

THE NEW  
SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA  
OF  
RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EMBRACING

BIBLICAL, HISTORICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY  
AND BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND ECCLESIASTICAL  
BIOGRAPHY FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES  
TO THE PRESENT DAY

Based on the Third Edition of the *Realencyklopädie*  
Founded by J. J. Herzog, and Edited by Albert Hauck

PREPARED BY MORE THAN SIX HUNDRED SCHOLARS AND SPECIALISTS  
UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.  
(*Editor-in-Chief*)

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

CHARLES COLEBROOK SHERMAN  
AND  
GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.  
(*Associate Editors*)

AND THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENT EDITORS

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.  
(*Department of Systematic Theology*)

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.  
(*Department of Minor Denominations*)

JOHN THOMAS CREAGH, D.D.  
(*Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders*)  
(VOL. I.)

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.  
(*Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders*)  
(VOLS. II. TO XII.)

JAMES FREDERIC M-CURDY, PH.D., LL.D.  
(*Department of the Old Testament*)

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.  
(*Department of the New Testament*)

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.  
(*Department of Church History*)

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.  
(*Department of Pronunciation and Typography*)

---

Complete in Twelve Volumes

---

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY  
NEW YORK AND LONDON

JAN 6 1909  
Divinity School  
(Burr fund)  
(I II)

COPYRIGHT, 1908, BY  
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

---

Registered at Stationers' Hall, London, England

---

[Printed in the United States of America]  
Published May, 1908

he got over his concealed dread of the term *homousios*, though without giving up the assimilation of *ousia* and *hypostasis*, as to which he was evidently uncertain in the "Orations." In fact, his later *homousios* is scarcely distinguishable from *monousios*, and the earlier *homoios* [*tēs ousias*] no longer sufficed him. If we ask the origin of this change between 339 and 348-352, it will be obvious that we can not neglect to think of his sojourn in the West from 339 to 346, and his intercourse with Marcellus. Further evidences of development may be found in his teaching as to the manhood of Christ. If, however, his change of attitude toward the Homousians, his condemnation of Basil of Ancyra, etc., show that he was capable of development, it need not be taken as a reproach. He knew better than many of his contemporaries how to separate the fact, as to which he never wavered, from the formulas employed to describe it; his convictions were fixed early, but to the end of his life he never obstinately asserted the completeness of the phrases he had chosen to express them. Through evil report and good report, through the many changes of a long and eventful career, he maintained indisputably his title to the respect which we give to love of truth and honesty of mind. (F. Loofs.)

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** The Benedictine ed. of the works was printed in 4 vols., at Padua, 1677; again at Paris, 1690, ed. B. de Montfaucon; in *MFG*, xxv-xxviii; and in A. B. Cail-  
lau, *Patres Apostolici*, xxx-xxxii, Paris, 1842-43. The dogmatic treatises are accessible in the ed. of J. E. Thilo, Leipzig, 1853. Editions or translations of selected works are: *Historical Tracts and Treatises in Controversy with the Arians*, in *Library of the Fathers*, viii, ix, xiii, and xxviii, 1843; *Contra Gentes*, ed. H. von Hurter, in *Collectio opusculorum sanctorum patrum*, xlv, Innsbruck, 1874; *Select Treatises*, transl. by J. H. Newman, 2 vols., London, 1881; *Historical Writings ed. from the Benedictine Text*, by W. Bright, Oxford, 1881; *Dialogus of Athanasius and Zaccarius*, ed. F. C. Conybeare, in *Anecdota Ozoniensia*, part 8, ib. 1882; *Orations Against the Arians*, ed. W. Bright, with a life, ib. 1873, reissued in *Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature*, 1887; *Select Writings and Letters*, transl. with prolegomena, in *NPNF*, iv; and *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei*, transl. with notes by T. H. Bindley, London, 1903. Especially noteworthy is the edition of the long lost *Festal Letters*, by W. Cureton from a Syriac manuscript, London, 1853, Eng. transl. by H. Burgess, Oxford, 1854. His life, from early sources, is in *ASB*, May, i, 186-258, cf. 756-762 and vii, 546-547; consult the biographies by P. Barbier, Paris, 1888; R. W. Bush, London, 1888; and H. R. Reynolds, ib. 1889 ("lucid and able"). For his writings and teaching consult J. A. Moehler, *Athanasius der Grosse und die Kirche seiner Zeit*, Mainz, 1844 (Roman Catholic); H. Voigt, *Die Lehre des Athanasius*, Bremen, 1861; F. Boehringer, *Athanasius und Arius, oder der erste grosse Kampf der Orthodoxie und Heterodoxie*, Stuttgart, 1874 (Protestant, in his familiar series); E. Fialon, *St. Athanasie, Étude littéraire*, Paris, 1877; L. Aitzberger, *Die Logoslehre des Athanasius, ihre Gegner und Vorläufer*, Munich, 1880; G. A. Pell, *Lehre des Athanasius von der Sünde*, Passau, 1888 (Roman Catholic, "difficulties not always faced"); W. Bright, *Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers*, New York, 1891; P. Lauchert, *Die Lehre des heiligen Athanasius*, Leipzig, 1895; K. Hoss, *Studien über Schrifttum und Theologie des Athanasius*, Freiburg, 1899; Harnack, *Dogma*, passim (consult Index), 7 vols., Boston, 1895-1900 (important, very detailed); L. L. Paine, *Critical History of the Evolution of Trinitarianism*, Boston, 1900 (brilliant, deals with the position of Athanasius respecting homousianism); W. F. Fraser, *A Cloud of Witnesses to Christian Doctrine*, third series, *Against Arianism*, part 1, *St. Athanasius*, London, 1900; L. H. Hough, *Athanasius; the Hero*, Cincinnati, 1906.

