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MABILLON, Jean, b. at St. Pierreumont, in the diocese of Rheims, Nov. 23, 1632; d. in Paris, Dec. 27, 1707. In 1653 he entered the Congregation of St. Maur; and in 1664 he settled in the abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés in Paris, as the assistant of D’Achery. His first independent work was his edition of the Opera omnia S. Bernardi, 1667, the first and also the model of the celebrated St. Maur editions of the Fathers; but his great life-work was his history of the Benedictine order. In 1668 appeared the first volume of his Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti, which contained many striking proofs of his great critical talent. But just the cutting criticism which he exercised caused him trouble. He was accused by members of his own order, and had to defend himself before the chapter-general, in which, however, he succeeded completely. The ninth and last volume of the work appeared in 1701. In 1703 followed the first volume of his Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, of which he finished four volumes before he died. The fifth was completed by Massuet (1719); the sixth, by Martène (1728). His most celebrated work, however, is, perhaps, his De re diplomatica, libr. vii., written against characters in the ancient church.— I. Macarius contained many striking proofs of his great critical and learned ability. In 1668 he went to Italy in 1685-86, he published Museum antiquorum et scriptorium, Paris, 1667, the first and also the model of the modern Museum historicum, etc. Part of his comprehensive correspondence has been published in his Ouvrages posthumes, by Valery, Paris, 1846, 3 vols. Lit.—The life of Mabillon has been written by Ruimart (Paris, 1700), Emile Chavin de Malan (Paris, 1843), Henri Jadart (Rheims, 1870). G. LAUBMANN.

MACARIANS. See Macarius (IV.).

MACARIUS is the name of several prominent characters in the ancient church.— I. Macarius the Elder, also called the Great, or the Egyptian; b. about 300, in Upper Egypt; d. 391, in the desert of Sceita; grew up as a pupil of Antonius; was ordained priest in 340, and directed the monastic community of Sceita for half a century. He is commemorated in the Western Church on Jan. 15, in the Eastern on Jan. 19; and several monasteries in the Libyan Desert still bear his name. He left fifty homilies, which have been edited by J. G. Pritius, Leipzig, 1698, also some Apophthegmata and letters, edited by H. J. Floss, Cologne, 1830, while the Opera omnia were extracted from his homilies. See Br. LINDNER: De Macario, Leipzig, 1846, and Th. FÜSTER, In Jodrabscher f. d. Theologie, 1873.— II. Macarius the Younger, or the Alexandrian, was a somewhat younger contemporary of the preceding, and stood at the head of five thousand monks in the Nitrian Desert. A tradition fixes the date of his death at Jan. 2; but he is commemorated on the same days as Macarius the Elder, with whom he is often confused. A monastic rule (HLSTENIUS: Cod. regul., i. 18) is ascribed to him, also a homily and some apophthegmata (MIGN. Praet. Graec. xxxiv.).— III. Macarius Magnes, probably identical with that Macarius (Bishop of Magnesia), who, at the Synod of the Oak (405), denounced the Bishop of Ephesus, the friend of Chrysostom. An apology of Christianity, directed against some Neo-Platonic adversary, discovered at Athens in 1807, and edited by C. Blondel (Paris, 1736), probably belongs to him. See L. DUCHESNE: De Macario Magneta et scripta ejus, Paris, 1877. [IV. Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch in the seventh century; present at second council of Constantinople (868); was a Monothlete, and leader of a sect known as Macarians. See MONOTHELITES.] ZÖCKLER.

MACBRIDE, John David, D.C.L., F.S.A., eminent Orientalist; b. at Norfolk, Eng., 1788; d. at Oxford, Jan. 24, 1868. He was educated at Exeter College, Oxford, where he took a fellowship. In 1813 he was appointed principal of Magdalen Hall, and Lord Almoner’s professor of Arabic in his university, and for the rest of his life retained these positions. He published anonymously, Diatessaron, or the History of our Lord Jesus Christ, compiled from the Four Gospels according to the Authorized Version, Oxford, 1897; Lectures explanatory of the Diatessaron, 1835, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1854; Lectures on the Articles of the United Church of England and Ireland, 1833; Lectures on the Epistles, 1858; also a work upon Mohammedanism. His Diatessaron was for some time a university textbook at Oxford.

