Notes

Note: All Scripture quotations in this paper, except when noted otherwise, are from the Holy Bible, New International Version. Copyright (c) 1973, 1978, 1984 International Bible Society. Dates for historical figures in this paper generally refer to the period of a man's rule, not to his total lifetime. Exceptions are noted as they occur.

[1]See Hardy, *Historical Overview of Dan 11:23-28*, *Historicism* No. 15/Jul 88, pp. 38-39. The section is the unit of temporal progression within the chapter. The subsection or bloc is the unit of temporal progression within a section. It is not useful to look for such relationships at the level of individual verses. Neither Daniel nor the angel speaking to him had verses in mind as the narrative unfolded. The material is arranged topically.

[2]An analogy, from the field of data processing, is that of paired index and data files. An index file makes data orderly and findable. In the same way apocalyptic prophecies such as Dan 11 can be thought of as an index into history. They do not themselves contain all we need to know about history, but they show us where to look and how to interpret what we find.

[3]See Hardy, *The Preterist Model for Interpreting Daniel*, *Historicism* No. 2/Apr 85, pp. 2-13.

[4]In a later paper I argue that vss. 36-39 do not describe events at all. They belong to the text and are divinely inspired. But instead of dealing with events they deal with attitudes--the attitudes of the entity which rises to power and maintains its authority throughout vss. 29-35. Verses 29-35 and 36-39 are not repetitive in the sense that they say the same things twice. But they do deal with the same period of history. Thus, there is no historical break between vss. 35 and 40. Verse 35 brings us up to the "time of the end" and vs. 40 continues on from that point.

[5]See Hardy, "Notes on the Linear Structure of Dan 11," *Historicism* No. 7/Jul 86, p. 15, 28-29; "Historical Overview of Dan 11:2-15," *Historicism* No. 11/Jul 87, p. 18; "Historical Overview of Dan 11:23-28," pp. 37-38. An exception to the above rule is that there is no king of the South in vss. 16-22 and therefore no conflict between him and the king of the North. The absence of events in vss. 36-39 provides a parallel. Both sections deal exclusively with the king of the North.

[6]A. H. M. Jones, *Augustus*, Ancient Culture and Society Series (New York: Norton, 1970), p. 110.

[7]Chester G. Starr, *The Influence of Sea Power on Ancient History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 68.

[8]Ibid., p. 76.

[9]Ibid., p. 75.

[10]"It is true that the Empire had become stronger since the darkest days of Gallienus, but emperors of the third century, as a rule, did not last very long. In that sense, perhaps the greatest contribution Diocletian made was to rule for over twenty years (284-305), the longest reign since the death of Antoninus Pius in the second century" (Arthur Ferrill, *The Fall of the Roman Empire: The Military Explanation* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988, p. 41).

[11]The focus of attention for God's people is no longer Jerusalem at this time in history. Indeed it was not the focus of anything more substantial than Jewish nostalgia. Hadrian (117-38) demolished the city and plowed the land it was built on. He then built a pagan city over it, named Aelia Capitolina, with temples dedicated to Bacchus, Venus, and Serapis and a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus built on the site of the former sanctuary. A boar, the symbol of the tenth legion, was placed over the southern gate. No Jew was allowed to set foot in the city (see *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.v. Jerusalem). Over time Christian churches were built there by Constantine (326), Eudoxia (460), and Justinian (sixth century). The city was taken from Roman control by Arabs in A.D. 637. It was not a center of Christian learning or worship. That function was first shared, and then monopolized, by Rome. Those who wish to emphasize the place

where Jerusalem is situated over the people who lived there, thus giving the place significance, or the people themselves over the covenant which in turn gave them significance, should prayerfully reread Christ's words in Matt 23:16-22.

[12]J. D. Douglas, et al., eds., *The New Bible Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 1982), s.v. "Kittim."

[13]The word kitt m is grammatically plural.

[14]The second century B.C. War Scroll does not concern us here, but notice what John J. Collins says about the generality with which "Kittim" was used during the last centuries before Christ: "All agree that the term Kittim can refer to either Greeks or Romans--cf. Josephus, *Ant*. 1.6.1 who says the name was applied to all islands and most maritime countries. It is difficult to assess how far the War Scroll had specific enemies in mind. In view of the lack of specificity it is most probable that the scroll simply accepted the traditional idea that Israel's enemies would be destroyed in the eschatological battle. In the Hellenistic and Roman periods Israel's outstanding enemies could be appropriately summed up as Kittim" ("The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic," *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975): 609, n. 54.

[15]See Ferrill, *Roman Empire*, pp. 10-22.

[16]Ibid., pp. 23-50 passim.

[17]There is a generation gap between scholars who argue that Rome did not fall and scholars who argue that it did. The position that Rome fell, which is the majority view at present, raises the question why it fell. "A recent book in German, almost 700 pages long, lists some 210 factors that have been adduced as causes of Rome's fall" (ibid., p. 12). If there are 210 factors, then none of them by itself can be very important. This approach betokens frustration. Why did Rome really fall? Or was its fall more apparent than real? Ferrill takes a frontal approach to this problem. He affirms that Rome fell and states that it happened for straightforward military reasons. I find his argument convincing in many ways, but the fact that there is so much room for debate should make us cautious. An earlier generation of scholars emphasized Rome's historical continuity. The present generation rejects that in favor of a defeat whose exact nature has eluded them. Ferrill is probably correct in his assessment of Rome's military failures but after we have discussed them the fact remains that Rome rose from its own ashes to become a great power again. When we stand back and view things from Rome's own perspective, the events we are studying assume the more modest proportions of temporary inconveniences and the question whether Rome fell becomes almost entirely academic.

[18]See Klaus-Peter Johne, "Germanen im römischen Dienst" [Germans in Roman service], *Das Altertum* 34 (1988): 5-13.

[19]Goths, Alans, and Huns all served in the Roman army (Gerhard Wolfram, *History of the Goths* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988], p. 136); the Roman cavalry commander under Valens (A.D. 364-78) in the battle of Adrianople was a Sarmatian named Victor (ibid., 125); during Belisarius' Vandal war in Africa the Roman officer who besieged the Vandal king Gelimer on Mount Papua was a Herul named Pharas (Procopius, *Vandal War*, 4.4.29 [see n. 23 below]). There were Isaurians, Huns, and Moors in the Roman army during Belisarius' Gothic war in Italy (Procopius, *Gothic War*, 5.5.3-4; see also ibid., 6.1.21-34; 6.13.14-15; 7.12.9-10). The Roman general Mundus, who fought under Belisarius in Italy, was a barbarian, if not a Goth (ibid., 5.5.2). Most of Belisarius' personal bodyguards were barbarians of one sort or another--at least those identified as such in the index to the Loeb edition of Procopius. Examples could be multiplied.

[20]"Gothic poly-ethnicity, which can already be attested in Ermanaric's kingdom, remained unchanged: Finns, Slavs, Antes, Heruli, Alans, Huns, Sarmatians, and no doubt also Aesti are mentioned" (Wolfram, *Goths*, p. 116). Again, this is one example.

