus statuit in nostris terris discedere Turægum, istic melius aliturus, et majora facturus ob vicinitatem Galliae, qui apud nos esse copiam sentit docentium," *ibid.*, pp. 145-146.

⁶ François Lambert, *Somme chrestienne, à thés victorieux Emperèur Charles, de ce nom le Cinquiesme* (Marburg, 1529); W. G. Moore, *La Réforme Allemande et la Littérature Française* (Strasbourg, 1930), pp. 72, 484. For further study see the following works of Lambert:

Christianissimi doc. Martini Lutheri et Annemündi Coctæ equitis Galli (Tübingen[?] 1523[?]); *Commentarii in Quatuor ultimos Prophetias*, 1526; *De Sacro Coniugio* (Norembergae, 1525); *The Summe of Christianitie* (London[?] 1536); *In regulam Minoritarum et contra universas sectationis sectas, Francisci Lambertii. Commentarii d'evre sevangelicis denno per ipsium recogniti*. . . (Avec une préface de Martin Luther, et une autre d'Annemündus Coctus; Argentorati, 1525) On Lambert see, J. W. Baüm, *Franz Lambert von Avignon* 150 (Strassburg, 1840); F. W. Hassencamp, *Franziscus Lambert von Avignon* (Elberfeld, 1860); ZKG, XXII (1901), 129-144.

Other French Lutherans

Guillaume Dumolin, whom we find in Wittenberg in 1525, is known especially by the preface of *Très utile Traicté du vray regne de Antechrist*. It is most interesting to find that Dumolin was the author of the first rational French statement on Luther as a person. In his *Notable et utile traicté* he attacks the Marian cult, a mark of a French Lutheran, a "shibboleth of distinction."⁷

Many shared Farel's view that "the gospel was most eagerly received in France." Pierre de Sébiville wrote, in an eloquent letter to Anémond de Coct, that the partisans of the gospel in France had almost all cooled off. He referred to another French Lutheran, Antoine Papillon, who was considered an authority on the gospel and who performed an important task: the translation of Luther's *De Votis monasticis* purposely for Marguerite. But that caused him much trouble "with the Parisian vermin"—referring, of course, to the chicaneries of the Sorbonne. But there was a hopeful sign: "There is no one today in France who is more evangelical than Madame (Marguerite) d'Alençon."⁸ For translating that little tract on monastic vows, Papillon was well rewarded by Marguerite.

Sébiville also mentioned that Marguerite was accompanied by Michel d'Arande, who preached in her court "but the purest gospel." Marguerite also arranged for Michel to preach at St. Etienne du Bourg, the capital of Berry, one of Marguerite's domains. The archbishop dared Michel to preach, threatening life imprisonment and excommunication. Marguerite wrote that there would be no change; her chaplain would preach, and thus the archbishop's interdiction was

⁷ Henri Hauser, *Etudes sur la Réforme française* (Paris, 1909), p. 41, n. 2, suggests that the one trait which marked the French Lutheran was his attitude toward the Virgin; there was an anti-marian movement in France; Jérôme de Hangest, *Adversus Antimarianos propugnaculum* (Paris, 1529); Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

⁸ Anémond de Coct to Farel, December 17, 1524, Herminjard, *op. cit.*, p. 309; "Il a translate le traicte de votis monasticis," December 28, 1524; *ibid.*, p. 314.

not in order because, she wrote, "nothing is involved here except the honor of God." What about the threat of excommunication on those who would listen? "No one," she wrote, "needs to be afraid to hear the word of God."⁹

Luther repeatedly expressed his concern about the slowness of the progress of the gospel in France. He wrote to the Duke of Savoy, Charles III, whom he urged to use his high position in favor of the evangelical cause. The Reformer advised the Duke to see that the gospel should not be a mere spark but become a flame: "Fan that divine fire that burns in you so that the House of Savoy may be consumed as well as all of France."¹⁰

If the cénacle of Meaux could not convert France, would it be done by the Lutheran Louis de Berquin, as the *Histoire ecclésiastique* indicated as possible? An admirer of Erasmus and Luther, Berquin translated some of Luther's writings, as well as those of Melanchthon and Hutten, without espousing all their ideas, but he succeeded in exposing again the ignorance of the clergy.¹¹ Suspected already in 1523 but protected by Marguerite, he was imprisoned in 1525 in the Conciergerie "because," said the contemporary *Bourgeois*, "he was a Lutheran and was punished for holding Luther's doctrine."¹² From his Madrid prison the King of France halted the proceedings. The following year, when Berquin was again apprehended, Marguerite intervened and asked Montmorency to set him free, "for I esteem it as if it were done for me."¹³

⁹ "Que nul ne craigne de ouir la parole de Dieu," *BSHPF*, LII (1903), 308-311; *ibid.*, LXX (1921), 170.

¹⁰ Luther to the duke of Savoy: "... et ardeat sanctum illud incendium Christi, immo flagret, ut vere tandem Francia possit dici ab Evangelio regnum Christianissimum quod hactenus ab impio Antichristum, propter effusionem sanguinem, officio, impie dictum est christianissimum!..." September 7, 1523; Herminjard, *op. cit.*, pp. 151-153.

¹¹ Charles d'Argentré, *De nov. error.*, I, i, XII, XIII; *BSHPF*, XXXVII (1889), 501.

¹² *Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris*, p. 278; *BSHPF*, XXX (1882), 113.

¹³ Marguerite, *Lettres, op. cit.*, I, 219.

Erasmus pleaded with Berquin, whom he called "*Mi Berquine eruditissime*," and Erasmus wrote to Marguerite soliciting her help. There are two letters from Erasmus to Marguerite, but none from her. Marguerite never followed Erasmus, whose wisdom was too rational for her taste and whose devotion was devoid of tenderness. To Marguerite, love was greater than reason. Erasmus liked clarity too much to suit either Marguerite or Lefèvre. That she was not easily impressed by Erasmus is witnessed by LeSueur's letter to Farel: "You see in her such a sincere and wise spirit that she will not easily be seduced by the artifice of the fox of whom you speak because she never has approved of his writings."¹⁴

Marguerite was at ease in the realm of the spirit and poured out her heart in sweet hymns like "A la clere fontenelle" and especially that magnificent hymn used thereafter, "Reveilles-toi Seigneur Dieu,"¹⁵ which was translated somewhat freely into English:

"Awake, O Lord God, . . .
 You want your Gospel to be preached
 In hamlet and town, in castle and hut.
 Give to your servants a heart
 That is strong and firm,
 And that with fervor and love
 They love thee unto death
 . . . that joyful death . . ." (and that was for Berquin).

¹⁴ For Erasmus' two letters see Percy Stafford Allen, *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami* (Oxford, 1906-47), VI, No. 1615 and VII, No. 1854; A. Renaudet, *Etudes erasmiennes*, (Paris, 1929), p. 65; Herminjard, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

¹⁵ Resveilles-toy, Seigneur Dieu, Donne donc a tes servants
 Fais ton effort Coeur ferme et fort
 De venger en chacun lieu Et que d'amour tous fervents
 Des tiens la mort. Ayment la mort . . .

Tu veux que ton Evangile Avance donc, Seigneur,
 Soit prêché par les tiens Ton doux support
 En chasteau bourgade et ville Leur donnant pour tout honneur
 Sans que l'on en cele riens: Joyeuse mort.

Marguerites de la Marguerite des Princesses, I (Paris, 1873), 505-508; BSHPF, XLVI (1898), 70-71.

"Berquin was jailed a third time: 'My Lord, Marguerite wrote to the King,' poor Berquin, who through your kindness was saved twice, goes now having no one to whom to cry his innocence!"¹⁶ In spite of Marguerite's pleas Berquin was condemned to die. Berquin's writings were never published, but he stood up with rare courage: "I am not a partisan of Lutheranism but I cannot agree to calumny, whoever might be the victim!"¹⁷ He was burned in 1529 on the Place de Grève in Paris.

