

A

RELIGIOUS ENCYCLOPÆDIA:

OR

DICTIONARY

OF

BIBLICAL, HISTORICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

BASED ON THE REAL-ENCYKLOPÄDIE OF HERZOG, PLITT, AND HAUCK.

EDITED BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

REV. SAMUEL M. JACKSON, M.A., AND REV. D. S. SCHAFF.

VOLUME I.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

1883.

DK 75
15291
1853
VII

COPYRIGHT, 1882, BY FUNK & WAGNALLS.



Electrotyped and printed by Rand, Avery, & Co., Boston.

RELIGIOUS CYCLOPÆDIA.

A.

A and **Ω**, or **ALPHA** and **OMEGA**, the combination of the first and last letters of the Greek alphabet, is the phrase used three times by our Lord, in the Apocalypse, to set forth his eternity (Rev. i. 8, xxi. 6, xxii. 13). [The E. V. and the received text have it also in i. 11, where the best MSS. omit it.] The idea is much older. In the O. T., Isa. xlv. 6 (comp. xli. 4, xl. 10), Jehovah calls himself "The first and the last," in contrast to the perishable idols. In both Testaments the phrase expresses the popular conception of eternity as endless duration, and at the same time the idea of divine causality; the Alpha looking back to the ἀρχή, the beginning, the creation; the Omega, to the τέλος, the end, the completion of the kingdom of God in Christ.

Tertullian (*De Monog.* c. 5) and Prudentius (*Cathemer. hymn.* IX., 10-12) use the figure. Marcus the Gnostic discovered that the numerical value of α and ω was equal to the numerical value of the individual letters composing περιστέρα (dove); whence he inferred that Christ called himself A and Ω with reference to the Holy Spirit, who descended on him at his baptism in the shape of a dove (Irenæus, *Adv. Haeres.* I., 14. 6; 15. 1; Tertullian, *De Praescript.* c. 50). This trifling was employed by Primasius in his commentary on the Apocalypse (*Bibl. Patr. Max.* X. p. 338) to prove that the Holy Ghost is of the same substance with the Father.

The combination of α and ω , by its simplicity and suggestiveness, commended itself as a symbol of Christian faith from the earliest times, and was used extensively on monuments of every description; sometimes alone, but more frequently in connection with the monogram of Christ in its various forms:



Sometimes the two letters, of which the ω is almost always of that uncial form which resembles the minuscular, are hung by chains from the arms of the cross. One of the oldest instances of the use of the letters is in the catacombs on the Island of Melos, and dates from the first part of the second century or the latter part of the first. (See *Roes, Reisen auf den griech. Inseln des ägeischen Meeres*, vol. III. p. 149.) The oldest coins on which it is used belong to Constance and Con-

stantine, the sons of Constantine the Great. It is found upon rings and sigils, in pictures, illustrations, mosaics, reliefs, &c. Occasionally it is used by Protestants, e.g., on the front of the royal mortuary chapel at Charlottenburg, near Berlin, on the altar of the Matthaekirche in Berlin [in the Madison-square Presbyterian Church, New York, and in other American churches].

[LIT.—PFEIFFER: *De a et ω.* Regiom. 1667. BEYSLAG: *De sigillo nominis Dei hominis.* Viteb. 1692. EWALD: *De a et ω nomine Christi mystico*, in his *Embl.* II. 169. RÜDIGER: *De Christo per primam (ΑΨΩ) et ultimam (ΑΩ)* S.S. vocem indicato. Gless. 1724. DIDRON: *Iconogr. Chrét.* MARTIGNY: *Dict. des antiq. chrét. s. v. aneaux.* SMITH and CHEETHAM: *Christ. Antiq.* I. p. 1.] F. PIPER.

AARON (*mountaineer*, or, according to another root, *enlightened*), the first high priest of the Jews, eldest son of Amram and Jochebed, of the tribe of Levi, brother of Miriam and Moses, husband of Elisheba, and father of Nadab, Eleazar, and Ithamar (Exod. vi. 20, 23); was the "prophet," or mouthpiece, of Moses (Exod. iv. 16), and associated with him in all the preparations for and the actual conduct of the exodus and the subsequent wandering. By divine command he and his sons were set apart for the priesthood, and accordingly were consecrated by Moses (Lev. viii.); and the choice of Aaron as high priest was afterwards miraculously confirmed by the budding rod (Num. xvii.). Aaron held the office for almost forty years; and it then passed to Eleazar, the older sons having died at the hand of God (Lev. x. 1, 2). The most prominent defect in his character was weakness. He reflected the mood of those about him, and never acted independently. Thus he yielded to the solicitations of the people at Sinai, during the absence of Moses, and made the golden calf (Exod. xxxii. 4). He joined Miriam in her jealous murmuring against Moses (Num. xii.), and subsequently Moses in his impatient disobedience of the divine command at Meribah (Num. xx. 10). For this latter sin he was kept out of the promised land (verse 24). He died on Mount Hor, at the age of a hundred and twenty-three years, in sight of all the people, who mourned sincerely over his death. See **MOSES**, **PRIEST**. FR. W. SCHULTZ.