[21]Each barbarian nation is made of tribes and each tribe of subtribes, which in turn are made up of families, and so on. There is no end to naming them. Thus, "Alamanni" is a

collective term that includes the Juthungi, Lentienses, Bucinobantes, and other tribes or subtribes. Another ethnic group that I have not mentioned yet are the Cimbrians. "Historians report that the Cimbrians, who invaded the Roman territory together with the Teutons and Ambrons, were driven from their home in the Chersonnesus Cimbricus by storm floods. The Cimbrians certainly came from northern Jutland, still called *Himmerland*, and the other two tribes probably had been their neighbors (Teutons from *Thyland*, west of *Himmerland*, *Ambrons* from the isle of *Amrum*, west of Sleswig?); '*Toutoni*' (acc. *-os*) are named on a boundary stone near Miltenberg on the Main; but they may have been Celts who joined them later on their migration, somewhere in the South" (E. Prokosch, *A Comparative Germanic Grammar*, William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series [Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, 1939], p. 28). The list goes on and on.

[22]"The descendants of the Mediaeval Alans, a Scythic Iranian people, live in the North Caucasus today and are called Ossetes" (Richard N. Frye, *The Heritage of Persia* [New York: Mentor, 1963], p. 29)

[23]See B. H. Dewing, trans., *Procopius: History of the Wars*, 7 vols. (Harvard University Press, 1914 ff.), vol. 3: *Books III and IV*, 3.5.21 (subsequently Procopius, *Vandal War*). The *Gothic War* is contained in vols. 3 [books 5 and 6], 4 [books 6 and 7], and 5 [books 7.36 to 8]. "At the head of the [Vandal] State was the King, whose power had gradually become unlimited and differed but little from that of the Byzantine Roman Emperor. His full title was *Rex Vandalorum et Alanorum* ['King of the Vandals and of the Alans']" (H. M. Gwatkin and J. P. Whitney, eds., *The Cambridge Mediaeval History*, 8 vols. [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957], vol. 1: *The Christian Roman Empire and the Foundation of the Teutonic Kingdoms*, p. 317).

[24]"It was almost certainly the *concordia* with large groups of Alans which enabled the Huns to move against Ermanaric [d. A.D. 375]. . . . It was certainly not the first time that other tribes joined the Huns, nor was it the last. In some cases the alliance seems to have resulted in a real symbiosis, in others the tribes united temporarily for raids and looting expeditions. The Hunno-Alanic alliance lasted three decades" (Otto J. Maenchen-Helfen, "The World of the Huns: Studies in Their History and Culture" [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973], p. 22). Their next alliance was with the Goths and only then with the Vandals (see Constantin C. Diculescu, *Die Wandalen und die Goten in Ungarn und Rumänien*, Mannus-Bibliothek, no. 34 [Leipzig: Kabitzsch, 1923], p. 13).

[25]"[T]he short-lived Juan-juan empire of the sixth century had its last lease of life in the shape of the Avars of Hungary" (David Morgan, *The Mongols* [New York: Blackwell, 1986], p. 45).

[26]See Hardy, "Paul's Intention to Go to Spain," *Historicism* No. 17/Jan 89, pp. 38-39.

[27]For those counting the tribes, the number is greater than ten. But this fact--and it is a fact--does not weaken the substance of what Seventh-day Adventists have taught about the toes of the image in Dan 2. When summarizing the content of the king's dream, Daniel does not mention toes at all but only feet (vs. 33, "'its legs of iron, its feet partly of iron and partly of baked clay'"). The feet are mentioned again in vs. 34 ("'It struck the statue on its feet of iron and clay and smashed them'"), but the statue's toes are not mentioned until vs. 42. And what is said about them has to do with their composition rather than their number: "'As the toes were partly iron and partly clay, so this kingdom will be partly strong and partly brittle'" (vs. 42). As regards the significance of mixing clay with iron, the explanation is that "'the people will be a mixture and will not remain united, any more than iron mixes with clay'" (vs. 43). The point Daniel is making does not have to do with the number of toes but with the fact that the fourth empire of iron would break up. If this is the point Daniel wishes to make, then this is the point we should draw from what he says.

[28]"To what extent the Danish Isles had been Norse in prehistoric times, is unknown. Jutland became North Germanic (Danish) after a large part of its Anglian (West Germanic)

population had emigrated to England, during the fifth and sixth centuries" (Prokosch, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 27.

[29]In his chapter on King Arthur, Michael Wood summarizes his objectives by saying, "The purpose of this chapter is to look at the way in which Roman civilisation in Britain came to an end, and to see what justification there is to link a historical Arthur to these events" (*In Search of the Dark Ages* [New York: Facts on File, 1987], p. 37).   The fact is that, with or without benefit of a historical Arthur, the invasion of Britain by the Angles, Jutes, and Saxons was made possible by the withdrawal of Roman troops from the island. The setting for Arthurian legend is the native Celtic resistance to these Germanic invasions from the continent. There had to be native resistance because Rome was no longer able to protect its former provinces. In fact it was no longer able to protect itself.

[30]"At the opening of the fifth century a massive army, perhaps more than 200,000 strong, stood at the service of the Western emperor and his generals. In 476 it was gone. The destruction of Roman military power in the fifth century AD was the obvious cause of the collapse of Roman government in the West" (Ferrill, *Roman Empire*, p. 22).

[31]Arianism makes a powerful appeal to human reasoning. Even E. J. Waggoner, who devotes parts of six pages to refuting the Arian position in his excellent little book entitled *Christ and His Righteousness* (Palmwoods, Queensland, Australia: Destiny Press, reprinted 1978), cannot entirely free himself from its central premise: "The Scriptures declare that Christ is 'the only-begotten Son of God.' He is begotten, not created. As to when He was begotten, it is not for us to inquire, nor could our minds grasp it if we were told. . . . There was a time when Christ proceeded forth and came from God, from the bosom of the Father (John 8:42; 1:18), but that time was so far back in the days of eternity that to finite comprehension it is practically without beginning" (ibid., pp. 21-22). Saying that this happened a long time ago is no different from saying that it happened yesterday, because in both cases there is an event bound by time. Once we ask when, it does not matter how we answer; we have already yielded the crucial point. To his credit, however, we should remember that Waggoner wanted to free himself from the Arian premise. There is a difference between not having the desire to do so and being unable. For more on the problem of Arianism see Hardy, "What Does the Hebrew Word b·n Mean?" in this issue of *Historicism*.

[32]See Charles Kannengiesser, "Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: The Arian Crisis," in Irene Lawrence, ed., *Colloquy 41* (Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1982), pp. 1-40.

[33]Ibid., p. 21.

[34]See Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 8 vols. (New York: Scribner, 1910; reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), vol. 2: *Ante-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 100-325*, pp. 777-803. Kannengiesser does not wish to emphasize such influences. Concerning Dionysius he writes that "our sources render inadequate an explanation of the emergence of Arianism starting with Dionysius" ("Alexandrian Christology," p. 21). About the ubiquitous Origen he suggests that "Arius has developed a theology which is not founded on Origenistic premises" (ibid., p. 34). Instead he sees Athanasius defending Origen in opposition to Arius (see ibid., p. 33).