In the opinions of some, the French Reformation failed, because, to use Augustin Thierry's argument, it did not reach the popular elements.¹⁸ Indeed, the later Huguenot movement strongly appealed to the French nobility, but during the pre-Calvin era, it was especially among the "little people," the *indochi*, the carders, weavers, and merchants, students, and cobblers, that we find the sparks of the Lutheran revolt. "Ignorant people became overnight excellent theologians."¹⁹ It was the time when, according to Erasmus, bartenders argued about the gospel. Not one of France's eleven universities endorsed Lutheranism, but the agitation gained the public places, as well as intellectuals and princes. The first Lutheran victims were not in Germany but in Brussels—Henry Vos and Johann Esch—and Jean Leclerc in France.

A carder was martyred in Metz, and so was Jean Vallière; Jacques Pauvan was arrested and burned in 1525 on the Place de Grève in Paris.²⁰ The movement in its inception had its

¹⁶ Marguerite, *Lettres*, II, 96, 97.

¹⁷ On the proceedings by Parliament against Berquin see Charles d'Argentré, *op. cit.*, IV, 406; Charles Marie G. B. Jourdain, *Index chronologique chartulaire pertinentium ad historiam Universitatis Parisiensis* (Parisius, [n.d.]), p. 329.

¹⁸ Albert Autin, *L'échec de la Réforme en France au XVII^e siècle* (Toulon, 1917), p. 133.

¹⁹ Hans H. Peters, "Luthers Einfluss und deutsche Lutheraner in Frankreich während des 16^{ten} Jahrhunderts," *Auslanddeutschtum und evangelische Kirche*, (1936), p. 236.

²⁰ François Lambert to Frederic of Saxony, March, 1525; Herminjard, *op. cit.*, pp. 344-347.

martyrs before it had its theologians, in a time when "it was almost improper for a Christian to die in his bed."²¹

Luther's books brought consolation to some but confused others; the anonymous Paris *Bourgeois* called him "a maker of books," and deplored the damaging debate on the Real Presence. "I have never believed it," wrote Farel, "but the progress of the gospel in France is hindered by our divergences and also by the reading of the first books of Luther which, to a certain extent, endorse the adoration of saints and purgatory."²² Opposition also arose from former sympathizers, most intelligent among whom was Josse Clichtove of Flanders, a former disciple of Lefèvre, and Cousturier.²³ Among the literati who were drawn to the turmoil and were affected by new ideas, we might recall that Marot, who was in Marguerite's service, was the gifted translator of the Psalms into French. Lutheranism was no issue to him, but both Catholics and Lutherans suspected him of heresy. He was jailed in the Châtelet prison, not because of subversive ideas, but because he ate lard during Lent! As he was pursued from place to place until he found asylum in Marguerite's court, he wrote that he was neither a Lutheran, much less a Baptist, but God's alone.²⁴

²¹ Ferdinand Buisson, *Sébastien Castellion* (Paris, 1892), I, 86; Jules Bonnet, *Aonio Paleario* (Paris, 1862), p. 171.

²² Farel to Jean Pomeranus, October 8, 1525, Herminjard, *op. cit.*, pp. 393-398: "In qua re versores librorum Martini male fratribus consulunt, qui priora ejus opera, in quibus nonnihil Sanctorum invocationi et Purgatorio defertur, non repurgant."

²³ On Clichtove, *ibid.*, p. 238: "*Clichtoveus olim noster*" (Roussel to Farel). Beside Clichtove, there were other opponents such as Cousturier; Lucien Febvre, "Une question mal posée. . .," *Revue Historique*, CLXI (1929), 48, n.2.

²⁴ Point ne suis Lutheriste
Ne Zwinglien, et moins Anabaptiste.
Je suis de Dieu par son fils Jesuchrist.

Oeuvres de Clément Marot (Paris, 1875), I, 153; Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 181. On other poets, see V. L. Saulnier, "Maurice Scève, Et. de Bourget Tabourot," *Bibl. d'Human. et Renaiss.*, XIX (1957), 252-265.

Marguerite a Lutheran?

Did Marguerite read Luther's books? It is not difficult to establish that she kept in close touch with the Lutheran writings before 1530. Her correspondence with Bishop Briçonnet is, of course, well known. That correspondence, partly published by Becker, began in 1521 and lasted for at least three years. Moore conjectured that the correspondence was vividly reminiscent of the "Babylonish captivity."²⁵ (It is true that the mystic language of both Marguerite and the Bishop are suggestive of Luther's expressions.) The letter by Sébiville, already mentioned, indicated that Marguerite had received Luther's tract on monastic vows through Pappillon. In 1524, she finished writing the *Dialogue en forme de vision nocturne*, her most dogmatic writing, advocating salvation by grace alone. Soon after her trip to Madrid, where her brother was imprisoned after the defeat at Pavia in 1525, Gerbel informed Luther that Marguerite regularly received Luther's writings through Count Sigismond of Hohenlohe in Strasbourg, that "new Jerusalem."²⁶

Marguerite read Luther's books most assiduously in 1527 and 1528, keeping in touch with the Evangelicals in Strasbourg. Besides Hohenlohe, she corresponded with others, especially Bucer and Capito; the latter dedicated to her his commentary on Hosea.²⁷ Simon du Bois, the publisher of Luther's translated works in France, also published Marguerite's *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* (1531), together with the

²⁵ P. A. Becker, "Marguerite Duchesse d'Alençon et Guillaume Briçonnet Evêque de Meaux, d'après leur correspondance manuscrite, 1521-1524," *BSHPF*, XLIX (1900), 393-477, 661-667.

²⁶ Marguerite d'Angoulême, *Lettres* (Paris, 1841), pp. 180, 211, 215, 466. On Strasbourg, see L. Febvre, "La France et Strasbourg au XVI^e siècle. Un bilan," *La Vie en Alsace* (Strasbourg, 1925), pp. 239ff; (1926), 32ff; F. Wendel, "Le rôle de Strasbourg dans la Réforme française," *L'Alsace Française*, X (1930), 1, 20ff.

²⁷ Martin Bucer to Luther, August 25, 1530: "Nam *Rex à veritate alienus non est*, et, jam recuperatis liberis, non adeò à *Pontifice et Caesare*, hac quidem in cause, pendeat. Tum nunquam suo officio deest Christianissima illa heroina *Regis soror*..." Herminjard, *op. cit.*, II, 271.

Penitential Psalms, the *Psalter*, and the *Dialogue*. The year 1533 marked the peak of Marguerite's evangelical interest: Roussel, Courault, and Bertault preached the greatly advertised sermons of that year in the Louvre. The *Miroir* of Marguerite was reedited, and the wrath of the Sorbonne, against her in particular and the new movement in general, was at its height.

Not only did Marguerite read Luther, but she translated Luther's *Pater Noster*, published as a transposition of the *Salve Regina*.²⁸ Already in 1525 Sebaldus Heyden, a well-known Nuremberg teacher and musician, had transposed the *Salve Regina* to Christ (*Salve Jesu Christe*).²⁹ This same prayer appeared in Farel's 1534 edition of the *Summaire*, and from that prayer is derived the beautiful first hymn of French Protestantism, of which Marguerite was most likely the author: "Je te salue mon certain Rédempteur."

Two Reformation specialists insist that Luther's influence on Marguerite was important: (1) Abel Lefranc, who qualifies her without reservation a Lutheran, and (2) Henri Strohl, who sees in all of her poems Luther's basic teachings. W. G. Moore also, who has carefully examined the texts of the *Dialogue* of 1524 and the *Miroir*, has pointed to the striking similarities between Marguerite's and Luther's writings. Like Marguerite, Luther constantly used the marriage relationship as a symbol of the intimacy between God and the soul—the crowning work of faith being the union of God with the soul of man—and Marguerite mentions it in the very title. Luther's contempt for works is of course noticeable in Marguerite's "You may pray the *Pater* as often as you wish,"³⁰ and

²⁸ Marguerite de Navarre, *Le Pater Noster fait en translation et dialogue par la Roynne de Navarre* (Paris, 1896); *Revue de la Renaissance*, IV (1904).

²⁹ Sebaldus Heyden, *Unum Christum Mediatorem esse et advocatum nostrum apud patrem non matrem ejus, neque divos...* (Genève, 1525).