AARON *ben-Asher*, or **AARON** *bar-Moses*, a Jewish rabbi, who in the eleventh century collected the various readings of the text of the O. T. from the manuscripts of the Western

¹ ["Corde natus ex parentis ante mundi exordium Alpha et Ω cognominatus; ipse Jonas et clausula, Omnia quae sunt, fuerunt, quaeque post futura sunt."]]

thing about the traditions of the place; but that is about all. The archives and libraries are in complete disorder.

LIT. — I. COMNENUS: *Descriptio Montis Atho*, etc., in MONTFAUCON: *Palteographia Græca*; GEORGIRENES: *Description of Present State of Mount Athos*, London, 1678; R. CURZON: *Visits to the Monasteries of the Levant*, London, 1850; VICTOR LANGLOIS: *Le Mont Athos*, Paris, 1867; [A. A. NEYRAT: *L'Athos, notes d'un excursion à la montagne des moines*, Paris, 1880.] GASS.

ATONEMENT. I. **The Word.**—1. The etymology and usage of the *English* word, (1) Supposed to be derived from "at-one-ment," and its primary signification, "reconciliation;" (2) At present universally used in the sense of "expiation," "satisfaction for an offence," "propitiation," "price of redemption."

2. In the authorized version the word occurs only once in the New Testament (Rom. v. 11), and there is the translation of *καταλλαγή*, "reconciliation." In the Old Testament it occurs frequently as the translation of *כַּפֵּר*, "to cover with sacrificial blood," and hence to "expiate," to "appease," to "purge away," to "ransom."

3. The biblical equivalents of the word. In the Old Testament, *כַּפֵּר* to make an atonement (Exod. xxx. 15, 16). *כַּפֵּר* a ransom (Exod. xxx. 12), a satisfaction (Num. xxxv. 31, 32). *כַּפֵּרִים* an atonement (Exod. xxx. 10; Lev. xxiii. 27).

In the New Testament, (1) As it respects sin *ἁμαρταναι*, to expiate, to make propitiation for (1 John ii. 2. iv. 10; Heb. ii. 17; Rom. iii. 25). (2) As it respects the sinner, *ἀγοράζειν*, to redeem by blood (1 Cor. vi. 20; Rev. v. 9); *ἐξαγοράζειν*, to redeem from the curse of the law (Gal. iii. 13); *λύτρον*, to release for a ransom, middle voice, to ransom (1 Pet. i. 18; Heb. ix. 12), Christ saves us by being our *λύτρον*, or ransom.

II. **The Doctrine.**—1. **The Patristic Doctrine.**—The Fathers, alike those who immediately followed the apostles, and those who flourished before and after the Council of Nice (A.D. 325), adhered to the sacrificial language of the Old Testament and to the terms used by the apostles in the New Testament; yet they failed to express their views definitely, or to maintain them consistently. It is, however, certain, that, more or less clearly, they always held the doctrine of expiation and satisfaction subsequently held by the whole church (Polycarpus, *Ad Philipp.*, l. 8. Clemens Romanus, *Ad Corinthios*, 7. 32. Athanasius, *De Incarnatione*, c. VII. See Outram, *Dis.* l. ch. 17); while together with this, and often disguising the more biblical view, there prevailed from the time of Origen (d. 254) to that of Anselm (d. 1109), and especially emphasized by Irenæus, and taught even by Augustine, a belief that Christ was offered to Satan as a ransom in the behalf of men, in whom he had acquired rights of conquest. This they derived from such passages as Col. ii. 15 and Heb. ii. 14.

2. **The Anselmic Doctrine.**—The view which had been implicitly received by the Fathers was first scientifically defined by Anselm (d. 1109), Archbishop of Canterbury, in his epoch-making book, *Cur Deus Homo?* He taught that sin is debt (guilt); that, under the government of

God, it is absolutely necessary that this debt should be paid, i.e., that the penalty incurred by the guilt of sin should be suffered; that this necessity has its ground in the infinite perfections of the divine nature; that this penalty must be inflicted upon the sinner in person, unless a substitute can be found having all legal qualifications for his office. This was alone realized in Jesus Christ, a divine person embracing a human nature. The best of the schoolmen, such as Bonaventura, Alexander Hales, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas, agreed with Anselm, except that, while holding the moral necessity for an atonement, they insisted that God possessed power to forgive sin by mere will, as involved in the metaphysical notion of omnipotence.