[35]Kannengiesser speaks wistfully of "the lonely grandeur of the Alexandrian heresiarch" (ibid., p. 24) and of his "intellectual solitude" (ibid., p. 11). He says, "Arius demonstrates . . . exceptional intellectual courage, rigor in thought, and originality in style which make of him an authentic master. Through the documents we have analyzed, however, this austere and intransigent man of doctrine stands isolated." Luise Abramowski cautions against overemphasizing this point. "The stress on the uniqueness and solitude of the Alexandrian presbyter should not lead us to cut the very thin threads which the documents still allow us to see connecting him with contemporaries and the past" (ibid., p. 50). Arius' work occurred within

a context and, in my view as well, this is a factor which deserves more attention than Kannen-giesser has given it.

[36]"Arius does not teach the thought of Plotinus, but he attempts to express his faith in the God of Scriptural revelation with the rigor and coherence of Plotinus. Plotinus appears to me, through my re-reading of the *Ennead V*, as the principal philosophical source inspiring the starting point and the logic of Arius' thought, and therefore his break with Origen and his peculiarity with respect to all the masters of Middle-Platonism with whom he has been compared. . . . It is clear that the rearrangement of these formulae is less the work of Arius than of the hostile authority which cites the *Thalia*. But it also appears certain that Arius' entire effort consisted precisely in acclimatizing Plotinic logic within biblical creationism. . . . All the connections regarding this subject which have been sought in vain in Origen or the Middle-Platonists are explicit in Plotinus" (ibid., pp. 36, 38).

[37]Ibid., p. 23.

[38]Ibid., p. 9.

[39]Ibid., p. 10.

[40]"The years of the Great Persecution also saw the first teaching of the heretical Arius, whose theology did not only extend to an abstract view of Christ's nature. It also reaffirmed man's capacity for salvation and perfectibility: 'indeed we can become sons of God, like Christ,' so Arius is said to have taught; 'it is written, "I fathered and raised up sons . . ."'" (Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* [New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1986], p. 602). Arius had an agenda in teaching as he did concerning the nature of Christ. His concerns were not primarily Christological in nature, but soteriological (see the response of Thomas A. Kopecek in Lawrence, *Colloquy 41*, p. 60).

[41]Ibid., p. 44 (Thalia 12).

[42]Wolfram, *Goths*, p. 70.

[43]One should perhaps not make too much of the fact that, among the emperors after Constantine, those who led the Empire to their worst military defeats were Julian the Apostate (361-63), a pagan (fighting Persians, A.D. 363), and Valens (364-78), an Arian (fighting Goths at Adrianople, A.D. 376).

[44]"[The Heruls] were one of the most primitive of the Germanic peoples of that period. Kingship was but little developed among them. Their slaves fought side by side with them in battle. Human sacrifice is still mentioned among them in the 6th century" (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1964 ed., s.v. Heruli). And after the sixth century there is no mention of Heruls at all.

[45]There were two branches of Sueves. One came to Spain with the Vandals by crossing the Rhine (not the Danube) in A.D. 409. A few years later they were defeated in battle by their former Vandal allies (A.D. 428 or 429), after which they were confined to Galicia. Later they expanded into Portugal. This branch of the Sueves were converted from paganism to Arianism under Remismund sometime after 464 (see ibid., s.v. Suebi). Bavarian Swabia (also known as Alamannia) had a Suevic population already in the first century and were not converted to Christianity until the seventh century (see ibid., s.v. Swabia). "The Alamanni, who had preceded the Suebi to Swabia, remained pagan until the first half of the 8th century" (ibid., s.v. Alamanni).

[46]Another branch of the Burgundians ruled what would later become the Netherlands (see ibid., s.v. Habsburg).

[47]"The Visigoth kings were kings only in name. Their nobles did not always obey them. Rebellions were frequent. In 589, Reccared was elected king and decided to strengthen his position. He turned Roman Catholic, thereby obtaining the help of the Catholic clergy. Through the clergy he also gained the support of the Catholic population against the unruly Visigothic nobility. The bishops, in turn, now saw their chance of destroying the respect which the Jews enjoyed among the common people. The king wanted to prevent the aid which the Jews might extend to the nobles who opposed him. Therefore, king and bishops joined hands to prohibit Judaism entirely. The Jews were ordered to become Catholics or leave the country. . . . The

whole of the next century was occupied in this struggle of Judaism to survive in Spain. . . . The climax was reached around the year 700 when it was decreed that anyone found practicing a Jewish ceremony should be sold into slavery, and the children of people under suspicion of being Jews should be taken from them and be brought up by the Christian clergy" (Solomon Grayzel, *A History of the Jews from the Destruction of Judah in 586 BC to the Present Arab Israeli Conflict*, pp. 272-73). As another source puts it, after Reccared's conversion "the next century was a period of clerical terror and was disfigured throughout by a hideous persecution of the Spanish Jews" (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.v. Goths).

[48]On the possibility that Clovis himself had been an Arian, and not a pagan, before his conversion to Catholic Christianity see Edward James, *The Franks* (New York: Blackwell, 1988), p. 122.

[49]More specifically the barbarians did their best fighting on horses. This fact, among others, is thought to have led Rome to imitate their example and make the historic blunder of underestimating the importance of their infantry (see Ferrill, *Fall of Rome*, p. 47). Thus, the barbarians who fought for Rome weakened the Empire perhaps as extensively as those who fought against it.

[50]"One characteristic of Gothic Arianism was a certain religious tolerance of or indifference to Catholics or even pagans. As late as the sixth century, it was considered 'Gothic' to show reverence toward Christian churches as well as pagan temples" (Wolfram, *Goths*, p. 197). The Jews, however, did not fare well in Visigothic Spain after Reccared's conversion to Catholicism (see n. 47 above).

[51]See Wolfram, ibid., p. 51-55; Starr, *Sea Power*, pp. 078-79. There was another Gothic-Herul expedition that supposedly included ships in A.D. 270, one year after Naissus (see Wolfram, *Goths*, pp. 55-56).

[52]After sacking Rome in A.D. 410 Alaric's Goths set off toward the south. "The march to the south was successful, cities like Capua and Nola were taken, but time was running short. And then the Straits of Messina presented an insurmountable obstacle. Ridiculous attempts to get at least to Sicily failed. The Goths lacked the necessary ships, and the autumn storms were setting in. Gainas' debacle at the Bosporus repeated itself, even though this time the Roman fleet was not involved. The Gothic army then began its retreat; . . ." (ibid., p. 159).

[53]"But during the past ten years the Goths [led by Valia] had not become seafarers, and as a result even the merely 'twelve thousand foot wide' Straits of Gibraltar became an insurmountable obstacle. A Gothic advance party perished in a storm. Valia called off the expedition" (ibid., p. 170).

[54]"Early in June the Vandals entered Rome. There was no attempt to defend the city militarily. Pope Leo met the invaders at the gate, but his spiritual power could not stay the Vandals, who devoted fourteen days to the systematic plunder of Rome, promising the pope merely that there would be no burning and no bloodshed. The Vandals took everything they could get their hands on, including the gilded bronze tiles from the roof of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus and the booty Titus had brought to Rome from Jerusalem" (Ferrill, *Roman Empire*, p. 154-55). See also Procopius, *Vandal War*, 3.5.4; 4.9.5.

[55]Gwatkin and Whitney, *Cambridge Mediaeval History*, 1:308. As regards the treasure from Jerusalem, Wolfram (*Goths*, p. 439, n. 258) prefers the year 410 for its capture--by Goths rather than Vandals.