³⁰ Vous avez beau dire Paternostre,
Ouir vepres, matines ou prou messes,
Peu de bien est-ce-que dehors se montre...

the "Pauline" accent, which clearly appears in the *Miroir*. It is difficult to define Marguerite's religious outlook. She has been called Lutheran, Catholic, Calvinist, spiritual, skeptical, libertine, evangelical, mystic, hypocritical. "Mystic" seems to be a frequent and acceptable designation. She was drawn to the Neo-Platonic notions of Ficino, (Bessarion) and Plethon. Similar views expressed by Pico, Bembo, and Castiglione, had a marked influence on Marguerite.³¹ The Ficino type of love was coined by Pelletier du Mans as the "philosophy of France," an antidote to Lucretius and Pomponazzi, and was a type of Platonism feared by Calvin, who saw among the Nicodemites "many cultured people who were attracted by the philosophy of Plato but were not interested in reforming the church."³²

From the outset Marguerite tried every system to find out for herself what was taught and believed.³³ Her interest in the Protestant trends lasted until about 1536. After the affair of the *Miroir*, it says the *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, she acted differently and plunged deeply into idolatry, like the rest. Bayle wrote that, after 1533, "she behaved in a manner which the Calvinists highly condemned."³⁴ Before that time, she belonged to almost every group, according to her biographers. She always was a Lutheran, it thinks Jacob. No, says Doumic, she was a Catholic, that faith which was

Dialogue en forme de Vision nocturne entre tres noble et excellente princesse Marguerite de France, Soeur unique de nostre Roy nostre Sire et l'âme de defuncte Madame Charlotte de France (Paris, 1568). It appeared first, 1533, together with the second edition of the *Miroir*, but it was written in 1524, the first of Marguerite's religious writings;

Lucien Febvre, *Autour de l'Heptaméron* (Paris, 1944), pp. 140-42; Moore, *op. cit.*, pp. 187 ff. et seq.

³¹ André Marie Jean Festugière, *La philosophie de l'amour de Marsile Ficin et son influence sur la littérature française au XVI^e siècle* (Paris, 1941), pp. 3, 413.

³² *Ioannis Calvinis opera quae supersunt omnia*, VI, col. 6007.

³³ Pierre Jourda, *Marguerite d'Angoulême, Duchesse d'Alençon Reine de Navarre* (Thèse; Paris, 1930), I, 48.

³⁴ *Hist. Ecclés.*, I, 36; Pierre Bayle, *Dict. hist. et crit.* (Rotterdam, 1697), III, 468.

always hers." "On the contrary," writes Faguet, "she is permeated with Calvinistic thought."³⁵ Some (Hyrsoix) accuse her of hypocrisy because of her "hatred for the Catholic church." A clever formula is Doumergue's: "She thought as a Protestant but acted like a Catholic."³⁶ Brunetière saw neither a Catholic nor a Protestant in her—she merely belonged to the group of Rabelais and Marot. If she must be confined to a sect it would be that of the Spiritual Libertines. And Doumic calls her an insoluble case: "She was a woman," he said, "and you can't expect her to be logical."³⁷ And thus we could multiply the quotations, of which Jourda has made a very careful inventory.³⁸

Abel Lefranc was of the opinion that she was a Protestant. The distinguished publisher of her last poems saw in her *Dialogue* of 1524 her first literary and evangelical statement where she affirms that salvation is in Christ alone, that man cannot cooperate, and that grace is a gift of the Creator. The *Oraison de l'âme fidèle* discusses predestination; *Le triomphe de l'Agneau* depicts Christ's victory over the law. Lefranc was convinced that the *Miroir* was more revolutionary still. It does reveal a type of Paulinism—but revolutionary? Hardly. At the same time, Marguerite in that writing does not entirely reject the intervention of the saints or the efficacy of the sacraments. But it is undeniable that her spiritual songs have a Protestant accent. The spiritual song which she perfected is her contribution to militant Protestantism. What Lefranc saw in the *Comédie jouée au Mont-de Marsan* was her condemnation of sensualism and Catholic bigotry.³⁹ Her definition

³⁵ "A mesure qu'elle se sent près du terme de son existence, elle adhère de toutes ses forces aux dogmes de la foi catholique qui a toujours été la sienne," *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, June 15, 1896, and: "... plus on ira et plus il faudra expliquer les parties les plus élevées de Marguerite de Valois par le Calvinisme..." *Cosmopolis* (April, 1896), p. 177.

³⁶ Emile Doumergue, *Jean Calvin* (Lausanne, 1899), I, 406, 415.

³⁷ *Revue des Deux-Mondes* (1896); *ibid.*, (15 Juin, 1936).

³⁸ Pierre Jourda, *op. cit.*, p. 1032.

³⁹ Abel Lefranc, *Les Idées Religieuses de Marguerite*, (Paris, 1898),

of love, the "philosophy of France," is quite similar to that of the antinomian sect of the Spiritual Libertines.

Sometimes her ideas were conflicting. On the one hand she referred to "the elect whom God was pleased to choose" and hoped that she was "deserving to be predestinated." On the other, she saw free will as a basic element in man's redemption. While Protestants have claimed her as their own, the Catholics have done the same. Vergerio, Contarini's disciple, marveled at the spirit of the Queen of Navarre, and compared her to Vittoria Colonna, Renata, and Leonora Gonzaga. Those who saw in Marguerite a Catholic referred to the fact that she received the Eucharist at Madrid, where her brother, King Francis I, was jailed, and she took communion at the bedside of her mother. All this, in her friends' eyes, was a mere gesture: her receiving the extreme unction, praying often before a crucifix, etc. But Aleander thought that she was won over to the new ideas, though she remained always on excellent terms with the pope.

Marguerite's Mystic Nostalgia

Let us have another look at the cénacle of Meaux, where Bishop G. Briçonnet had gathered several men who were under the spiritual influence of Lefèvre and whose aim was to reform the clergy. These men were suspected of héresy for having published the New Testament in French, and the *Psalter*.⁴⁰ The anonymous *Bourgeois* wrote that "it is to be noted that Meaux was infested by the false doctrine of Luther." Off and on, there were Farel, Mazurier, F. Vatable, the Hebrew scholar, and Caroli, with whom Calvin was to have so much trouble, and Michel d'Arande, a little-known Augustinian hermit.⁴¹ Marguerite wrote to Briçonnet of her hunger "for

p. 27; Lefranc, *Mélanges* (Paris, 1936). The *Comédie* was written Jan.-Feb., 1548, a year before her death.

⁴⁰ Lefèvre to Farel, July 6, 1524, Herminjard, *op. cit.*, I, 219.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 41, n.; M. Bataillon, *Erasmus et l'Espagne* (Paris, 1937),

bread, even if it were a few crumbs"; she compared herself to a lost sheep in a foreign land. "I come to you and Mr. Fabry and the other gentlemen begging for alms," she wrote, requesting also to be granted "an alarm clock" to be awakened from her heavy and mortal slumber "since the time has come . . ."⁴² Marguerite, a victim of spiritual nostalgia, used that mystic jargon, "sublime galimatias" as Michélet called it, but promised that she would be their mouthpiece at the court. "Oh yes," wrote Briçonnet, "give the Lord that little heart liberally, entirely," asking her to intercede with the members of the royal household, like Ste. Cécile, who won her husband and brother.⁴³ And it seemed to succeed, for Marguerite informed Briçonnet: "The King and Madame have decided, yesterday, that they will have it known that God's truth is no heresy."⁴⁴ But that was in 1521.

By 1524 Briçonnet too was suspected of Lutheranism, and he renounced hurriedly and in profuse terms what he was accused of. Briçonnet said that since "almost the whole earth is filled with his (Luther's) books, and since the masses easily fall for new things, and were seduced by the liveliness of his style, [and] could be caught by the false and imaginary liberty which he preaches! . . . for this reason . . . we deem it

p. 536. In a "Lutheran" song there is an allusion to Michel and Marguerite:

Vostre erreur creust jusques a leon

Soubz'une simple courtoisie

Michelot et [en ?] faisoit leçon
Dieu scet de quelle theologie;

Ms. No. 15939 in the Library of the *Société de l'hist. du Protest. franç.*

⁴² Marguerite to Briçonnet, February 9, 1524: "Vous priant par vos oraisons impétrer de l'indicible misericorde *ung reveille-matin* pour la pauvre endormie, afin qu'elle se lève de son pesant et mortel somme, *puisque l'heure est venue* . . . Et voyant de toutes ces choses en moy trop de default, *je retourne a vous et a Monsieur Fabry et tous voz sieurs*, vous requerant l'aumosne . . ." Herminjard, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

⁴³ "Soiez. la bonne sainte Cécile, qui gaigne mary, frères, et plusieurs aultres . . ." Briçonnet to Marguerite, November 11, 1521, *ibid.*, 478; *Rev. de théol. et de quest. relig.* (Montauban, 1900), 300.