MACCABEES, the name given in later times to the Asmoneans, a family of Jewish patriots who rose to celebrity in the reign of Antiochus (IV.) Epiphanes. It placed itself at the head of a popular revolt, which finally led, after terrible struggles, and many bloody vicissitudes of fortune, to a period of freedom and glory for Israel. The derivation of the name “Asmonean” is a matter of doubt. According to Josephus, it is to be looked for in a certain Asmoneus, who, he says, was an ancestor of the priest Mattathias. But it has such a singularly foreign appearance as to make it seem not improbable that it was a title of honor. [Professor Curtiss, in his brochure on The Name Machabees, advocates the meaning “extinguisher.”] The authorities for the history of the Asmoneans are, (1) the so-called “Books of the Maccabees,” which found their place in the Greek appendix of the Old Testament. The first book goes down to the death of Simon; the second does not extend to the death of Judas. (2) Josephus gives in his Antiquities (12-14) the most exen-
have regarded the introduction of foreign customs
the morasses and ravines of the Lower Jordan,
years he led the party with almost superhuman
their relations with foreign states, their wealth,
for the beginning of the revolt. Fleeing to the
hand restrictions. These measures induced an
patriot Mattathias of Modin. His bold deed of
mountains, he, with the co-operation of his five
relations with the Roman Senate. But the armies
time occupied the throne. But a pretender
pretender. Jonathan defeated him, and secured
the only account. In the beginning of his narra
moral resistance, Antiochus finally inaugurated

The further fortunes of the house of the Maccabees (Asmonaean) has been given under the names of Simon's successors. It will be sufficient here to give a brief survey. John, or Hyrcanus I., Simon's son, was his immediate successor. With his death (107 B.C.) the glory of Israel descended to the house of the Maccabees advanced rapidly to its destruction. Hyrcanus, anticipating nothing good from his five sons, left his kingdom to his widow. Aristobulus I., however, pushed his way into power, but died (106 B.C.), after allowing his mother to perish of hunger, and throwing three of his brothers into prison. He was the first to assume the title of king. His widow Alexandra,
not yet weary of the new dignity, and worthy of it, offered her hand and her crown to one of her brothers-in-law, Alexander Janneus I., whose reign was longer than that of any other member of his family. He desired to shine, like his father, as a conqueror, without possessing his father's qualities. His son succeeded to power at his death (79 B.C.), and was followed, after a pru-
dent and powerful reign, by his son Hyrcanus II. (70 B.C.). He united the offices of king and high priest, but was soon deprived of both by his brilliant and daring brother, Aristobulus II. Thenoecro the fortunes of the family were inti-
mately associated with the ambitions and suc-
cesses of the Herodian house. Its history was a
series of tragedies. The land was deprived of the royal title by Pompey, 63 B.C. Aristobulus was murdered, and subsequently Hyrcanus II. (31 B.C.), in the eightieth year of his age, and by the ambitious hand of Herod the Great, who had married his beautiful grand-daughter Mari-
amne. The same ambition put to death Mariam-
ne's brother Aristobulus, in his eighteenth year (31 B.C.), in a manner infamous to the life of Mariamne herself, and consummated the bloody tragedy of the Maccabean house by the ghastly murder of his own two sons by Mari-
amne,— Alexander and Aristobulus. [See Alex-
ander and Aristobulus, H. de S. Macrobeus.] For
further facts the reader may consult the His-
tories of Israel of Ewald and Stanley, and espe-
cially Schürer: N. T. liche Zeitgesch., pp. 59–23,
Leip., 1874; S. I. Curtius: The Name Machabeus,
Leip., 1879; F. de Sauloy: Histoire des Macha-
bees, Paris, 1880; Coxeter: Judas Maccabeus,
London and New York, 1880.] ED. REUSS.

MACCAEBES, Books of. See Apocrypha.
MACCAEBES, Festival of the. The seven
brothers, who with their mother were martyred
at Antioch under Antiochus (see 2 Macc. vii.),
were commemorated Aug. 1. The festival dates
from the fourteenth century. Panegyrics upon the
martyrs were uttered by Gregory Nazianzen,
Augustine, Chrysostom, and Leo the Great.

MACCOVIUS (Makowsky), Johannes, Reformed
theologian of Polish descent; b. at Lobzenic
in 1596; d. at Padua, 1680; an elderly man, and the young Paulus. The Atha-
nasian party succeeded in carrying the election
in favor of Paulus; but Eusebius of Nicomedia,
and Theodorus of Hierapolis, induced the emperor
to banish him. After the death of Constantine,
however, he returned; but he was unable to
maintain himself. Deposed by the synod of Con-
stantinople, in 338 or 339, he was banished to
Mesopotamia. He, however, himself made bishop of the metropolis. After his
death, the rivalry between Maccedonius and Paulus began anew; and Macedonius was con-
secrated bishop by the anti-Nicene party. The
emperor then came in person. Paulus was expelled, the refrac-
tory city was punished, and Macedonius was
finally installed by force. Some years later on,
however, Macedonius was once more compelled
to retire before his rival on account of the gen-
eral reaction which took place in favor of Atha-
nasius; but shortly after the death of Constans,
in 350, he returned, and succeeded in maintain-
ing himself for about ten years. His position
was considerably weakened by the policy of the
emperor, who wished to show the perfect harmony be-
 tween the doctrines of Augustine and those of the Church of Rome;
several others, to show the perfect harmony be-
tween Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, etc.
A complete list of the works of the two brothers
Macedonius is found in N. Antonio: Bibliotheca
Hispana Nova, i.