[56]Gwatkin and Whitney, *Cambridge Mediaeval History*, 1:309.

[57]Ferrill, *Roman Empire*, p. 138.

[58]See Wolfram, *Goths*, p. 69.

[59]It is said that Euric did not actually persecute Catholics, and yet any discussion of this king's religious policy must be accompanied by such disclaimers. What he did was to prevent the appointment of new bishops (sees were allowed to remain vacant in Bordeaux, Perigueux, Rodez, Limoges, Mende, Eauze, Auch, Bazas, St. Bertrand-de-Comminges, and elsewhere),

banish two bishops (Crocus and Simplicius), and prevent the clergy from communicating with Rome (see ibid., p. 199-200). The king was not cordial toward his Catholic constituents. That much is clear. "Yet Euric cannot be described as a systematic persecutor of Catholics, even though in saying this we contradict prevailing notions. Euric tried to achieve a gradual 'shutdown of the ecclesiastical institutions,' but he did so without proselytizing. . . . Euric's anti-Catholic policy remained purely negative and therefore stopped halfway. It tried to 'eliminate the Catholic church politically as long as its positive integration into the Gothic state was not possible.' Euric therefore ceased his openly anti-Catholic policy soon after the Romans recognized his conquests" (ibid., p. 200). Euric attacked the church as a political rather than religious entity.

[60]See Gwatkin and Whitney, *Cambridge Mediaeval History*, 1:306.

[61]See ibid.

[62]See ibid., p. 307.

[63]See ibid., p. 310.

[64]Ibid., p. 312. Notice that what made Huneric's persecution so violent, apart from the malice of those who implemented its provisions, was that he took the Empire's existing laws against heresy (i.e., against Arianism) as his starting point. The only difference was that these same laws were now being pointed in the opposite direction, applied to those who had framed them.

[65]Ibid., p. 321.

[66]At this point let me insert a description of the Vandals' personal habits, written by Procopius, who had accompanied Belisarius to Libya and was writing as an eyewitness: "For of all the nations which we know that of the Vandals is the most luxurious, and that of the Moors the most hardy. For the Vandals, since the time when they gained possession of Libya, used to indulge in baths, all of them, every day, and enjoyed a table abounding in all things, the sweetest and best that the earth and sea produce. And they wore gold very generally, and clothed themselves in the Medic garments, which now they call 'seric [silk],' and passed their time, thus dressed, in theatres and hippodromes and in other pleasureable pursuits, and above all else in hunting." (*Vandal War*, 4.6.5-7). The Vandals were warlike and cruel but they were not uncultured.

[67]An Anglican author, John W. Howe, states: "By the fourteenth century, Roman Catholicism had evolved into something very different from the 'faith once delivered to the saints.' . . . In 1545 the pope convened the Council of Trent. It declared what had long been practice: that regarding authority, Roman Catholicism gives equal veneration to the Scriptures and the traditions of the church, written and unwritten. In the sharpest contrast, Anglicanism stands for what Bishop Neill calls the 'position held by the Church through the centuries'--the ultimate authority of Scripture alone (*sola Scriptura*). 'From this standard,' he says, 'the Church of Rome has departed, with disastrous consequences to herself.' By her compromise, she is simply 'not the great historic Church of the West'" (*Our Anglican Heritage*, Church Heritage Series [Elgin, IL: David C. Cook, 1977], pp. 17, 24-25). The church of Rome has served, to a larger degree than is commonly appreciated, not as an agent of preservation but as an agent of change. The Protestant Reformation, by an act of restoration, is the true preserver of ancient things--more ancient than the traditions with which Scripture must share attention in the Roman system. The real roles of the Catholic and Protestant communities within the Christian church are therefore in fact the reverse of what they appear. The great innovation of Protestantism is that it returned to a neglected past and at least one of the things notably preserved by Catholicism is the time-honored litany of its innovations.

[68]See A. Leroy Moore, "The Humanity of Christ," *Historicism* No. 9/Jan 87, pp. 2-6.

[69]Wolfram, *Goths*, pp. 158-59.

[70]See n. 54 above.

[71]As regards the Vandal's avoidance of bloodshed in A.D. 455, see n. 54 above. As regards the Goth's relatively humane treatment of Rome in A.D. 410 under Alaric consider the

following: "Augustine created in his *City of God* an eschatology in which the fall of Rome became an event of providential history. While this interpretation was truly Christian, on a more profane level some contemporaries down-played the Gothic 'plague' and its terror. Christian apologists and opinion-makers began to point out to themselves and the pagans how humanely Alaric and his warriors had plundered Rome and that in any case they had left the city after only three days" (Wolfram, *Goths*, p. 159). There is no sense in which either of the above sacks can be compared in savagery with that of the Celts for seven months in 387 B.C. (Gerhard Herm, *The Celts: The People who Came out of the Darkness* [New York: St. Martin's, 1976], pp. 12-13) or that of Charles V for five months in 1527 (Chamberlain, *Bad Popes*, pp. 273-83).

[72]The Scirians were a Gothic royal family (Wolfram, *Goths*, p. 188). Odovacar's base of support, however, was essentially non-Gothic (ibid., p. 266). Heruls were among his followers.

[73]The rule of Odovacar was apparently harsh. Procopius quotes some later Gothic ambassadors to Belisarius as saying, "Such has been the course followed by us; but you, on your side, did not take the part of Italy while it was suffering at the hands of the barbarians and Odoacer, although it was not for a short time, but for ten years, that he treated the land outrageously; but now you do violence to us who have acquired it legitimately, though you have no business here" (*Gothic War*, 6.6.21). The situation was such that Theodoric's later "attack on Odovacar was meant to appear as a liberation of Romans from the yoke of a tyrant and as a barbarian campaign of revenge" (Wolfram, *Goths*, p. 280).

[74]"[T]he usual distribution of the revenues--one third for the army, one third for the central government, one third for curial administration--was possible only in the Italy of Odovacar and Theodoric, for both had taken over the entire Roman governmental apparatus. By contrast, the Gallic kingdoms were made up of *civitates*" (ibid., pp. 223-24).

[75]"Between A.D. 235 and A.D. 284 Rome was governed by a procession of soldiers and Senators, peasants, lawyers and civil servants, and the son of a Transjordanian Arab *shaykh* who, by an exquisite irony of history, wore the Imperial purple in A.D. 248, when the millennium of Rome's founding was celebrated with pomp in the capital. Philip the Arab was neither the best nor the worst of these Emperors. He rose through the ranks in the normal Roman fashion of preferment, and once come to power, he dutifully played his Imperial role on the frontiers. He tried hard to found a dynasty but reigned only five years and fell" (F. E. Peters, *The Harvest of Hellenism: A History of the Near East from Alexander the Great to the Triumph of Christianity*, Touchstone Books [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970], p. 570)

[76]"And it so happened on that day that at the very same time when Belisarius and the emperor's army were entering Rome through the gate which they call the Asinarian Gate, the Goths were withdrawing from the city through another gate which bears the name Flaminian; and Rome became subject to the Romans again after a space of sixty years, on the ninth day of the last month, which is called 'December' by the Romans, in the eleventh year of the Emperor Justinian [A.D. 536]" (Procopius, *Gothic War*, 5.14.14.). The war, however, was not at an end. It was just beginning.