⁴⁴ Herminjard, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

our duty to eradicate it entirely." 45 And he warned the clergy that "in these last days" there would be some who deny the existence of purgatory and the invocation of saints. But among those affected by his decree was his respected master, Lefèvre. Furthermore, while Briçonnet anathematized Luther, he kept on showing the greatest esteem for Oecolompadius, and sought and followed the advice of Bucer.

The best known of Marguerite's religious writings is the *Mirror of the Sinful Soul*. The title was not original. A number of *Mirrors* were written before (see the Hultemiana collection at Brussels): *Miroir des dames*, *Miroir of Ruybroeck*, and Reuchlin's *Augenspiegel*. Marguerite's *Miroir* is biblical and essentially Pauline. Florimond lamented: "Alas, while King Francis works to protect the kingdom against the floods of the Rhine, the Queen of Navarre is endeavoring to break the dikes and to open the sluices." Florimond further stated:

"It is the Queen of Navarre who maintains in France the disciples of Luther. She alone placed them in schools. She alone watches with marvelous care and keeps them from all harm."

The Sorbonne resented Marguerite's insistence on justification as expressed in the *Miroir*. Bédé especially was furious. Now at last he had a proof of heresy: Marguerite was accused of not mentioning the saints, meritorious works, purgatory, and of replacing the *Salve Regina* by a "Salutation to Christ."

The furor about Marguerite's *Miroir* caused Cordelier monk to suggest that she be thrown into the Seine river. Marguerite was hard pressed, and many like the unrelenting Montmoréncy tried to discredit her at court. But Francis I

45 See various letters by Briçonnet to a) "Aux fidèles de son diocèse" and b) "Au clergé de son diocèse," Herminjard, *op. cit.*, pp. 153-158, 320; Doumergue, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

46 Florimond de Raemond, *Histoire de la naissance de l'hérésie*, (Rouen, 1629), pp. 847, 848.

was not impressed. "Let's forget about her," the king said, "she loves me too much. She will never believe other than what I believe and never will she endorse a religion that would cause prejudice to my state."⁴⁷

A play by the students at the College of Navarre exposed her and Roussel to public ridicule. Eventually Marguerite lived through the crisis. The monk who had suggested that she be thrown into the river was to undergo the ordeal himself, but she intervened in his favor. The authors and players of the comedy were punished. As for the *Miroir*, the King's confessor, Guillaume Petit, stated: "They take up arms against an excellent woman who is at the same time protector and mother of all virtues." Most conspicuous of all was the fact that the prosecuting theologians had not even read the book. Beda was jailed. The *Miroir* was taken off the list of forbidden books. Nicolas Cop, son of the king's physician and brother of Jean, another "novator," gathered the Faculties to report to the king that Marguerite's book had been neither attacked nor even read, and the Bishop of Senlis said he found only good things in this book unless he had forgotten all his theology.⁴⁸

From a Catholic viewpoint the *Miroir* was unorthodox. Although Marguerite still could not disentangle herself from the mystic jargon which she used in corresponding with Briçonnet, the idea was clear: she applied to her spiritual life the notion of gratuitous justification, undeserved and sufficient.

To sum up—but how dangerous it is to conclude! On the question that is still debated: was Marguerite a Protestant, a Lutheran? we attempt to say: *No*, if by Protestantism is meant a rigidly defined doctrine, be it Lutheran or Calvinistic; *Yes*, if by Protestantism we mean an effort at renewing church

⁴⁷ Pierre de Bourdeille, abbé de Brantôme, *Oeuvres* (Paris, 1864-82), VIII, 216.

⁴⁸ Jean Calvin, *Opera . . .* (ed., Baum, Cunitz, and Reuss; Brunsvigae, 1863-1900) I, 27-30.

and society, belief in salvation by grace as advocated by Lefèvre, and reaching directly out to God in mystic fashion. Marguerite's religious attitude is incomprehensible, if she is to be hemmed into a confessional system; but it is simple if we consider her thirst for knowledge and love, and her unconcern as to who would quench her thirst. We cannot see her in the Lutheran fold any more than we can make a chauvinistic Frenchman out of Lefèvre for the sake of accommodating a modern historical conception. While Lefèvre did greatly influence his generation by his *Commentaries*, we do not overlook Luther's influence in France, where some of his ideas coincided with those of Lefèvre and Marguerite. Had Luther been endowed with a gift or concern for proselytism like Calvin's, a firmer basis might have been established in France.

Intellectually independent, yet easily influenced, Marguerite was not impressed by the stiff inexorableness of existing orthodoxy: "My religion is based on James' words: to my God a heart sound and clean, and to my fellowmen the power to do good." This charming and gifted mother of the French Renaissance was, to paraphrase Ronsard's lyrical expression, the most beautiful flower ever born on a golden morning.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ The two last lines in Ronsard's "Ode Pastorale" are:

"... La plus belle fleur d'eslite
Qu'oncques l'aurore enfanta."

Marguerites de la Marguerite des Princesses, I, 23.

THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF MAN: II ¹

JEAN R. ZURCHER

Séminaire Adventiste du Salève, Collonges-sous-Salève
(Haute Savoie), France

II. Ethical and Religious Notions of Anthropology

If Biblical anthropology can give us an image of man which far surpasses the conclusions that may be drawn from ordinary experience, it is because it refuses to know man other than in his individual and collective history. Man is, for it, a historical being, and his image must bear strongly the mark of his historical specificity. Moreover, his personality has existence only through his relationship with others and especially through his relationship with God. Man without God does not exist and consequently he could not become an object of knowledge. The existence of man is made effective only by and *in confronting* God. That is why it can be said that Biblical anthropology is always and primarily a reference to God. "Man does not know himself truly except as he knows himself confronted by God. Only in that confrontation does he become aware of his full stature and freedom and of the evil in him." ²

1. *Man as Creature or the Notion of Dependence.* If, then, the bond which unites man with God is the basis of Biblical anthropology, the first characteristic of this relationship is expressed in the double affirmation, man is a *creature*, God is his *Creator*.

In fact, the entire creation has for its objective this position of God vis-à-vis man. This irreversible rapport between the Creator and the creature is the unique motif of all the move-

¹ The first part of this article was published in *AUSS*, II (1964), 156-168.

² Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (New York, 1941), I, 131.

ment of the world. Desiring a witness to his work, God speaks to himself and decides on the creation of man: "Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness." And Genesis adds, "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."³

The entire Bible echoes this fundamental declaration of the creation of man, and in this it opposes itself once more to the most widespread anthropological concepts of antiquity as well as of modern times. Certainly, as Karl Barth has said so well, "Natural science may be our occupation with its view of development; it may tell us the tale of the millions of years in which the cosmic process has gone on; but when could natural science have ever penetrated to the fact that there is one world which runs through this development? Continuation is quite a different thing from this sheer beginning, with which the concept of creation and the Creator has to do."⁴

Limited to our anthropological point of view, these concepts establish in the first instance, the absolute dependence of man vis-à-vis God. The existence of the creature beside the Creator is possible only through an uninterrupted participation in Being. Not only is it true that "all things were created by him, and for him," but "by him all things consist." "In Him we live and move and have our being."⁵ Creation signifies here that while there exists a reality different from God, it does not exist in itself, but only through God. This different reality is thus not autonomous; it cannot be God any more than it can exist without God. In other words, there is not on one side the creature and on the other the Creator, as two independent realities, the world and God, as if there were two kingdoms, two separate worlds. We have here neither pantheistic monism nor cosmological dualism.

³ Gn 1 : 27.

⁴ Karl Barth, *Dogmatics in Outline* (New York, 1959), p. 51.

⁵ Col. 1 : 16, 17; Acts 17 : 28.