MACEDONIA, the kingdom of Philip and
Alexander the Great, comprised the middle part
of the Balkan peninsula,—from Thessaly and
Epirus to Illyria and Moesia; from Thrace and the Ægean to the Adriatic. It was conquered
by the Romans in 188 B.C., and divided into four
provinces; but after the conquest of Greece, in
142 B.C., Macedonia appears as one single pro-
bince besides Asia. Herod the Great annexed
the Apocrypha of the Old Testament (Esth. xiv.
14, xvi. 10; 1 Macc. i. 1, vi. 2, vii. 5; 2 Macc.
viii. 20). But it has acquired a much greater
interest by being the first part of Europe which re-
ceived Christianity. Paulus out of the city; but Hermogenes was
killed by a fanatical mob. The emperor then
came in person. Paulus was expelled, the refrac-
tory city was punished, and Macedonius was
finally installed by force. Some years later on,
however, Macedonius was once more compelled
to retire before his rival on account of the gen-
eral reaction which took place in favor of Atha-
nasius; but shortly after the death of Constans,
in 350, he returned, and succeeded in maintain-
ing himself for about ten years. His position
was considerably weakened by the policy of the
emperor, who wished to show the perfect harmony be-
 tween the doctrines of Augustine and those of the Church of Rome;
several others, to show the perfect harmony be-
tween Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, etc.
A complete list of the works of the two brothers
Macedonius is found in N. Antonio: Bibliotheca
Hispana Nova, i.

MACEDONIA, the kingdom of Philip and
Alexander the Great, comprised the middle part
of the Balkan peninsula,—from Thessaly and
Epirus to Illyria and Moesia; from Thrace and the Ægean to the Adriatic. It was conquered
by the Romans in 188 B.C., and divided into four
provinces; but after the conquest of Greece, in
142 B.C., Macedonia appears as one single pro-
bince besides Asia. Herod the Great annexed
the Apocrypha of the Old Testament (Esth. xiv.
14, xvi. 10; 1 Macc. i. 1, vi. 2, vii. 5; 2 Macc.
viii. 20). But it has acquired a much greater
interest by being the first part of Europe which re-
ceived Christianity. Paulus out of the city; but Hermogenes was
killed by a fanatical mob. The emperor then
came in person. Paulus was expelled, the refrac-
tory city was punished, and Macedonius was
finally installed by force. Some years later on,
however, Macedonius was once more compelled
to retire before his rival on account of the gen-
eral reaction which took place in favor of Atha-
nasius; but shortly after the death of Constans,
in 350, he returned, and succeeded in maintain-
ing himself for about ten years. His position
was considerably weakened by the policy of the
emperor, who wished to show the perfect harmony be-
 tween the doctrines of Augustine and those of the Church of Rome;
several others, to show the perfect harmony be-
tween Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, etc.
A complete list of the works of the two brothers
Macedonius is found in N. Antonio: Bibliotheca
Hispana Nova, i.
a synod of Constantinople, in 380, his enemies actually succeeded in having him deposed, and he seems to have died shortly after. But his adherents in Constantinople and the adjacent dioceses were for a long time known under his name, as the "Macedonians," and offered a stubborn opposition to the orthodox teaching of the deity of the Holy Spirit.