[77]See ibid., 6.10.13.

[78]See ibid., 7.21.19; 7.22.6.

[79]Ibid., 7.22.7.

[80]Ibid., 7.22.17.

[81]"As for the Romans, however, he kept the members of the senate with him, while all the others together with their wives and children he sent into Campania, refusing to allow a single soul in Rome, but leaving it entirely deserted" (ibid., 7.22.19).

[82]See ibid., 7.23.8; 23.24.1-2.

[83]See ibid., 7.24.31.

[84]See ibid., 8.33.27.

[85]See *Essays on Church and State*, with an introduction by Douglas Woodruff (New York: Crowell, 1968), "The States of the Church," pp. 86-122. Lord Acton, a loyal Catholic, died in 1902.

[86]Ibid., pp. 89-111, passim.

[87]Lord Acton, *Essays*, "The Political System of the Popes," pp. 123-58.

[88]See ibid., pp. 126-57.

[89]Ibid., p. 148. "The history of the States of the Church is quite independent of that of the Papal system of Europe, but runs parallel with that of the growth of the German Empire, which found Rome the great obstacle to the attainment of a universal sovereignty" (ibid., p. 136). In this comparison what we are talking about here is the "Papal system of Europe," i.e., the means by which popes exerted secular authority outside Italy.

[90]Ibid., p. 134.

[91]Concerning the Spanish troops of Philip II in the Netherlands one historian records that, "They prepared for their worst massacres [c. 1576] with prayer and carried them out under a banner from one side of which Christ, from the other the Holy Virgin, looked down on them" (Pieter Geyl, *The Revolt of the Netherlands (1555-1609)*, 2nd ed. [London: Benn, 1958], p. 145).

[92]The title by which Rodrigo Díaz is known to history--and legend--is an Arabic word. "Cid" is from Arabic sayd (root swd "to be or become master, head, chief; to rule, govern") and means "master, lord."

[93]The First Crusade and the activity of el Cid occurred within a year of each other. It is unlikely that Urban II would have preached the first crusade because Díaz captured Barcelona. It is also unlikely that el Cid was acting on papal advice--that the siege of Barcelona was really a European crusade against Islam--although we do read elsewhere that, "In Spain he [Urban II] encouraged successfully the reconquest from the Moors, extended the feudal suzerainty of the holy see over states like Aragon and Catalonia, and reorganized the country ecclesiastically; . . ." (*Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, s.v. Urban II). The Cid's activities would certainly be consistent with such a program but that is all we can say in the absence of further information.

[94]Constantinople fell to Mehmed II (1451-81) the Conqueror on May 29, 1453 (Lord Kinross, *The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire* [New York: Morrow Quill, 1977], p. 111) during the reign of pope Nicholas V (1447-55).

[95]Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980.

[96]The Christianization of Finland can be documented in part by a study of its burial practices. Christian graves are oriented east and west and they contain different kinds of artifacts than their pagan counterparts (Eino Jutikkala with Kauko Pirinen, *A History of Finland*, rev. ed., trans. Paul Sjoblom, [New York: Dorset, 1988], pp. 21-22). The change is gradual. The geographical orientation begins to change before the pagan grave goods disappear. What we are talking about here is western or Catholic Christianity in Finland. It is said, on the other hand, that the earliest terms in the Finnish language which pertain specifically to the new religion are Slavic in origin and therefore reached Finland from the east. But Sweden's acceptance of Catholic rather than Orthodox Christianity (from about A.D. 800 to the eleventh century) made it inevitable that Finland's church loyalties would also have a western orientation.

[97]See ibid., p. 22-23.

[98]Ibid., p. 26.

[99]H. W. Koch, *A History of Prussia* (New York: Dorset, 1978), p. 7.

[100]The Lithuanians at this time lived inland and ruled a territory extending as far east as Kiev. To the extent that they were able the Teutonic Knights avoided conflict with the Lithuanians for fear of a Polish-Lithuanian coalition, which in fact did materialize. When it finally came this union was especially devastating because Lithuania became Christian in the process. This would seem to be a windfall in support of the Order's broader goals but in fact it deprived them of their reason for existence. The wars continued unabated but without the religious element by which the Teutonic Knights had justified them before (Koch, *History of Prussia*, pp. 16-17).

[101]Estonia was ruled by Denmark at one time. The Teutonic Knights obtained it from the Danes by purchase, which led to the disappearance of Danes from Finland as well as Estonia. "Two centuries had passed since the Danish attempt to gain a permanent foothold on Finnish soil. After selling Estonia to the Teutonic Knights in 1346, the Danes had faded from sight" (Jutikkala and Pirinen, *History of Finland*, p. 41). When they finally became prominent again in the eastern Baltic it was by means of the Scandinavian Union. But these later events affected only Finland, not Estonia.

[102]Around A.D. 950 a man named Bogomil (whose name is the Slavic counterpart of Greek Theophilus) "began preaching to Bulgarian peasants and artisans a strange mixture of evangelical Christianity and Oriental dualism. . . . The upper classes and their religion were thus identified with evil and darkness; the lower strata, with goodness and light. The analogies were carried deeper into the human being himself. The body was identified as a creation of the Devil; the soul, as the imperishable emanation of God. Such dichotomies were later reflected as civil disobedience in the political order and as puritanism in the religious sphere" (Leslie C. Tihany, *A History of Middle Europe From the Earliest Times to the Age of the World Wars* [New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1976], p. 38). The Bogomils' grave stones showed, not a cross, but an uplifted hand. "These funerary monuments memorialize not only the uncompromisingly pious men and women over whom they were raised but also a possible historical east-west link between the Bogomil and the Albigensian heresies. Three popes--Innocent III in 1203, Gregory IX in 1234, and Innocent VI in 1355--preached crusades against the Bogomils. Innocent III also preached a crusade against the Albigenses, which was successful in the extirpation of that heresy in 1213 through military and inquisitorial means" (ibid., p. 39). Other authorities place the end of the Albigenses in 1229.

[103]J. N. D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), s.v. Innocent III. It should be noted that this legate died only after agreeing to excommunicate "the feudal lord and count of Toulouse, Raymond VI" (Miroslav Hroch and Anna Skýbová, *Ecclesia Militans: The Inquisition*, trans. Janet Fraser [Leipzig: Edition Leipzig, 1988], p. 14). This does not excuse his murder but shows that there was a political context for it.

[104]See ibid.

[105]See ibid., p. 41.

[106]*Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, s.v. Honorius III.

[107]With a little better handling pope Alexander III (1159-81) might have made Peter Waldo into a respectable Catholic saint. Waldo approached him about his calling to preach the virtues of poverty but Alexander made his own approval contingent on the approval of Waldo's local archbishop, whom he had offended. Waldo continued preaching but now what he said could only be construed as a form of protest against the church. His followers (the "Poor of Lyons") were excommunicated in 1184 by pope Lucius III (1181-85) (see Hroch and Skýbová, *Ecclesia Militans*, p. 13). It was only a few years later that Giovanni Bernardone of Assisi appeared before Innocent III (1198-1216) with a similar request and indeed with a similar agenda. He was dirty and unkempt on the occasion of his first audience and was summarily thrown out. But he tried again and Innocent changed his mind, perhaps with Waldo's recent example in view. So Waldo became a heretic and Bernardone became a saint--St. Francis of Assisi, founder of the Franciscan order.