“What God does not grudge the world is creaturely reality, a creaturely nature and creaturely freedom, an existence appropriate to the creation, the world. The world is no appearance, it exists, but it exists by way of creation. It can, it may exist alongside of God, by God’s agency. Creaturely reality means reality on the basis of a *creatio ex nihilo*, a creation out of nothing. Where nothing exists—and not a kind of primal matter—there through God there has come into existence that which is distinct from Him. And since there is now something, since we exist because of divine grace, we must never forget that, as the basis of our existence and of the existence of the whole world, there is in the background that divine—not just *facere*, but—creation. Everything outside God is held constant by God over nothingness. Creaturely nature means existence in time and space, existence with a beginning and an end, existence that becomes, in order to pass away again.”⁶

The Biblical notion of creation then is not a simple theoretical question; it is a question of existence. The creature exists only by the good will of the Creator. The life of man depends on the grace of Him who has created the world and who maintains its life. If the authors of the Bible return constantly to the activity of the Creator, it is in order to emphasize more strongly the omnipotence of God and the absolute dependency of man.⁷ For them it is less a question of recalling the original event, the first beginning of man, than to establish the fact of his existing only to the extent that God wills it. These continual allusions to God the Creator develop to the maximum our consciousness of being only a *creature*, that is to say, a being continually menaced by the possibility—excluded by God and by God alone—of *nothingness* and of *ruin*. This possibility, on the other hand, depends entirely on the free decision of the creature, and on it alone.

The absolute dependence of the creature in relation to the

⁶ Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

⁷ Ps 33 : 8; 103 : 14 = Job 10 : 9; 33 : 6; Ps 139 : 13-16.

Creator emphasizes without doubt the smallness of man and his state of perpetual grace, but does not imply thereby a notion of imperfection, of weakness, even of sin, as is so often believed under the influence of dualistic philosophy. According to the Bible, the creature, no more than the creation, is evil, because he is not God, or simply because he is distinct from God. The finite world, dependent and contingent, is not evil because of its finitude, of its dependence or of its contingency. In the same way, man is not a fallen being because of his state of creatureliness. On the contrary, the Bible affirms expressly and emphatically that the entire creation is good because of the fact that it is of God: "God saw all that he had made; and behold it was very good." For all that God had created is good." "His work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he." But as for men, if they are corrupt it is not the fault of God, the shame is to his children. For "God has made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." ⁸

According to the Bible, the principle of evil is not in the fact of creation, or of not being God; this is why, moreover, evil did not originally exist. Karl Barth affirms: "This whole realm that we term evil—death, sin, the Devil and hell—is *not* God's creation, but rather what was excluded by God's creation, that to which God has said 'No.' And if there is a reality of evil, it can only be the reality of this excluded and repudiated thing, the reality behind God's back, which He passed over, when He made the world and made it good.

⁸ Gn 1 : 31, 10, 12, 18, 21, 26; 1 Ti 4 : 4; Dt 32 : 4, 5; Ec 7 : 29.

"The whole Biblical interpretation of life and history rests upon the assumption that the created world, the world of finite, dependent and contingent existence, is not evil by reason of its finiteness . . . Nevertheless Christianity has never been completely without some understanding of the genius of its own faith that the world is not evil because it is temporal, that the body is not the source of sin in man, that individuality as separate and particular existence is not evil by reason of being distinguished from undifferentiated totality, and that death is not evil though it is an occasion for evil, namely the fear of death." Niebuhr, *op. cit.* p. 167; cf. *idem.*, p. 169.

'And God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good.' What is not good God did not make; it has no creaturely existence. But if being is to be ascribed to it at all, and we would rather not say that it is non-existent, then it is only the power of the being which arises out of the weight of the divine 'No.'" ⁹

The Bible clearly shows that evil appears in the universe and in the world only with the desire of the creature to wish to be self-sufficient and to realize its being independently of Being, as if the creature could exist separated from the Creator. In other words, the sin of man resides essentially in this pernicious and perpetually renewed temptation to make himself "God" rather than being willing to be only a creature "in the image of God." "The real evil," declares Reinhold Niebuhr, "in the human situation, according to the prophetic interpretation, lies in man's unwillingness to recognize and acknowledge the weakness, finiteness and dependence of his position, in his inclination to grasp after a power and security which transcend the possibilities of human existence, and in his effort to pretend a virtue and knowledge which are beyond the limits of mere creatures." ¹⁰

However, this may be, the simple possibility of the creature's being able to break the very order of creation presupposes that man, inasmuch as he is a creature of God, has received a power of individualization which permits him to think and act freely, whether in accord with the will of the Creator, or contrary to this will. This is what the story of the creation of man indicates: after having affirmed first of all that he is a creature, it points out: "God created man *in his own image, in the image of God* created he him." ¹¹

2. *Man as the Image of God or the Notion of Freedom.* To the idea of man's nature as creature, the story of creation thus adds a complementary notion: that of his being in the

⁹ Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

¹⁰ Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

¹¹ Gn 1 : 27.

image of God. The first term marks the fundamental distinction between the creature and the Creator, while the second emphasizes, on the contrary, that which God and man have in common between them.

Although this concept of *image* and of *likeness* of God is found explicitly only in Genesis,¹² the teaching of the Old Testament on the subject of man always implies it. The New Testament repeats it a number of times,¹³ and these allusions make its comprehension easier; for although the sense of the expression appears clear, it has been a subject of discussion by theologians for centuries. A great number of them think that the Hebrew terms *šelem*, "image," and *d'emût*, "likeness," designate the spiritual or moral functions of man: perfection, freedom, reason, etc.; others see in them one of the constitutive substances of human nature: the immortal soul or the divine in man; while still others, on the contrary, think that these terms relate to psycho-physical nature, since in the Bible they designate regularly an exterior physical appearance, a plastic image, effigy or statue.¹⁴

In our opinion, with the exception of those interpretations influenced by dualistic philosophy, these divergences are more apparent than real. For us, physical representation is always the expression of a corresponding psychological reality. If then the exterior aspect of man is "in the image" of the Creator, this is due to some superior power in man which not only distinguishes him from the rest of creatures, but also causes him to exist in the "likeness of God." A careful examination of the text in Genesis, moreover, confirms this point of view. If man is created "in the image of God," this signifies, first of all, that he is the representative of God on earth. In all the ancient Orient, an image was a manifestation, and a sort of incarnation of that which it represented. Thus the image of a god or of a sovereign expressed his real presence

¹² Gn 1 : 26, 27; 5 : 1, 3; 9 : 6.

¹³ Jas 3 : 9; 1 Cor 11 : 7; Eph 4 : 24; Col 3 : 10.

¹⁴ Cf. Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, pp. 152 ff.; p. 153, n. 4.

and his dominion over the place where it was set up. Accordingly, man must exercise his function of representation by ruling the world in general, and the animal world in particular. This is precisely what the text specifies: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeped upon the earth."¹⁵ In this sense, on earth man is "the image and glory of God,"¹⁶ to use Paul's expression.

But if the Creator could give man "dominion over the works of [his] hands," if he has "put all things under his feet" according to Psalm 8, which is certainly our best commentary on the theme of the image of God, this is in relation to the clearly indicated fact that "Thou hast made him a little lower than God, and hast crowned him with glory and honour."¹⁷ Referring to this text, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews shows that there is a direct relation between the dominion of man and his moral behavior in regard to his Creator. "Likeness of God" is a function of moral perfection, of a certain state of holiness which in its turn depends on obedience freely committed to the divine will.¹⁸ Man can be the representative of God on earth only to the extent that his bonds with the Creator are renewed "in knowledge after the image of him that created him."¹⁹ The being of man is not only a question of existence; it depends also on the knowledge of God. Life eternal is "that they might know thee the only true God."²⁰ And this knowledge of God implies the consent of man, a free decision of a creature.

Not only does God confer the privilege of being on that which is not himself, in giving to him a characteristic reality, a nature, but also he gives the human creature a power,

¹⁵ Gn 1 : 26.

¹⁶ I Cor 11 : 7.

¹⁷ Ps 8 : 6, 7.

¹⁸ Heb 2 : 6-11.

¹⁹ Col. 3 : 10.

²⁰ Jn 17 : 3.

similar to that of the Creator, which permits him to think and to act, to accept or to refuse Being. This is what it means to have been created in the likeness of God. Man created in the image of God is free, with an absolute freedom in the sense that his life and death no longer depend on the Creator, but on his own free decision. Access to "the tree of life" depends simply on his good pleasure to will to recognize God as Creator and his own nature as creature, or on his decision to dispense with God and to be himself "as God." On this major decision depends at the same time the existence of man and of the entire human reality in all its manifestations. For in truth, the liberty God gives to the creature in creating him in his image, in his likeness, means there exists a contingency, a possibility of action by the creature, a freedom of decision, a power of being.