W. MOLLER

MACHÆRUS, a strong fortress in Perea, nine miles east of the northern end of the Dead Sea, was built by Alexander, the son of Hyrcanus I., and dismantled by Gabinius. It is not mentioned in the Bible; but Josephus (Ant., XVIII. 5, 2) points it out as the place in which the prelate, b. early in the spring of 1789 (or March 15, 1791, according to the college register) at Tuber-na-Fian, Mayo, Ireland; d. at Tuam, Monday, Nov. 7, 1881. He was graduated with high honors at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, 1814; beheading of John the Baptist took place. 5, 2) points it out as the place in which the death of the professor in that department, was unanimously elected his successor (1820). In 1825 he was appointed coadjutor bishop of Killala; but in July of that year he was elected archbishop of Killala, and consecrated with the title of Bishop of Maronia in partibus. In 1829 he laid the foundation of the Killala Cathedral. In May, 1834, ordained priest, and appointed lecturer on theology to his alma mater, the same year; and, on the death of the bishop in that department, was elected archdeacon of Pieter-Maritzburg. In 1839 he returned to England, to arouse an interest in African missions. He was subsequently sent out, under the Universities' Mission, to Africa, and was consecrated its first bishop Jan. 1, 1861, of the diocese covering territory bordering on Lake Nyanza. Bishop MacKenzie's death was premature; but his life was sufficiently long to enable him to develop a missionary enthusiasm and devotion which place him in the front rank of the foreign missionaries of the Anglican Church. See MACKENZIE, Charles Frederick, a devoted foreign missionary of the Anglican Church; b. in Portmore, Pembrokeshire, April 16, 1822; d. Jan. 31, 1862, of fever, in Africa, on an island at the confluence of the Shiré and Ruo Rivers. He graduated with distinction at Cambridge, and was made fellow of Caius College. Fired with missionary zeal, he went out in 1855, with Bishop Colenso, to Natal, as archdeacon of Pieter-Maritzburg. In 1859 he was elected archbishop of Tuam, and metropolis bishop of the diocese covering territory bordering on Lake Nyanza. Bishop MacKenzie's death was premature; but his life was sufficiently long to enable him to develop a missionary enthusiasm and devotion which place him in the front rank of the foreign missionaries of the Anglican Church. See MACKNIGHT, James, D.D., Scotch divine; b. at Irvine, Ayrshire, Sept. 17, 1721; d. at Edinburgh, Jan. 13, 1800. He was educated at Glasgow and Leyden; pastor at Maybole, Ayrshire, 1753-59; at Jedburgh, 1769-72, until his death. He prepared A Harmony of the Gospels, in which the natural order of each is preserved, with a Paraphrase and Notes, London, 1736, 2 vols., 7th ed., 1822, Latin trans. by A. F. Ruckersfelder, Bremen, 1772-73, 3 vols. (the notes are so copious, that the work amounts to a complete Life of Christ: it has long been a standard); The Truth of Gospel History, 1763 (a work upon the external and internal evidences of the Gospels); A New Literal Translation, from the Original Greek, of all the Apostolical Epistles, with a Commentary and Notes, 1795, 4 vols., several subsequent editions in varying number of volumes (the work has been very severely condemned for heretical teaching and defective scholarship, and, on the other hand, as highly praised for learning and ability). See his Life, by his son, prefixed to editions of the Epistles since 1806.

MACHCLARIN, John, Scotch divine; b. at Glendaruel, Argyshire, October, 1683; d. at Glasgow, Sept. 8, 1754. He was educated at Glasgow and Leyden, licensed to preach April 1722, and pastor Portmore, Peeblesshire, April 1723. His works were edited by W. H. Goold, Edinburgh, 1860, 2 vols. The most admired of his publications are An Essay on the Prophecies relating to the Messiah, with an Inquiry into Happi-
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ness, and Three Sermons (1773), and a sermon upon Glorifying in the Cross of Christ.