Abelard (d. 1142) resolved the moral perfections of God into benevolence and the liberty of indifference. He held that sin could be abolished, and the sinner received into favor, by the simple volition of God. Duns Scotus (d. 1308) denied that sin is an infinite evil, or that the sacrifice of Christ has an infinite value, and held that "tantum valet omne creatum oblatum, pro quanto acceptat Deus illud, et non plus." Hence God accepted (*acceptatio*) by a sovereign act the work of Christ as a sufficient compensation to his law, instead of the condign punishment of sinners.

The "Reformers before the Reformation," e.g., Wycliffe (d. 1384) and John Wessel (d. 1489) and the ancient Waldenses, held the strict Anselmic doctrine. This has subsequently been adopted in the creeds of the entire Christian Church. *Dec. Conc. Trent.*, sess. 6, ch. 7. "Jesus Christ, who when we were enemies merited justification for us by his most sacred passion on the tree, and satisfied God the Father for us." *Cat. Rom.* II. 5, 63; Hase, "*Libri Symbolici*," p. 684 (Form. of Concord.); *Heidelberg Cat.*, ques. 60; *Second Helvetic Conf.*, ch. 15; *Galic Conf.*, art. 18; *Belgic Conf.*, art. 22; *Westminster Conf.*, ch. 8, § 5; *Thirty-nine Articles of the Ch. of England*, Arts. 28 and 31.

3. **The Moral Influence Theory** was taught by Abelard, and has since, in various forms, been taught by Socinus, and such Trinitarians as Maurice, Jowett, Bushnell, etc.

According to Abelard, benevolence is the only divine attribute concerned in human redemption. Christ died for the twofold purpose of subduing the rebellion, and removing the guilty fears of men by the transcendent exhibition of divine love.

Socinus adopted this view, and emphasized the additional purpose of the death of Christ as the necessary prerequisite to his resurrection, whereby he brought light and immortality to light (*Rac. Cat.*, p. 265).

Frederick Denison Maurice, in his *Theological Essays*, London, 1853, and elsewhere, taught that the sufferings and death of Christ were the only complete sacrifice or self-surrender of the spirit and body to God ever accomplished, designed "to illustrate the principle of self-sacrifice as due from all God's intelligent creatures to Him who made them."

Horace Bushnell, in his *Vicarious Sacrifice*, N. Y., 1866, taught that Christ suffered with us through sympathy and fellowship, the result of which was to give him a moral power over men, spiritually

quicken them, and moulding them by his love and example.

McLeod Campbell, in his *Nature of the Atonement*, London, 1856, taught that Christ has by his sympathy, at once with us and with the righteous law we have broken, so identified himself with us as sinners, that he has offered up to God a perfect confession and adequate repentance of our sins. This repentance meets all the demands of law, which, according to Maurice, are repentance or punishment. This appears to occupy the middle ground between the "moral" and the "satisfaction" theories.

4. The *Governmental Theory of the Atonement* was first propounded by Hugo Grotius (d. 1645), a great lawyer, in his work against the Socinians: *Defensio Fidei Catholice de Satisfactione Christi*. He taught that the law under which man is held is, including precept and penalty, a positive product of the divine will. The right to relax its demands at will belongs to God's prerogative as moral governor. But since the gratuitous remission of the penalty in the case of some sinners would weaken the motives restraining from disobedience the subjects of the divine government in general, by affording an example of impunity, the *benevolence* of God requires, that, as a precondition of the forgiveness of any sinners, he should furnish such an *example* of suffering in Christ as will exhibit his determination that sin shall not escape with impunity. This view has been represented subsequently by the *Supernaturalists* of the last age in Germany, as Stäudlin, Flatt, and Storr, and, in America, by Jonathan Edwards, jun., Smalley, Maxey, Emmons, Park, and others.

The Remonstrants, or Arminians, of the seventeenth century in Holland, held substantially the same ground, while they adhered more closely to the use of biblical language and metaphors. Limborch, *Apol. Theol.* 3. 21, 6. "The death of Christ is called a sacrifice for sin; but sacrifices are not payment of debts, nor are they full satisfactions for sins; but a gratuitous remission is granted when they are offered."

All these various theories which have been propounded in the different schools of Protestant theologians have, in like manner, been advocated in the various schools of Catholic theologians. See OXENHAM: *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, London, 1869. 3d ed. 1881.