Karl Barth remarks, "But this freedom can only be the freedom appropriate to the creature, which possesses its reality not of itself, and which has its nature in time and space. Since it is real freedom, it is established and limited by the subjection to law, which prevails in the universe and is again and again discernible; it is limited by the existence of its fellow creatures, and on the other hand by the sovereignty of God. For if we are free, it is only because our Creator is the infinitely free. All human freedom is but an imperfect mirroring of the divine freedom." ²¹

Let us note, in any case, that the freedom of choice God has given man is not that of choosing between good and evil, as too often is concluded from the story of the two trees in the Garden of Eden. The freedom of the creature as God conceived it originally consists essentially in knowing "to refuse the evil, and choose the good." ²² Barth acutely remarks, "Man is not made to be Hercules at the cross-roads. Evil does not lie in the possibilities of the God-created creature. Freedom to decide means freedom to decide towards the Only One

²¹ Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

²² Is 7 : 15.

for whom God's creature can decide, for the affirmation of Him who has created it, for the accomplishment of His will; that is, for obedience. But we have to do with freedom to decide. And here too danger threatens. Should it happen that the creature makes a different use of his freedom than the only possible one, should he want to sin—that is, to 'sunder' himself from God and from himself—what else can happen than that, entered into contradiction to God's will, he is bound to fall by his disobedience."²³

Now, this is precisely the meaning of the dramatic recital of the Fall, as it is related for us in Genesis. Some think of it as a myth, a legend or a parable; but call it what you will, to deny its historical reality is to renounce any desire to comprehend the nature of man as it is daily manifested with increasing evidence. Existentialist writers have described it with loyalty and precision, at times even with brutality and cynicism. This human reality is composed of misery, anguish, contradictions, vanities, a reality which the Bible very simply calls a *carnal* nature, because it is controlled by sin. And this affirmation constitutes precisely the third characteristic of Biblical anthropology, which after having declared man to be a creature, but a creature in the image of God, presents him to us finally as a sinful man.

3. *Man as Sinner or the Notion of "Sarx."* Man could be nothing else than a creature; the fact of being a creature in the image of God is then a particular privilege. Now this privileged situation of man, participating at the same time in the determinism of Nature and in the freedom of God, necessarily constitutes a problem. This is resolved by the Creator, but the solution must also be freely entered into by the creature. Being thus at once both free and bound, man is tempted wrongly to interpret his privileged situation. The danger, the only one, is that man may forget that he is only a creature, that he derives everything from his Creator, that he has every freedom, save that of dispensing with God, every

²³ Barth, *loc. cit.*

position except that of God. For even if God had made man a god, he would not have remained less a creature. The absolute danger is that man himself may wish to attribute something to himself, that he may seek to become his own end. The mortal danger is that man may touch the forbidden fruit of the tree of good and evil, that is that he may transgress the limits of creaturely condition and desire to become more than a creature.

These are exactly the terms in which the problem is found presented in the story of Genesis. The text specifies that God, in His goodness, had clearly traced the boundaries, established the conditions of life and warned man of the danger that he would have if he willed to change the order of Creation. The permanent presence of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, marking the boundary between man and God, must permanently remind him of the necessity of God and the absolute condition of his freedom.²⁴

We do not know whether or not man by himself would have transgressed the order of God. For the false interpretation he has of his situation at a given moment, which becomes the source of temptation with inevitable consequences, is truly not the product of human imagination. It is suggested to man by a celestial being represented by the serpent, whose experience of evil precedes the creation of man.²⁵ It is not relevant here to probe into that which the apostle Paul calls "the mystery of iniquity."²⁶ Although theological explanations of it are infinitely varied, there can be no doubt that the Fall with its universal consequences constitutes a fundamental premise of Biblical teaching regarding the nature of man. It is certainly possible to give many names to the often contradictory powers which act in us, but it is impossible to deny them. Every sane psychology is forced to admit that the choice of the conscience is not determined alone by

²⁴ Gn 2 : 15-17.

²⁵ Gn 3 : 22; Jn 8 : 44; 1 Jn 3 : 8; Is 14 : 12-15; Eze 28 : 11-19.

²⁶ 2 Th 2 : 7.

value judgment, but that there are also forces active contrary to these very values.

The experience of evil is universal and the result of the first sin manifests itself in the life of every man. Often without knowing its origin, pagan writers have described the effects of it in a language strangely similar to that of the apostle Paul. Plautus, for example, makes one of his characters say: "I knew how I ought to be, but miserable person that I am, I could not do it." The Latin poet Ovid wrote: "Desire counsels one thing, reason another." "What is it then," cries Seneca, "which when we lean to one side, pulls to the other?" And Epictetus affirms, "He who sins does not do what he wills to do and does what he does not will." Thus, men have ever identified in themselves this duality between good tendencies and evil, and after the fashion of Paul have experienced human powerlessness to accomplish the good. "What I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that I do." "This duplicity of man is so evident," writes Pascal, "that there are those who have thought that we have two souls. A simple subject appears to them incapable of so great and so sudden varieties of unbounded presumption." This is probably what led Plato, and after him all the dualistic philosophers, to believe that the conflict is between soul and body, whereas Christian psychology teaches us that the conflict exists in the conscience between "the law of the mind," powerless in itself, and "the law of sin," to which we are captive. On this view, the present situation of natural man is no longer that of a being absolutely free to choose between the forces which solicit him, for this choice has been made in the course of his history contrary to his nature.

In yielding to the foreign power which solicited him, man from the beginning set himself in a direction contrary to God. Having failed to recognize his true existence as creature, he has sought life where it is not to be found. So doing, he has directed his being contrary to the order of creation. In disobeying the law of God, he has become a slave of the law of

sin, for one is always the slave of that which has conquered him.²⁷ His power of self-direction is alienated to the power of sin, and because of the solidarity of the human species, all humanity was involved by the choice of the first man. For, "as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned . . ." ²⁸

Commenting on Romans 7, on the present situation of man as he is subject to the dominion of sin, Paul Tillich writes: "It is our human predicament that a power has taken hold *over* us which is not from us but *in* us . . . The name of this power is sin . . . Sin in the singular with a capital 'S.' Sin as a power, controlling world and mind, persons and nations." And examining what it is within us which gives a dwelling place to this power, he answers: "But one thing is certain. Paul and with him the whole Bible, never has made our body responsible for our estrangement from God, from our world, and from our own self. Body, flesh, members, that is not the *one* sinful part of us, with the inmost self, mind, and spirit comprising the *other*, sinless part. But our whole being, every cell of our body and every movement of our mind is both flesh and spirit, subjected to the power of Sin and resisting its power." ²⁹

The carnal reality of man is thus a real anthropological notion, although not in the common and ordinary sense that is true of the other terms already studied. First, the Hebrew and Greek equivalents of "flesh" are never employed to designate a constitutive element of the being, as in the case with their terms for "body" and "spirit." Moreover, the notion of *flesh* is so closely bound up with each of the other anthropological notions that it includes them all at the same time that it surpasses them. This notion, in fact, introduces

²⁷ 2 Pe 2 : 19; Jn 8 : 34; Rom 6 : 16.

²⁸ Rom 5 : 12.

²⁹ Paul Tillich, "The Good I Will, I Do Not," *RL*, XXVIII (1958-1959), 540-44.

an ethical and religious sense absolutely unique, without the comprehension of which our knowledge of man is altogether incomplete, if not false. Certain aspects of it, indeed, have not escaped existential psychology.

For all these reasons and still others, it is imperative that we define clearly the anthropological notion, both ethical and religious, contained in the Hebrew *bāšār* and in the Greek *sarx*. This is all the more important since Christian theology rapidly lost the true meaning under the influence of Greek thought which designated by "flesh" only the corporeal substance (the body itself insofar as it is material substance, as opposed to spiritual substance) and which, in addition, saw in the one the principle of evil and in the other the principle of good. This metaphysical dualism is absolutely foreign to Jewish and Christian thought, just as is strictly anthropological dualism.