[108]See LaMar Sprout, *The French Waldenses of Provence* (Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary [later Andrews University], M.A. thesis, 1957), pp. 58-63. This thesis will be reprinted in its entirety as a supplement to the next issue of *Historicism* (No. 19/Jul 89).

[109]Statements linking the emergence of the Inquisition in Spain, Italy, and elsewhere to events in the mid-sixteenth century have great potential for being simultaneously accurate and misleading: "Here in 1541-2 can be seen a major landmark in the transition from Augustinian and Erasmian reformism to a dual policy of reform plus repression. In Spain, however, this transition had been made a decade earlier" (A. G. Dickens, *The Counter Reformation* [New

York: Norton, 1968], p. 106). Elsewhere the same author mentions the fact that, "From 1483 to his death in 1498 [the queen's] inquisitor general Tomás de Torquemada [who was made Grand Inquisitor at age eighteen] directed his chief efforts against the *moriscos* and *conversos* (respectively Moorish and Jewish converts to Christianity) and may have burned some two thousand victims" (ibid., 48). Thus, while important events happened in 1541-2, that year did not mark the first appearance of the inquisition or the first efforts at intra-Catholic reform. "On the question of church life and the struggle against heresy, there are parallels to be drawn between the 13th and 16th centuries. The outcome of the deliberations of the Fourth Lateran Council are reminiscent of those of the Council of Trent" (Hroch and Skýbová, *Ecclesia Militans*, p. 12). For the reference to Torquemada's age at the time of his elevation to high office see ibid., p. 47.

[110]King Robert of France burned thirteen heretics in Orléans (1022) and later burned seven heretical women there as well. Vilgard of Ravenna was burned in Milan (1030). Emperor Henry III executed an unspecified number of heretics by hanging (1051) (see ibid., pp. 11-12). Joan of Arc would not be burned until much later, in 1431, a century after Gregory IX and well into what could be called the Inquisition's second phase (XIII-XV A.D.)--the period following the preliminary accumulation of precedents but before reaching the full height of its power during and after the time of the Reformation.

[111]*Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, s.v. Honorius III.

[112]Ibid., s.v. Innocent IV.

[113]See *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1964 ed., s.v. Inquisition.

[114]See ibid.

[115]Ibid.

[116]There is a difference of opinion about the date. According to Gustav Henningsen 1820, rather than 1834, marks the end of the Inquisition in Spain. "The Spanish Inquisition functioned until 1820, and, depending on how long Spanish dominion lasted in each instance, the documentation can span from 200 to 350 years" ("The Archives and the Historiography of the Spanish Inquisition," in Gustav Henningsen and John Tedeschi with Charles Amiel, *The Inquisition in Early Modern Europe: Studies on Sources and Methods* [Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1986], p. 54). At issue is what Henningsen means by the word "functioned." The Inquisition may not have functioned actively in Spain after it was restored in 1923 but in any event it was not officially dissolved until 1834.

[117]"Adrian, the earnest Dutchman who had never before been to Rome, was so ignorant of affairs that he had written asking that some suitable lodgings be obtained for him in Rome whence he could discharge his duties as pope. He was a barbarian who had been horrified at the pagan splendors of the Vatican when he at length arrived there. Barely able to speak Latin, Adrian seemed to believe that the prime duty of the supreme pontiff was to give spiritual guidance and set a Christian example to Christians. He lasted not quite two years and died, it was said, of a broken heart" (E. R. Chamberlain, *The Bad Popes* [New York: Dorset, 1969], p. 255).

[118]Vespasiano da Basticci (lived 1421-98) gives an entirely favorable sketch of Nicholas V, whom he knew personally (William George and Emily Waters, *Renaissance Princes, Popes and Prelates: The Vespasiano Memoirs*, with an Introduction by Myron P. Gilmore [New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963], pp. 44-58). Here is one example: "And from Don Nicolo, the prior aforesaid, I heard how one evening the Pope came alone into their room [the room of Don Nicolo di Cortona and Don Lorenzo da Mantua, the prior of Pisa--common clergy] where he found the friars seated and talking together. On the Pope's entry they prepared to get up, but he would not let them, and made them keep seated and sat down between them, asking them, as soon as he began to speak, if there was in the whole world a more unhappy man than himself. He went on to say that the sorrow which troubled him most was that of all the people who entered his apartments there was not one who told the truth about the matter he was considering: that he was so greatly troubled that, if fair dealing allowed, he would willingly

renounce the Popedom and be once more Maestro Tomaso da Serezana; and that he had formerly enjoyed more ease in a day than he now had in a year, pouring out his grief to them without cease till they all wept. Everyone knows there is often great misery where in common belief there must be great happiness. In the public eye Pope Nicolas was looked upon as the most fortunate Pope of the Church of God for many years; nevertheless he spoke of himself as the most miserable and unhappy of men" (ibid., p. 55). (The name is spelled "Nicholas" in other sources.)

[119]This is not a complete list. For a well written and totally honest discussion of selected popes who conspicuously failed to give the church spiritual leadership it had the right to expect see E. R. Chamberlain, *The Bad Popes* (New York: Dorset, 1969), cited above.

[120]Chamberlain, *Bad Popes*, p. 7.

[121]The popes who served under Alberic and at his appointment include: Leo VII (936-39), Stephen VII (IX) (939-42), Marinus II (942-46), and Agapitus II (946-55) (see *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*).

[122]Chamberlain, *Bad Popes*, pp. 38-39.

[123]Ibid., p. 285.

[124]Ibid.

[125]Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1977.

[126]See ibid., p. 3. The Diatessaron was not so much a harmony of the four gospels as a synthesis of them, making one connected narrative out of the four.

[127]Ibid., p. 459.

[128]New York, 1972.

[129]See ibid., p. 32.

[130]See ibid.

[131]F. F. Bruce, *The English Bible: A History of Translations from the earliest English Versions to the New English Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 96.

[132]London: Oxford University Press, 1961, p. 1. The problem was that Henry VIII (1509-47) had no male heir and wanted a wife who could give him one. Catharine of Aragon had produced six children for Henry but five had not survived infancy and the one who remained was a girl (Mary). In the words of John W. Howe, "Henry couldn't legitimize an heir without an annulment from the pope; the pope couldn't grant an annulment without offending the emperor [who had sacked Rome in 1527]; and the emperor couldn't extend his approval without damaging the reputation of his aunt [Catharine of Aragon]" (*Our Anglican Heritage*, Church Heritage Series [Elgin, IL: David C. Cook Publishing Co., 1977], p. 20). This situation was real enough, but Howe points out that another part of the background for what happened was local in nature rather than international. Britain had always had independent leanings. "British allegiance to Roman Catholicism was not formalized until the Synod of Whitby in the seventh century, and by then many local customs and emphases were firmly established in English faith and practice. . . . One of the clearest voices calling for reform was that of John Wycliffe, an Englishman. . . . By the time Henry VIII declared his independence from Rome, perhaps 50 percent of the English bishops were of Lutheran persuasion" (ibid., pp. 16, 17, 19). If Henry had thought that breaking with Rome would cause a revolt in his own kingdom, he probably would not have done so. But in fact he knew that his actions would be strongly supported at home.