MACLEOD, Norman, D.D., a distinguished minister of the Church of Scotland, but even more widely known as the original editor of Good Words, and as the author of various standard works in popular literature; was b. at Campbelton, Ayrshire, June 5, 1812; and d. in Glasgow, June 18, 1872. In his own Reminiscences of a Highland Parish will be found an animated account of the old Highland family — especially as represented by his grandfather, the patriarchal minister of Morven — from which he was proud to be descended, as well as graphic descriptions of the wild scenery, and free, out-of-door life, in the midst of which some of the happiest days of a happy boyhood were spent. It was, however, chiefly with the seaport town of Campbelton and its seafaring associations, that the boy was familiar. On his singularly impressive and sympathetic nature and the circumstances of those early years appear to have exercised a lasting influence. Among the circumstances in question, his biographer attaches prominent importance to the character of his father and mother; the former, Dr. Norman Macleod (minister successively of Campbelton, Camphill, and St. Columba, Glasgow), being “in many ways the prototype of Norman.” Young Macleod never made any pretensions to scholarship; and at the University of Glasgow, which, after an irregular classical training, he entered in 1827, he shone more in the students’ scholarship; and at the University of Glasgow, where, after taking his theological course under the celebrated Dr. Thomas Chalmers, then professor of divinity in that university. Before receiving license, he spent three years in the family of a Yorkshire gentleman, Mr. Preston of Moreby, as tutor to his son; during most of the time residing at Weimar, or elsewhere in the Continent of Europe. This first of many visits abroad seems to have had an important influence on the development of the character of the young man. “His views were widened, his opinions matured, his human sympathies vastly enlarged; and, while all that was of the essence of his early faith had become doubly precious, he had gained increased catholicity of sentiment, and a knowledge of the world” (Memoir, vol. i. p. 49). His first charge was Loudon, in Ayrshire, a parish partly agricultural, but with a considerable weaving population. There he seems to have given himself up, with all the ardor of his nature and the enthusiasm of youth, to his parochial duties, especially among the working-classes of the population. It was, however, in the large and important parish of the Barony, Glasgow, embracing at that time eighty-seven thousand souls, to which (after thirteen years passed in Loudon, and in his second charge, Dalkeith) he was called in the year 1851, being “in many ways the prototype of Norman.” Young Macleod never made any pretensions to scholarship; and at the University of Glasgow, which, after taking his theological course under the celebrated Dr. Thomas Chalmers, then professor of divinity in that university. Before receiving license, he spent three years in the family of a Yorkshire gentleman, Mr. Preston of Moreby, as tutor to his son; during most of the time residing at Weimar, or elsewhere in the Continent of Europe. This first of many visits abroad seems to have had an important influence on the development of the character of the young man. “His views were widened, his opinions matured, his human sympathies vastly enlarged; and, while all that was of the essence of his early faith had become doubly precious, he had gained increased catholicity of sentiment, and a knowledge of the world” (Memoir, vol. i. p. 49). His first charge was Loudon, in Ayrshire, a parish partly agricultural, but with a considerable weaving population. There he seems to have given himself up, with all the ardor of his nature and the enthusiasm of youth, to his parochial duties, especially among the working-classes of the population. It was, however, in the large and important parish of the Barony, Glasgow, embracing at that time eighty-seven thousand souls, to which (after thirteen years passed in Loudon, and in his second charge, Dalkeith) he was called in the year 1851, that though multiplied public engagements, as he often complained, prevented him from over-much energy, and of such varied powers, into engaging in literary work. It was in 1860 that he undertook the editorship of one of the ablest and most successful of the religious magazines of the day, Good Words. About the same time, some of the more popular of his contributions to general literature were written; the greater number of them, indeed, originally appearing in Good Words. These works include The Earnest Student, The Old Lieutenant and his Son, The Gold Thread, Character Sketches, The Starling, Eastward, and Peeps at the Far East. One of the most exquisite pieces of religious fiction in the language is his Wee Davie, which belongs to this period. During the last ten or fifteen years of his life, Dr. Macleod took an active part in the general work of the church, including labors connected with some of the chief posts of honor to which Scottish churchmen are eligible. In 1815 he was one of a deputation to visit the Scottish churches in Canada. From 1864 to 1872 (the year of his death) he undertook the arduous duties of the chairman of the foreign missions committee of the church; in this capacity paying also a visit to India as a deputy from the church, — an occasion, it may be added, on which he was received, both by Anglo-Indians and by the natives of India, with the utmost enthusiasm. He also, for many years, held the High Court appointments of Dean of the Thistle, Dean of the Chapel Royal, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen for Scotland. Nor were these empty honors; for personally he enjoyed in an eminent degree the favor and confidence of his sovereign. In the year 1869 he was twice, by a unanimous vote to the presidency, or moderatorship as it is called, of the General Assembly, the Supreme Court of the Church of Scotland.

LIT. — Memoir of Norman Macleod, D.D., by his brother, the Rev. Donald Macleod, B.A., minister of the Park Parish, Glasgow, London, 1876. WILLIAM LEE.

MACNEILE, Hugh, D.D., b. at Ballycastle near Belfast, county Antrim, Ireland, 1795; d. at Bournemouth, Eng., Jan. 26, 1879. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin; studied law, but afterwards took orders in 1820; and from 1834 to 1868 was rector in Liverpool, where he acquired great popularity. In 1868 he was, on the recommendation of Mr. Disraeli, appointed Dean of Ripon; but in October, 1875, he resigned, on account of failing health. He was an eloquent man, noted for his vehement attacks upon the Roman-Catholic Church. His publications were mostly Sermons and Lectures, which passed through several editions, and controversial tracts upon Romanism, Unitarianism, etc. 1876. WILLIAM LEE.

MACON, a city of Burgundy, in which three councils were held (Concilia Malvae consensit). One, in 681 (twenty-one bishops being present), issued nineteen canons, of which the seventh threatens
with excommunication any civil judge who should dare to proceed against a clerk, except in criminal cases. Another, in 585 (forty-three bishops being present in person, and twenty represented by deputies), issued twenty canons, of which the eighth forbade anyone who had taken refuge in the sanctuary to be touched without the consent of the priest; while the ninth and tenth forbade the civil power to proceed against a bishop, except through his metropolitan, or against a priest or deacon, except through his bishop. The third was held in 624. See Mansi: Conc. Coll., ix.

MADAGASCAR (an island off the eastern coast of Africa, eighteen hundred miles from the Cape of Good Hope) has been a distinguished scene of the success of modern missions among the heathen, and the steadfast perseverance of native Christians under violent and prolonged persecutions. The island is nine hundred miles long, and four hundred miles wide at its widest point. It was discovered, and made known to Europe, by Marco Polo, in the latter part of the thirteenth century, but was not reached by the Spaniards, or Portuguese, or Dutchmen, with an admixture of negro blood. They are a well-built race. The native religion consisted of the worship of a supreme God (whom they called "The Fragrant Prince"), idolatry, sacrifices, sorcery, and divination. Infanticide was practised till the arrival of the missionaries, and polygamy and slavery prevailed. Thousands of the population were shipped away by slave-dealers. The present population is estimated at two millions and a half.