There are numerous texts to be found in which the term "flesh" is used simply to designate the fleshly parts of the body³⁰ or the entire body insofar as it is visible and material.³¹ But, even in these cases, the part designated fleshly or carnal is never placed in opposition to another part not so designated. On the contrary, the Bible explicitly affirms of man that "he is flesh."³² All that is in him is carnal, to the point that Paul can conclude: "I am carnal."³³ The carnal reality of man is so completely applicable to all that is human that the expression "all flesh" comes to cover the whole of humanity.³⁴

Like *sōma*, *psuchē* and *pneuma*, *sarx* also designates essentially an indivisible totality, a nature of the complete man. Even more emphatically, *sarx* defines as carnal the very state of the personality, its essence, the "I" as Saint Paul so clearly declares. And to better demonstrate that this carnal reality is applied to the totality of the being as well as to each one of

³⁰ Gn 2 : 21; 41 : 2; Job 10 : 11; Eze 37 : 6-8; Lk 24 : 39; 2 Cor 12 : 7.

³¹ Num 8 : 7; Ex 30 : 32; 2 Ki 6 : 30; Jn 6 : 51; Acts 2 : 26, 31; 1 Cor. 15 : 39; etc.

³² Gn 6 : 3 (RSV); Ps 78 : 39.

³³ Rom 7 : 14.

³⁴ Gn 6 : 13, 17; Ps 136 : 25; Lk 3 : 6; Acts 2 : 17; etc.

its parts, as an adjective it qualifies each of the other anthropological notions. Each nature is found to be conditioned by *sarx*. Its influence is exercised on the body³⁵ as well as on the mind.³⁶ It determines the emotional life³⁷ with its passions and its desires³⁸ as well as the mental life, characterized by will and thought.³⁹

But this is not all. Further analysis of the notion *sarx* shows that flesh defines not only the human being in himself, but also the whole human sphere, all that touches man from near or far, all in the created world that bears his imprint, all that is humanized by man. Thus, not only "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," but "they that are after the flesh do *mind the things of the flesh*." "He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption," for "the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like . . ." ⁴⁰

As is evident, this nature, which Christian psychology calls "carnal," is manifested in man, in his life and in his actions, everywhere and in all places that he exercises responsibility. This is why Paul defines this nature by such characteristic expressions as "to live after the flesh," or "to walk after the flesh," or again, "to war after the flesh."⁴¹ *Sarx* thus is more than the substance of the human being, more even than his psychological structure: it is rather, as has been said, "the particular dimension in which the life of natural man manifests itself."⁴²

Finally, Pauline theology accords to the notion *sarx* an

³⁵ Col. 2 : 11.

³⁶ Col. 2 : 18.

³⁷ Rom 8 : 6.

³⁸ Gal 5 : 24, 16.

³⁹ Eph 2 : 3.

⁴⁰ Jn 3 : 6; Rom 8 : 5; Gal 6 : 8; 5 : 19-21.

⁴¹ Rom 8 : 4, 8, 9, 12, 13; 2 Cor 10 : 2, 3.

⁴² Mehl-Koehnlein, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

ethical and religious sense of the highest importance, which we must make more precise. The authors of the Old Testament, by use of the Hebrew term *bāśār* and by comparison with God, had already emphasized that which is creaturely in man: his limits, his finitude, his powerlessness, his weakness.⁴³ But the apostle Paul would appear to go further, in that he establishes a definite connection between *sarx* and sin. "I," he said, "am carnal, sold under sin. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do." For "with the flesh [I serve] the law of sin."⁴⁴ In other words, a mysterious power makes man the slave of "the law of sin," incapable of submitting himself to "the law of God," even when he delights in it. And this power which dwells in him isolates him from God, makes him powerless and presses him to act against God.⁴⁵

Does this mean that man is a sinner because he is carnal? Is the flesh then the principle and the seat of sin, as is often thought? If such were the case, it would be difficult to understand how, in the search for God, the flesh as well as the soul "longeth for thee."⁴⁶ If the flesh were evil in itself would God propose to pour out his Spirit on all flesh?⁴⁷ Also, if the flesh were the principle of evil in man, how could Jesus have lived in the flesh to be "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin?"⁴⁸ By the very fact that "God sending his own Son . . . for sin, condemned sin in the flesh," it is possible to conclude that the two terms "flesh" and "sin" ought not to be regarded as designating the same and single thing.⁴⁹

⁴³ Gn 6 : 3; Ps 78 : 39; Is 40 : 6; Dt 5 : 26; Is 49 : 26; 66 : 16; Jer 12 : 12; Eze 21 : 9; Ps 9 : 21.

⁴⁴ Rom 7 : 14, 18, 25.

⁴⁵ Rom 8 : 7, 8.

⁴⁶ Ps 63 : 2; Is 40 : 5.

⁴⁷ Joel 2 : 28; Acts 2 : 17.

⁴⁸ Heb 4 : 15; 1 Pe 2 : 22; 2 Cor 5 : 21.

⁴⁹ Rom 8 : 3.

If such were the case, Paul could not have spoken of the possibility of man's being delivered from the bondage of sin while continuing to live "in the flesh." Still less could he say, "That the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh."⁵⁰

A careful analysis of all texts treating of the flesh and of sin permits us not only to draw a sharp distinction between these, but further leads to the conclusion that it is necessary to establish a supplementary distinction between sin, properly speaking, and the power of sin. On the one hand there is the transgression itself, and on the other, the power of temptation; the one is the evil consummated, the other, the source of all possible temptations. In fact, "every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."⁵¹ In truth, "sin is the transgression of the law." "For where no law is, there is no transgression." Therefore, even if sin exists, "sin is not imputed when there is no law." In other words, the knowledge of sin is possible only with the knowledge of the law. "I had not known sin, but by the law."⁵²

The act, however, of regarding himself in "the perfect law of liberty," as "in a glass" has the effect only of showing to man "his natural face," that is to say, his state of sin.⁵³ The law revives in man the power of sin, "for without the law sin was dead." "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." With the commandment, sin revived: it "wrought in me all manner of concupiscence," and "taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me." So that which was in the beginning only a potential sin ended by manifesting itself as a sin, that is to say, by a transgression of the law.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Php 1 : 22, 24; 2 Cor 4 : 11; 1 Pe 4 : 2; Gal 2 : 20.

⁵¹ Jas 1 : 14, 15.

⁵² 1 Jn 3 : 4; Rom 4 : 15; 5 : 13; 7 : 7.

⁵³ Jas 1 : 23-25.

⁵⁴ Rom 7 : 7-13.

From all this it is evident that the flesh is neither an evil substance nor the power of evil that Paul sometimes personifies and calls simply "sin," nor above all, is it incarnate sin. Flesh is only "flesh of sin" because man, a creature of God, has separated himself from the Creator and has delivered himself to the power of sin. "I am carnal," said Saint Paul, because I am "sold under sin." "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do." "Now if I do that I would not, it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." In other words, the carnal state denotes the powerlessness of the natural man to govern himself. In yielding to sin, he has alienated his freedom to the control of the power of sin, which now dwells "in me (that is, in my flesh,) . . . bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members."⁵⁵

Such is the tragic situation of carnal man, delivered to the power of sin: a dead man who does not know true life because he is a captive of powers contrary to life.⁵⁶ For man to disobey the law of life is to introduce in himself death. And this death begins with the unbalancing of the personality. Instead of living—which involves continuity, the creation of conscience and the free unfolding of personality—carnal man knows only a miserable existence. Of the three terms of the law of life: to endure, to create, to flourish, only the first remains. We exist, but we do not live; and further, this duration is passed in narrowness and sterility. From a spiritual point of view this man is dead in spite of the duration in which his existence is pursued. He has no spiritual future; rather he has no other future than that of the flesh, which is death, "for the wages of sin is death."⁵⁷

This makes understandable the anguished cry of Paul: O

⁵⁵ Rom 7 : 14, 18-20, 23.

⁵⁶ Eph 2 : 1-7; Col 2 : 13; Rom 6 : 23.