5. The *Mystical Theory*, which exists in various forms, may be generally stated thus: The reconciliation effected by Christ is brought about by the mysterious union of God and man, accomplished by his incarnation. This was held by the Platonizing Fathers, by followers of Scotus Erigena during the middle ages, by Osiander and Schwenkfeld at the Reformation, and the disciples of Schleiermacher among modern German theologians.

[LIT. — ANSELM: *Cur Deus Homo?* finished 1098; modern editions, Berlin, 1857, and London, 1863, translated in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. XII., also separately, Oxford, 1865; HUGO GROTIUS: *Defensio Fidei Catholice de Satisfactione Christi*, Leyden, 1617, modern edition, Oxford, 1836; FRANÇOIS TURRETIN (1623-87): *The Atonement of Christ*, translated by J. R. Wilson, N.Y., 1859; JOHN OWEN (1616-83): *The Death of*

Death in the Death of Christ, London, 1630 (*Works*, vol. 9, Philadelphia, 1865); Archbishop WILLIAM MAGEE: *Discourses and Disputations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice*, London, 1811, 8th ed., 1856, also in his *Works*, London, 1842, 2 vols.; WILLIAM SYMINGTON: *The Atonement and Intercession of Christ*, Edinburgh, 1834; F. C. BAUR: *Die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung, in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung von der ältesten Zeit bis auf die neueste*, Tübingen, 1838; RALPH WARDLAW: *Discourses on the Nature and Extent of the Atonement of Christ*, Glasgow, 1840; KURTZ: *Das Mosaische Opfer*, Mitau, 1842; English translation, *Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament*, Edinburgh, 1860; F. D. MAURICE: *Theological Essays*, London, 1853, 3d ed., 1876; the same: *The Doctrine of Sacrifice: A series of Sermons*, London, 1854, new ed., 1879; J. McLEOD CAMPBELL: *The Nature of the Atonement*, London, 1856, 4th ed., 1873; E. A. PARK: *Discourses and Treatises upon the Atonement* (by different writers), Boston, 1859; ALBERT BARNES: *The Atonement in its Relations to Law and Moral Government*, Philadelphia, 1859; THOMAS W. JENKYN: *The Extent of the Atonement*, Boston, 1859; W. G. T. SHEDD: *Discourses and Essays*, Andover, 1861; revised ed., N.Y., 1879; CHARLES BEECHER: *Redeemer and Redeemed*, Boston, 1864; HORACE BUSHNELL: *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, N.Y., 1866; the same: *Forgiveness and Law*, N.Y., 1874, the two volumes have been issued together in a new edition under the title, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, N.Y., 1876, 2 vols.; JOHN YOUNG: *The Life and Light of Men*, London, 1866; ROBERT CANDLISH: *The Atonement*, London, 1867; A. A. HODGE: *The Atonement*, Phila., 1867, new edition, 1877; GEORGE SMEATON: *The Doctrine of the Atonement as taught by Christ Himself*, Edinburgh, 1868, 2d ed., 1871; the same: *The Doctrine of the Atonement as taught by the Apostles*, Edinburgh, 1870; THOMAS J. CRAWFORD: *The Doctrine of Holy Scripture respecting the Atonement*, Edinburgh, 1871, 3d ed., 1880; R. W. DALE: *The Atonement*, London and N.Y., 1876, 8th ed., 1881; ALFRED CAVE: *The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice*, Edinburgh, 1877; G. W. SAMSON: *The Atonement*, Philadelphia, 1878; JOHN MILEY: *Atonement in Christ*, N.Y., 1879. — See also the historical works, ANDREW ROBERTSON: *History of the Atonement Controversy in the Secession Church*, London, 1846; K. R. HAGENBACH: *A Text-Book of the History of Doctrines*, ed. by Professor H. B. Smith, N.Y., 1869, 2 vols.; revised trans., Edinburgh, 1880, 2 vols.; WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM: *Historical Theology*, Edinburgh, 1870, 2 vols.; W. G. T. SHEDD: *A History of Christian Doctrine*, N.Y., 1871, 2 vols.; ALBRECHT RITSCHL: *A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, trans. from the German, Edinburgh, 1872. Also, for symbolical statements in respect of the Atonement, see R. WATSON: *Theological Institutes*, N.Y., n. d., 2 vols.; CHARLES HODGE: *Systematic Theology*, N.Y., 1872, 3 vols.; PHILIP SCHAFF: *The Creeds of Christendom*, N.Y., 3 vols., vols. II. and III.] A. A. HODGE.

ATONEMENT, Day of. The directions for its observance are found, Lev. xvi., xxiii. 26-32; Num. xxix. 7-11. On this day the most imposing acts of the Mosaic cultus were performed; for sacrifices were offered as an atonement, not