Christian missions were established in Madagascar, in 1818, by the arrival of Messrs. Jones and Bevan, under appointment of the London Missionary Society. Mr. Bevan died soon after his arrival. In 1818 the first embassy of friendship had arrived on the island from England. Radama, who was king at the time of the missionaries' arrival, was an enlightened prince, and seconded their efforts in establishing schools. They invented an alphabet for the native language, and reduced it to writing. The London Society sent out two printing-presses; and a version of the New Testament was prepared, text, language, and reduced it to writing. 'The London Missionary Society' (Norske Misjonsselskap zu Stavanger) also prosecutes missionary work on the island, and in 1880 had 1,200 communicants connected with its missions. In 1857 the Friends established a mission, with which, in 1858, 3,500 members and 26,000 Christians were connected. The Rev. Mr. Ellis again in 1861 visited it as the agent of the London Missionary Society. The sufferings of the Christians were now recognized, and their constancy commemorated in a number of martyrs' memorial churches. In 1869 there were 75 churches on the island, with 95 native and foreign pastors, and 4,374 communicants. The London Society in 1882 had 71,585 communicants connected with its missions. In 1887 the Friends established a mission, with which, in 1881, 5,200 members and 20,000 Christians were connected. The Rev. Mr. Ellis again in 1861 visited it as the agent of the London Missionary Society. In 1887 the Friends established a mission, with which, in 1881, 5,200 members and 20,000 Christians were connected. The Rev. Mr. Ellis again in 1861 visited it as the agent of the London Missionary Society. In 1887 the Friends established a mission, with which, in 1881, 5,200 members and 20,000 Christians were connected. The Rev. Mr. Ellis again in 1861 visited it as the agent of the London Missionary Society. In 1887 the Friends established a mission, with which, in 1881, 5,200 members and 20,000 Christians were connected. The Rev. Mr. Ellis again in 1861 visited it as the agent of the London Missionary Society. In 1887 the Friends established a mission, with which, in 1881, 5,200 members and 20,000 Christians were connected. The Rev. Mr. Ellis again in 1861 visited it as the agent of the London Missionary Society.
VENICE, 1585: Historiarum indicarum Libri XVI., Florence, 1588: a History of Gregory XIII., not published until 1743, by Carlo Coquetimes, Rome, 1747, 2 vols. All his Latin works appeared at Verona, Venice, 1585; Historiarum indicarum Libri XIX.,
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MAGDALA, MARGARITAS, a name given by some writers of the middle ages to Magadan.

MACADALON, Order. During the last centuries of the middle ages there arose in various places, and, as it would seem, without any connection with each other, associations of women under the patronage of St. Mary Magdalen, and for the purpose of converting prostitutes. The oldest of these associations seem to have originated in Germany, more especially at Worms and Metz, though it is not a question of exaggeration when the last claims to date back to the year 1005. It was certain, however, that, in the middle of the thirteenth century, the Popes Gregory IX. and Inno.

MAGEE, William D.D., b. in County Fermanagh, Ireland, March 18, 1766; d. in Dublin, Aug. 16, 1811. He was graduated at Trinity College, Dublin in 1782, with the highest honors and fellow 1788, entered holy orders 1790, left the university 1812 for the regular ministry, and in 1822 archbishop of Dublin. His most noted works were Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice, expanded from two sermons delivered on these themes in 1788 and 1799. The volume was first issued 1801; the eighth edition appeared 1856, and it still is a standard. Archbishop Magee was a determined foe to Romanism and Unitarianism. See his Works with Memoir, London, 1842, 2 vols.

MA'GI. The Greeks designated the Persian priests simply as mаги, and the Persian state religion, the doctrinal system of Zoroaster, simply as magianism, or even as magic. From the Greek this designation was generally adopted, though it is not quite correct. Magianism was a foreign element in the Zend religion. Originally, in its home in Bactria, on the north-western confines of India, the Zend religion knew nothing about magianism. The word "magi" does not occur in the Zend Avesta,—the only authentic representation of the Zend religion. The priests are there always called Аθάт, that is, those provided with fire, or providing for the fire; and the institution of the Atharva priesthood is dated back to the time before Zoroaster, to the time when the law was not yet written, and the popular religion was a mere nature-worship. Magianism came to the Persians from the Medes.