⁵⁷ Rom 6 : 23; 8 : 13.

wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" There is in this cry something of the existentialist *Angst*. With the apostle there was further the awareness that the situation is such because he was alienated from God and in revolt against him, because he was subject to sin in spite of him. Nevertheless, even if in this respect Christian anthropology recalls certain existentialist conclusions, happily it does not stop there. Its last word has not been said with any emphasis in affirmation of the anthropological reality of human carnal nature. Quite on the contrary, its whole *raison d'être* resides in the revelations it brings anguished man to draw him out of this impasse. For although man no longer knows freedom, although he is a slave to powers contrary to life, he still has the possibility of being freed from them and of being born to a new life, that of the Spirit. This is why, to the question, "who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Paul replies: "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." ⁵⁸

With this response, Christian theology opens a new chapter, that of Jesus Christ, bearer of the Spirit, proposing to us the Spirit as an anthropological reality as certain as that of the flesh, and alone able to deliver man from the dominion of sin.

(To be concluded)

⁵⁸ Rom 7 : 24-25.

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW

CONSONANTS

א	=	ʾ	ד	=	d	י	=	y	ס	=	s	ר	=	r
ב	=	b	ה	=	h	כ	=	k	ע	=	ʿ	ש	=	š
ג	=	g	ו	=	w	ל	=	l	פ	=	p	ת	=	ṯ
ז	=	z	ז	=	z	מ	=	m	צ	=	ṣ	ת	=	t
ח	=	ḥ	נ	=	n	ק	=	q						
ט	=	ṭ												

MASORETIC VOWEL POINTINGS

ֿ	=	a	וּ, וֹ, וֶ (vocal shewa)	=	o	וֹ	=	ō
ֿ	=	ā	וּ, וֹ, וֶ	=	e	וֹ	=	o
ֿ	=	o	וּ, וֹ, וֶ	=	i	וֹ	=	ō
ֿ	=	e	וּ, וֹ, וֶ	=	i	וֹ	=	u
ֿ	=	ē	וּ, וֹ, וֶ	=	o	וֹ	=	ū

ABBREVIATIONS OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

<i>AAS</i>	Annales archéol. de Syrie	<i>BMB</i>	Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth
<i>AASOR</i>	Annual, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res.	<i>BQR</i>	Baptist Quarterly Review
<i>ADAJ</i>	Annual, Dep. of Ant. of Jordan	<i>BR</i>	Biblical Research (Chicago)
<i>AER</i>	American Ecclesiastical Review	<i>BRG</i>	Biblioth. Rerum Germanicarum
<i>AfO</i>	Archiv für Orientforschung	<i>BS</i>	Bibliotheca Sacra
<i>AfP</i>	Archiv für Papyrusforschung	<i>BT</i>	Bible Translator
<i>AJA</i>	Amer. Journal of Archaeology	<i>BZ</i>	Biblische Zeitschrift
<i>AJSL</i>	Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang. and Literature	<i>CBQ</i>	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
<i>ALBO</i>	Analecta Lovan. Bibl. et Orient.	<i>CC</i>	Christian Century
<i>ANF</i>	The Ante-Nicene Fathers	<i>CdE</i>	Chronique d'Égypte
<i>AO</i>	Acta Orientalia	<i>CH</i>	Church History
<i>ARG</i>	Archiv für Reformationsgesch.	<i>CIG</i>	Corpus Inscript. Graecarum
<i>ARW</i>	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft	<i>CIL</i>	Corpus Inscript. Latinarum
<i>ASAE</i>	Annales, Serv. des Ant. de l'Ég.	<i>CIS</i>	Corpus Inscript. Semiticarum
<i>ASB</i>	Acta Sanctorum (ed. Bolland)	<i>CJTh</i>	Canadian Journal of Theology
<i>AThR</i>	Anglican Theological Review	<i>CSEL</i>	Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.
<i>AUSS</i>	Andrews Univ. Sem. Studies	<i>CT</i>	Christianity Today
<i>BA</i>	Biblical Archaeologist	<i>ER</i>	Ecumenical Review
<i>BASOR</i>	Bulletin, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res.	<i>ETHL</i>	Ephemer. Theol. Lovanienses
<i>Bib</i>	Biblica	<i>ET</i>	Expository Times
<i>BIES</i>	Bulletin, Israel Expl. Soc.	<i>HJ</i>	Hibbert Journal
<i>BIFAO</i>	Bulletin, Inst. Franç. d'Arch. Or.	<i>HThR</i>	Harvard Theological Review
<i>BiOr</i>	Bibliotheca Orientalis	<i>HUCA</i>	Hebrew Union College Annual
<i>BJPES</i>	Bulletin, Jewish Pal. Expl. Soc.	<i>IEJ</i>	Israel Exploration Journal
<i>BJRL</i>	Bulletin, John Rylands Library	<i>Int</i>	Interpretation
		<i>JAch</i>	Jahrb. für Ant. und Christentum

<i>JAOS</i>	Journ. of the Amer. Or. Soc.	<i>RHR</i>	Revue de l'Histoire des Religions
<i>JBL</i>	Journal of Biblical Literature	<i>RL</i>	Religion in Life
<i>JBR</i>	Journal of Bible and Religion	<i>RLA</i>	Reallexikon der Assyriologie
<i>JCS</i>	Journal of Cuneiform Studies	<i>RQ</i>	Revue de Qumrân
<i>JEA</i>	Journal of Egyptian Arch.	<i>RSR</i>	Revue des Sciences Religieuses
<i>JJS</i>	Journal of Jewish Studies	<i>SJTh</i>	Scottish Journal of Theology
<i>JNES</i>	Journal of Near Eastern Studies	<i>STh</i>	Studia Theologica
<i>JQR</i>	Jewish Quarterly Review	<i>ThEH</i>	Theologische Existenz heute
<i>JR</i>	Journal of Religion	<i>ThQ</i>	Theologische Quartalschrift
<i>JSS</i>	Journal of Semitic Studies	<i>ThT</i>	Theology Today
<i>JThS</i>	Journal of Theol. Studies	<i>ThLZ</i>	Theologische Literaturzeitung
<i>LQ</i>	Lutheran Quarterly	<i>ThR</i>	Theologische Rundschau
<i>MGH</i>	Monumenta Germaniae Historica	<i>Trad</i>	Traditio
<i>MQR</i>	Mennonite Quarterly Review	<i>ThS</i>	Theological Studies
<i>NKZ</i>	Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift	<i>ThZ</i>	Theologische Zeitschrift
<i>NPNF</i>	Nicene and Post-Nic. Fathers	<i>VC</i>	Verbum Caro
<i>NRTh</i>	Nouvelle Revue Théologique	<i>VD</i>	Verbum Domini
<i>NT</i>	Novum Testamentum	<i>VCh</i>	Vigiliae Christianae
<i>NTA</i>	New Testament Abstracts	<i>VT</i>	Vetus Testamentum
<i>NTS</i>	New Testament Studies	<i>WThJ</i>	Westminster Theol. Journal
<i>Num</i>	Numen	<i>WZKM</i>	Wiener Zeitschr. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenlandes
<i>Och</i>	Oriens Christianus	<i>ZA</i>	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie
<i>OLZ</i>	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung	<i>ZAS</i>	Zeitsch. für ägyptische Sprache
<i>Or</i>	Orientalia	<i>ZAW</i>	Zeitsch. für die alttes. Wiss.
<i>OTS</i>	Oudtestamentische Studiën	<i>ZDMG</i>	Zeitsch. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft
<i>PEQ</i>	Palestine Exploration Quarterly	<i>ZDPV</i>	Zeitsch. des Deutsch. Pal. Ver.
<i>QDAP</i>	Quarterly, Dep. of Ant. in Pal.	<i>ZKG</i>	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte
<i>RA</i>	Revue d'Assyr. et d'Arch. Or.	<i>ZHTh</i>	Zeitsch. für hist. Theologie
<i>RAC</i>	Rivista di Archaeologia Cristiana	<i>ZKTh</i>	Zeitsch. für kath. Theologie
<i>RB</i>	Revue Biblique	<i>ZNW</i>	Zeitsch. für die neuest. Wiss.
<i>RE</i>	Review and Expositor	<i>ZStTh</i>	Zeitschrift für syst. Theologie
<i>RdE</i>	Revue d'Égyptologie	<i>ZThK</i>	Zeitsch. für Theol. und Kirche
<i>RHE</i>	Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique		
<i>RHPR</i>	Revue d'Hist. et de Philos. Rel.		