**ATHEISM:** A term employed with some variety of connotation. Sometimes it is taken purely negatively and applied to every point of view which does not distinctly assert the existence of God, or order the life in view of his claims upon Different it. In this application it is broad Uses of the enough to include not only such systems as Agnosticism and Secularism Word. (qq.v.), but even that simple forgetfulness of God which is commonly known as "practical atheism." Sometimes, on the other hand, it is given a distinctly positive sense, and made to designate the dogmatic denial of the existence of God. Even when it is so understood, however, it has a wider and a narrower application, dependent on the meaning attached to the term "God," the denial of which constitutes its differentiation. In its narrowest sense, it is confined to those theories which deny the existence of all that can be called God, by whatever extension or even abuse of that term. In this sense it stands over against Pantheism or Fetishism, as truly as over against Theism; and takes its place alongside of this whole series of terms as designating a distinct theory of the universe. In its widest sense, on the contrary, it receives its definition in contrast with, not a vague notion of the divine, but the specific conception of Theism, and designates all those systems, differing largely in other respects, which have in common that they are antagonistic to a developed Theism. In this application, Atheism is synonymous with Antitheism, and includes not only Pantheism (q.v.), but even Polytheism, and, with some writers, Deism itself,—all of which fail in some essential elements of a clear Theism. Most commonly the term is employed by careful writers either in its narrowest sense, or else in the somewhat broadened sense of the denial of a personal God. Between these two definitions choice is not easy. All depends on our definition of God, and what we are prepared to admit to involve recognition of him. From the point of view of developed Theism all that can be thought God is denied when a living personal God, the creator, preserver, and governor of all things is disallowed; it is inevitable, therefore, that from the standpoint of Theism, Atheism should tend to receive one of its more extended connotations. It may be truer to the historical sense of the term, however, to take it in its narrowest sense and to treat it as designating only one of the Antitheistic theories, and as standing as such alongside of the others, from which it is differentiated in that it denies the validity of the notion of God altogether, while the others allow the possible or actual existence of the divine in one or another sense of that term.

The question which has been much discussed, whether Atheism is possible, depends for its solution very much upon its definition. That negative Atheism, especially in the form of "practical atheism," is possible, is evident from its persistent appearance in the world. Whether men may be totally ignorant of God or not, they certainly can very completely ignore him. And if the great atheistic systems like Buddhism and Confucianism have not been able to preserve the purity of their Atheism, no more have the great theistic

systems—Mohammedanism, Judaism, Christianity itself—been able to eliminate "practical atheism" from among their adherents. It is

**The Possibility of positive Atheism in its wider sense, in Atheism.** The face of the great part which has

been played in the world by the various forms of Pantheism, which not only underlies whole systems of religion but is continually invading with its leaven the most austere and complete systems of Theism. It is only in its narrowest sense, in which it is the denial of all that is called God or that is worshiped, that the possibility of Atheism can be brought into question, and then only when we regard it, not in its outward expression, but in the most intimate convictions of the heart. No one can doubt that portentous systems of reasoned Atheism have flourished in the bosom of the most advanced culture. As little can it be denied that, among the backward races, a very low order of religious conception may sometimes be discovered. It may well be contended, however, that even the most thoroughly compacted system of atheistic thought only overlies and conceals an instinctive and indestructible "sense of the divine," just as the most elaborated system of subjective idealism only insecurely covers up an ineradicable realism; and that it is this innate "sense of the divine" which we see struggling in the conceptions of low savages to express itself in the inadequate forms which alone a low stage of culture can provide for it. If this is all that is meant, Atheism is, no doubt, a condition impossible to man. Man differs from the lower creations, not in being less dependent than they, but in being conscious of his dependence and responsibility; and this consciousness involves in it a sense of somewhat, or better, some one, to which he is thus related. The explication of this instinctive perception into an adequate conception is a different matter; and in this explication is wrapped up the whole development of the idea of God. But escape from the apprehension of a being on whom we are dependent and to whom we are responsible is no more possible than escape from the world in which we live. God is part of our environment.