It must be noticed, that, during the first kings of the house of the Achemenides, the Greeks often make a sharp distinction between Magians and Persians, identifying the Medes, the Medes, with Magians and the Medes, with Persians. Thus the reign of Pseudo-Smerdis is represented as an attempt of the Magians to substitute Median law for Persian rule (Herodotus, III. 30, 62); and Herodotus expressly calls the Magians a Median tribe (1, 101; 107; 120; 128; 7, 18; 37), describing them as experts in astral magic and oneiroscopy. To this must be added that the Persians instituted a festival, the Magiophonia, in commemoration of the defeat and massacre of the magi,—a circumstance which could not possibly have occurred if magianism had been an original Persian institution. It was, however, an original Median institution either. In their home, the Medes adhered to the pure Zend religion of Zoroaster. Berosus even calls Zoroaster king of the Medes. The magi they adopted from Babylonia. Still earlier than the Persians and Medes, the magi are found among the Chaldeans. They appear there as contemporaries of the Hebrew prophets, who describe them as the wise men and scholars of the Chaldeans, though with a smack of the soothsayer, the conjurer, the sorcerer, etc. (Isa. xlv. 25; Jer. L 35; Dan. ii. 11, 23).

They were, indeed, so intimately connected with the Chaldeans that the names became interchangeable; a Chaldean meaning a magian or magician, just as a Cauaanite meant a merchant. The name is, nevertheless, not of Chaldaean origin. There is no Shemitic root from which it could be derived. Nor does it seem to be of Arian origin, though there are Sanscrit roots from which it might be derived without violence. Most probably, the name descended, together with the whole institution, to the Chaldeans from that Turanian people, the Accadians, whom we know as the first settlers in the Valley of the Euphrates. Originally an Accadian institution, magianism was successively introduced among the Chaldeans, Medes, and Persians, and was finally completely incorporated with the Zend religion.

According to Xenophon (Cyrop., VIII. 1, 9, 33),
it was Cyrus who first established magianism in Persia; and from that time the Persian priests were called magi, both in the cuneiform inscriptions and by the Greeks. As above mentioned, magianism met with some resistance in Persia during the first kings of the house of the Achaemenides; but gradually its spirit pervaded the whole religious life of the Persian people, and threw even the most prominent doctrines of the Zend religion into the shade. The influence which the Greeks exercised on the Persians after the death of Alexander was by no means unfavorable to the further development of magianism. The Greek felt a natural aversion to the somewhat vain and completely shapeless abstractions of the old religion of light, and a natural affinity for the half-mystical, half-scientific artifices of magianism. While in the Parthian Empire magianism reached its acme of power, the most prominent doctrines of the Zend religion being composed exclusively of magi, it reached, at the same time, its greatest extension in the Greek-speaking world. The name “magian” there gradually became synonymous with sorcerer, enchantor, or to a milder and more dignified sense, (as, for instance, in Matt. ii. 1-12, where the wise men from the East are represented as possessed of some prophetic insight derived from astrology, and enabling them to arrive in due time to do homage to the new-born Christ, just as they had done in former time to the new-born Plato), but generally in a more odious sense, as, for instance, in Acts viii. 9, where Simon Magus is spoken of, and xiii. 6, where “magian” is explained by “false prophet.”


Magia, as a means by which to obtain control of such natural or mystical powers as are ordinarily beyond the reach of man, was, from an early date, connected with the idea of evil spirits. Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans agreed in ascribing to them the demons and the Devil. But besides this diabolical magic, or “black art,” there arose, principally stimulated by the new departure of natural science, a so-called “white,” or “lower” magic, which operated by the aid of the good spirits, or by cunning physical tricks. The latter kind of magic was widely propagated by J. B. Porta’s Magia naturalis (Naples, 1558), which was translated into many European languages. But unfortunately, just at the same time, and supported both by the Roman Inquisition and the Protestant orthodoxy, the “black art” threw itself into prominence under the form of witchcraft. During the reign of rationalism in the latter part of the eighteenth century, both the black and the white magic were, so far as they depended on spirits, set aside as idle nonsense; and those forms of magic which have afterwards arisen, such as Mesmerism, Spiritualism, Hypnotism, etc., have no theological interest: they belong to psychology and natural science.

MAHANA'IM (Ar. ma'nâm), a town named by Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 1, 2), allotted to the Levites (Josh. xiii. 29, 30, xxii. 59; 1 Chron. vi. 80), and situated in the territory of Manasseh, on the River Jabbok. It was the residence of Ishbosheth (2 Sam. ii. 8, 12), and the refuge of David on his flight before Absalom (xxiv. 24, 27; 1 Kings ii. 8). The place has not yet been identified with certainty.

MAHOMET. See Mohammed.