[133]In the present context the above emphasis is correct and yet we must maintain balance. "To secular factors the Protestant explosion undoubtedly owed a great deal. But among these, the role of ambitious German and Scandinavian rulers has sometimes been exaggerated. The initial impacts of Protestantism look especially striking within the free cities of the Empire and Switzerland, places where kings and princes exercised little or no influence. Throughout Europe the independent-minded and more or less literate townsman formed the hard brick from which Protestantism could build its churches. The image of the greedy autocrat is not wholly imaginary, yet it may too easily be invoked to explain Lutheran expansion. For the

most part the early Lutheran princes were sincere converts who ran immense risks for the religious cause, and in the years 1547-55 they narrowly avoided utter catastrophe. By contemporary standards not a few of them and their descendants can be labelled 'good rulers', and several used a fair proportion of the secularized Church lands for charitable and educational purposes. Greater material beneficiaries were the nobles and squires who bought these lands, made fortunes from the rise in agricultural profits and successfully strove in the various Estates to control the incomes and powers of their princes" (*Counter Reformation*, pp. 31-32).

[134]The piety of Philip II (1556-98), king of Spain, and of his father, the emperor Charles V (1515-1556), present us with a conundrum. Both were loyal sons of the church and yet Philip threatened to attack Paul IV (1555-59) militarily in 1557 and Charles actually did attack Rome during the pontificate of Clement VII (1523-34) some thirty years earlier in 1527.

[135]New York: Mentor, 1950. See especially pp. 238-54.

[136]Luther's own struggle was deeply spiritual in nature rather than political. In the *Table Talk* he is reported to have said, "'The issue in the controversy over the papacy is that the pope boasts that he's the head of the church and condemns all who don't live under his power, for he says that although Christ is the [spiritual] head of the church, there must nevertheless also be a bodily head on earth. (I would gladly have conceded this to the pope if he had only taught the gospel.) . . . He boasts that he is lord over the church, and the church in turn is mistress over the Scriptures, and so everybody must submit to him. This was intolerable to me and provoked me to write against the papacy. Our opponents still admit today that our teaching's true, but they defend themselves by saying that it's not yet approved by the pope'" (Helmut T. Lehmann, gen. ed. [vols. 31-55], *Luther's Works*, 55 vols. [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), vol. 54: *Table Talk*, trans. Theodore G. Tappert, p. 185).

[137]"Scathing remarks have frequently been made to the effect that the Netherlanders suffered the torments to which they were put on account of religion, and only rose in revolt when they felt their purse to be endangered. . . . And indeed one can understand the exiles feeling thus bitterly. They always talked as if Protestantism was, or ought to be, the cause dearest to the heart of all Netherlanders. But in reality the religious question, far from being a unifying factor, could not but make for disruption amongst the Netherlands people; at least from the moment when, however, briefly, the menace of a Calvinist domination had shown its face. Nothing is more natural, on the other hand, than that the Tenth Penny should have proved an efficient means to heal the cleavage" (Geyl, *Revolt of the Netherlands*, p. 110).

[138]It was pointed out earlier (see n. 110 above) that the latter two periods (XIII-XV, XVI-XIX A.D.) have some features in common, such that a defensible comparison can be made between the Fourth Lateran council (1215) and the council of Trent (1545-47, 1551-52, 1562-63). "In other respects, however, the Church's position was more favourable in the 13th century, especially as the Great Schism in western Christianity had not yet assumed its full significance" (Hroch and Skýbová, *Ecclesia Militans*, p. 12).

[139]The third phase of the Inquisition was not called forth by the Reformation but was already poised to meet the Protestant threat when it should arise. "In 1478, the inquisition in Spain was reorganized and introduced into Castile" (Henningsen, "Archives and Historiography," p. 54), i.e., half a century before the Reformation became a serious problem for the established church.

[140]See ibid., pp. 54-60.

[141]Irish Celts had been drawn to Catholicism right from the first. "So far as we can know, Ireland produced no equivalent of the martyrs who elsewhere marked the church's passage into the heathen world. Christianity seems to have advanced by the power of persuasion alone. Charioteers, spear-men, bairds and filids laid down their multi-coloured cloaks, their bronze visors, were baptized and took to the woods: at least, such is the impression given by the facts we know. If it is right, we are here confronting the greatest mystery in Irish history, a

metamorphosis that cannot be explained and can hardly be illustrated" (Gerhard Herm, *The Celts: The People that Came out of the Darkness* [New York: St. Martin's, 1976], p. 262).

[142]"The Roman Mass was transformed into a Communion meal once again. Wine, previously reserved for the clergy, was distributed along with the bread to all communicants. The bread itself was real bread instead of a special wafer. The altar was replaced by the Holy Table. By law it had to be made of wood and moved away from the wall into the middle of the congregation. Adoration of the communion elements (and anything that hinted of it) was prohibited. The prayer of transubstantiation, that the bread and wine become Christ's body and blood, was eliminated. The words of distribution were reduced to simply 'Take and eat this" or "Drink this in remembrance.' Ritual gestures were forbidden. So were prayers for the dead and every reference to purgatory. The priest's vestments were reduced to cassock and surplice (a black robe with a single white overrobe). Clergy were freely permitted to marry" (Howe, *Anglican Heritage*, pp. 23-24). And yet, "When the Anglican church assumed final form during the reign of Queen Elizabeth it proved to be a communion half way between evangelical Protestantism and Roman Catholicism" (Lars P. Qualben, *A History of the Christian Church*, rev. ed. [New York: Nelson, 1964], p. 318).

[143]See ibid., pp. 291-96.

[144]There were few examples of moral corruption among the clergy in Sweden and Finland, but, as Jutikkala and Pirinen put it, "The Church was enormously rich, while the Crown was poor. So the king prepared to reverse these conditions" (*History of Finland*, p. 58). Besides, the archbishop of Sweden had supported Denmark in the conflict over the Scandinavian Union. So the bishops were forced to surrender their castles and much of their "superfluous income," i.e., the church was made taxable. This was no small step. By one estimate the church owned one-fifth of the land in Sweden (ibid., p. 59), by another estimate two-thirds (Qualben, *History*, p. 297). The spiritual force behind the Reformation in Sweden was Olavus Petri, who had studied with Luther in Germany. The Reformation was officially welcomed at the Diet of Vasteras in 1528 (Jutikkala and Pirinen, *History of Finland*, pp. 59-60).

[145]Nostalgia appears to have been as much a factor as zeal in the case of the Finnish Reformation. Mikael Agricola, bishop of Turku, had studied with Luther in Wittenberg but was amiable and moderate, allowing the images to remain along with many other features of Catholicism that his parishioners had grown accustomed to--even the Latin liturgy, confession, and fasts--but he also translated the New Testament and encouraged literacy. Agricola was no firebrand but is kindly remembered as the father of literary Finnish (ibid., pp. 60-61).

[146]See Qualben, *History*, p. 290.