The history of reasoned Atheism is as old as the history of thought. There can be no right thinking unless there be thinking, and it is incident to thinking among such creatures as men

**History of that some may think awry.** In all

**Atheism.** ages, accordingly, the declaration has found its verification that those who have not liked to retain God in their knowledge he has given over to a reprobate mind. India and China both early gave birth to gigantic atheistic systems. The materialism of classical antiquity found its expression especially in the Atomists—Democritus, Epicurus, Lucretius. The unbelief of the eighteenth century ran to seed in the French Encyclopedists—De la Mettrie, D'Holbach, Diderot, Lalande—and embodied itself in that *Système de la Nature* which Voltaire called the Bible of Atheism. In the nineteenth century the older materialism strengthened itself by alliance, on the one hand, with advancing scientific theory, and, on the

other, with the increasing social unrest; and Atheism found expression through a series of great systems—Positivism, Secularism, Pessimism, Socialism. The doctrine of Evolution (q. v.), which was given scientific standing by Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859), became almost at once the prime support and stay of the atheistic propaganda. In every department of thought "evolution" is supposed to account for everything, while itself needing no accounting for. Men as widely unlike in everything else as Feuerbach, Strauss, Flourens, Csolbe, Dühring, Vogt, Buechner, Moleschott, Mailänder, Haeckel, Nietzsche, have united in a common proclamation of dogmatic Atheism; and probably in no period since the advent of Christianity has positive Atheism been proclaimed with more confidence or accepted more widely.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** R. Flint, *Anti-theistic Theories*, Edinburgh, 1880 (gives literature in Appendix 4); J. Beattie, *Evidences of the Christian Religion*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1876 (contains a bibliography); J. Buchanan, *Faith in God and Modern Atheism Compared*, Edinburgh, 1856; *Modern Atheism under its Forms of Pantheism, Materialism, Secularism; Development and Natural Laws*, Boston, 1856; Paul Janet, *Le Matérialisme contemporain*, Paris, 1864; Félix Dupanloup, *L'Athéisme et le péril social*, Paris, 1866; É. Méric, *Morals et athéisme contemporains*, Paris, 1876; J. S. Blackie, *Natural History of Atheism*, London, 1877 (keen and discriminating); J. Cairns, *Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1881; E. Naville, *Le Père Céleste*, Geneva, 1865, Eng. transl., *Modern Atheism or the Heavenly Father*, London, 1882 (philosophical); F. W. Hedge, *Atheism in Philosophy*, Boston, 1884; W. H. Mallock, *Atheism and the Value of Life*, London, 1884; H. H. Moore, *Anatomy of Atheism in the Light of the Laws of Nature*, Boston, 1890; A. Egger, *Der Atheismus*, Einsiedeln, 1901 (evangelical); F. le Dantec, *L'Athéisme*, Paris, 1906.

**ATHENAGORAS**, ath'e-nag'o-ras: Reputed author of two Greek treatises of the time of the Antonines, one on the resurrection, the other an apology for the Christians. He is entirely unknown to the tradition of the Church. Eusebius, Jerome, and their successors are silent, and, as the survey which Eusebius gives of the apologetic literature of the second century is very complete, his silence could not fail to attract attention. Very early the existence of an apologist of the name was doubted and the work was ascribed to Justin (cf. Baronius, *Annales*, ii, ad an. 179, chap. xxxix). This supposition, however, is from internal reasons untenable. The first testimony, and the only one from the third century, to the existence of the apology and the name of its author, is a quotation by Methodius, found (1) in the ancient Bulgarian translation (ed. Bonwetsch, i, 293); (2) in Epiphanius, *Hær.*, lxiv, 20, 21; (3) in Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 234 (cf. Athenagoras, *Supplicatio*, xxiv, p. 27 B). Certain notices by an unknown scribe (*Cod. Barocc.* 142, fol. 216) quoting from the "Christian History" of Philippus Sidetes (early in the fifth century) state that Athenagoras was an Athenian by birth, and first director of the catechetical school of Alexandria; he lived in the time of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius; like Celsus, he was occupied with searching the Scriptures for arguments against Christianity, when he was suddenly converted. Most of these notices, however, are palpably erroneous. Yet, in spite of the entire absence of tradition and the close resem-