[147]"The Reformation first affected the territory of the Teutonic Order. Their state seemed to be in a condition of utter decay and it was highly questionable whether it could survive at all. The pressure from Poland seemed irresistible: within the state the Reformation first affected Danzig, then Konigsberg where the Bishop of Samland, Georg von Polentz, also a member of the Teutonic Order, gave a famous sermon in favour of the new teachings at Christmas 1525. The Grand Master of the Order, Margrave Albrecht of Brandenburg-Ansbach, was very much in sympathy with Luther and in view of the condition of his order could see the only avenue of salvation in its secularization" (Koch, *History of Prussia*, p. 33). Prussia accepted both the Reformation and the protection of Poland at this time. It is an irony of history that the same organization which had fought so hard to make Prussia Catholic made it Protestant in turn. "There exists no evidence pointing to any resistance by the population to the new religion, perhaps an indication of how much the old had discredited itself in the course of time" (ibid.).

[148]"By 1527 the whole of electoral Saxony could be regarded as evangelical" (Roland H. Bainton, *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther* [New York: Mentor, 1963; first printed 1950], p. 243). Eventually "most of northern Germany became Lutheran, and in the south the cities of Strassburg, Augsburg, Ulm, and Nurnberg. Constance embraced the reform, severed connections with the Hapsburgs, and joined the Swiss. Basel came over to the reform in 1529"

(ibid., p. 247). That same year the emperor's brother Ferdinand demanded, at the Diet of Speyer, that: "In Lutheran lands the principle of religious liberty for Catholics must be observed, whereas in Catholic lands the same liberty would not be extended to the Lutherans. Against this invidious arrangement the Evangelicals protested, whence the origin of the name Protestant" (ibid., p. 248).

[149]See Georgia Harkness, *John Calvin: The Man and His Ethics* (New York: Abingdon, 1958), pp. 21-60.

[150]In the Netherlands things were somewhat more complicated because both leaders and citizens were divided among themselves. Even after the indiscriminate Spanish massacres at Mechelen, Zutphen, and Naarden under Don Fadrique de Toledo (1572) there were some who continued to think of Spain as an ally against the Calvinists. It took the "Spanish fury" at Maastricht and especially Antwerp (1576) to produce a united front against Philip II. Eventually Calvinism became firmly established in the north, i.e., in the Dutch speaking Netherlands as contrasted with French speaking Belgium.

[151]The course of the Reformation in Scotland was closely bound up with a struggle for political independence, as it had been in the Netherlands. And again, as in the Netherlands, the form that the Reformation took was Calvinist rather than Lutheran. See Williston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church*, rev. ed. (New York: Scribner, 1959), pp. 368-74.

[152]The Reformation in Italy met heavy opposition but despite this it attracted some notable people. "Bernardino Ochino, famed for his holy life and his marvellous oratory, was the general of a monastic order called the Capuchins. When he preached, no church was large enough to hold his audience. Ochino studied the writings of Luther and Zwingli for the purpose of refuting them, but they refuted him instead. He embraced the Protestant faith in 1542 after which he preached the Gospel with such power and simplicity that even the street cleaners discussed the Pauline Epistles" (Qualben, *History*, p. 305. And there were a number of reform-minded cardinals. Even the future Paul IV (1555-59), Giampietro Carafa, had corresponded with Erasmus during his earlier years. "Returning to Rome, he joined the Oratory of the Divine Love and worked to amend abuses in his dioceses" (*Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, s.v. Paul IV). If only we could stop here, it would be a pleasure to describe the career of Paul IV. "As head of the reactivated Inquisition he was described as showing inhuman severity" (ibid.). On Paul's death there was an outbreak of rioting and the headquarters of the Inquisition were ransacked. For Paul IV the brutality of the Inquisition was an expression of pastoral concern. It would be better for the victim to suffer for a few moments now than to spend all eternity in the flames of hell. Nothing people could do would be worse than what the devil would do later if their efforts should fail. This concept removed all limits to the Inquisition's cruelty. For Ochino, on the other hand, reform meant breaking away from such a mentality altogether. The gospel would bring people to Christ because of His love for them, not because of their fear for Him.

[153]"In 1559 the French Protestants had about forty-nine regular preaching places. At the first Protestant Synod, held in Paris in 1559, the 'Reformed' Church of France was formally organized. . . . During the next two years the number of congregations grew from 49 to 2150. About one-fourth of the population had become 'contaminated' with Protestantism. A large number of the great nobles, including the Coligny family, joined the Reformed Church. Even a powerful branch of the royal family, the Bourbons, embraced Protestantism. This gave to the French Reformation a peculiar mingling of religious and political aims which in 1562 plunged the French nation into a religious warfare which lasted for thirty-six years" (Qualben, *History*, p. 310). The Reformation in France was beaten back and defeated.

[154]"In Spain the Reformation had a considerable following, but the Spanish Inquisition suppressed it within twenty or thirty years" (Qualben, *History*, p. 306). This is all that Qualben says about the Reformation in Spain.

[155]See *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, s.v. Paul IV, Pius V, Sixtus V.

[156]See ibid., s.v. Urban VII.

[157]See ibid., s.v. Paul IV. "As head of the reactivated Inquisition he was described as showing inhuman severity" (ibid.).

[158]See ibid., s.v. Pius V.

[159]See ibid., s.v. Sixtus V.

[160]Qualben, *History*, p. 337.

[161]See C. Mervyn Maxwell, *God Cares*, 2 vols. (Mountain View, CA/Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981/85), vol. 2: *The Message of Revelation for You and Your Family*, p. 343.

[162]This move recalls "the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438), which had asserted [three and a half centuries earlier] the right of the French Church to manage its temporal possessions free of papal intervention, and had debarred papal appointments to French benefices" (Dickens, *Counter Reformation*, p. 13). Thus, the Revolution merely implemented as public policy a set of independent attitudes which had always been present.

[163]See Albert Goodwin, *The French Revolution*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966), pp. 126-27.

[164]Cedric Ward, "Napoleon and the Pope: What Really Happened in 1798?" *Ministry*, June 1979, p. 5.

[165]Ibid.

[166]See ibid., p. 6.

[167]The "'time of the end'" in Daniel is not a moment of time, but an extended period of time. This linear aspect of the word's meaning becomes predominant in post-biblical Hebrew but is present earlier (see N. Weider, "The Term q§ in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Hebrew Liturgical Poetry," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 5 [1954]: 22-31).

[168] It is interesting to note that the Gothic siege of Rome was lifted around the time of the vernal equinox in 538 (n. 77 above). Using a Gregorian calendar, the vernal equinox in 1798 also fell on the 20th, but of March (http://ns1763.ca/equinox/vern1788-2211.html).

[169]Aveling, *The Jesuits*, p. 204.

[170]"In the older mathematical sciences of physics and astronomy, the decade [1789-99] capped the achievement of the century with a series of great works of synthesis. Of these the most striking is the *Système du Monde* of Laplace, and its continuation the *Mécanique celeste*. Laplace filled out the Newtonian system into a rounded whole, extended and completed the infinitesimal calculus, and, taking up a suggestion thrown out by Kant, developed the nebular hypothesis, according to which the solar system was evolved from a rotating mass of incandescent gas. Beyond the nebulae he refused to go, and a Creator is significantly absent from his work. . . . At the beginning of the next century, Lamarck was . . . in a position to unite the work of geologists and paleontologists into a genuine theory of evolution" (Crane Brinton, *A Decade of Revolution: 1789-1799*, Torchbooks [New York: Harper and Row, 1963; first published 1934], pp. 269-70).