MAI, Angelo, b. at Schilpario, in the province of Bergamo, March 7, 1782; d. at Albano, Sept. 9, 1864. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1799; studied at Naples and Rome, and was in 1813 appointed custos at the Ambrosian Library in Milan. Possessed of competent philological learning, extraordinary critical acumen, and great skill in paleography, more especially as a reader of palimpsests, he published, from manuscripts discovered in the library, a speech by Isokrates, some fragments of a Gothic translation of the Epistles of Paul, several works of Philo Judaeus, a book of Porphyrius, the Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, some letters of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, etc. The celebrity he attained by these publications led to his appointment as librarian at the Vatican, in which position he developed a still greater activity. In 1838 he was made a cardinal. The various works he edited were collected in the four following series: Scriptorum veterum nova collectio, Rome, 1825-38, 10 vols.; Classicci auctores, Rome, 1828-38, 44, 8 vols.; Nova patrum bibliotheca, 1844-71, 8 vols.; and an Appendix, Rome, 1879. [See B. Fra: Biografiadel cardinale Angelo Mai, Ber- gamo, 1882.]

MAILLARD, Olivier, d. at Toulouse, June 13, 1502; belonged to the order of the Cordeliers; was professor of theology at the Sorbonne, court-preacher to Louis XI., confessor to Charles VIII., and enjoyed a great fame as a preacher. His sermons, published after his death, are a curious mixture of scrupulous and sublimity. He also wrote La confession générale du frère Olivier Maillard, Lyons, 1526.

MAIMBOURG, Louis, b. at Nancy in 1610; d. in Paris, Aug. 13, 1688. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1628, and was for some years professor of rhetoric at Rouen; but, as he took the side of the king against the Pope in a rather pronounced manner, he was compelled to leave the order, and retired to the abbey of St. Victor in Paris. In his time he enjoyed a great reputation as a church historian; but he wrote his books chiefly for the purpose of harassing his enemies, or flattering his friends, and nobody reads them any more. In his Histoire de l'Arménisme he attacks the Jansenists; in his Histoire des Iconoclastes he coaxes Louis XIV.; in his Histoire du Schisme des Grecs he tries to reconcile Innocent XII.; and so on. His Histoire du Calvinisme and Histoire du Luthérisme were severely castigated by Bayle, Jarieu, and Seckendorf.

MAIMONDII (i.e., son of Maimon), Moses, called by the Arabians Abu Amran Musa ibn Abdallah ibn Maimon Alkortobi, b. at Cordova, March 30, 1135. When the Almohades took Cordova, in 1148, his father, on account of the then existing religious fanaticism, fled to Fes with his family. In 1166 he went to Fostat (ancient Cairo) in Egypt, where he d. in 1169. In spite of the unsettled affairs of his family, Moses had acquired a great knowledge in Talmudic lore. He had also studied natural sciences, medicine, and more especially philosophy, under Mohammedan teachers. In 1177 he was made rabbi at Cairo, and finally spiritual head (reis, or najid) over the Jewish communities in Egypt. His great learning not only attracted very many young men, who came to attend his lectures, but also soon acquired for him an authority in matters of religion.

When only twenty-three years of age (1158), he composed for a friend a treatise on the Jewish calendar (Cheshbon ha-ibbur). Two years later he composed his iggeret ha-shemad [i.e., "A Letter on Religious Persecution," also entitled Maumur kit- dusha-shem, i.e., a "Treatise on Glorifying God;" viz., by suffering martyrdom], a most ingenious plea for those who have not the courage to lay down life for their religion, and who, having outwardly renounced their faith, continue secretly to practise it; which was written by the attack of a zealous co-religionist against Moses' public profession of Mohammedanism and private devotion to Judaism. In a second letter (iggeret ha-teman) he instructs his co-religionists, who outwardly professed Mohammedanism, to bear in mind that the enmity of the Gentiles was predicted long ago by the prophet Daniel, but also the final victory of Judaism over the other religions. He also shows the folly of pointing out the Messianic time, since the Messianic expectations had always brought misfortune over the house of Jacob. But according to a family tradition, prophecy, as a forerunner of the Messiah, will commence in 1216.

The works, however, which have immortalized his name throughout Judaism, are (1) his Commentary on the M. Lyons, 1489); and in Latin (Sermones dominicales, 1500; Sermo- nes de sanctis, 1518, etc.), are a curious mixture of scrupulous and sublimity. He also wrote La confession générale du frère Olivier Maillard, Lyons, 1526.
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MAIMONIDES.

His second great work was (II) his Mishne-Thora, a gigantic work, also called Yad Hachazeka [i.e., "The Mighty Hand"], which he composed in 1180, and divided into fourteen books, subdivided again into eighty-two treatises, of which the work, written in very clear and easy Hebrew, consists; thus forming a cyclopaedia comprising every department of biblical and Jewish literature. The first part speaks of the Jewish religion, the contents of which are also those of true philosophy. The second part speaks of the first vision of the prophet Ezekiel, with the intention to encourage the more intelligent to a more thorough investigation of the text of the Bible. But while, on the one hand, the Moreh Nebuchim contributed more than any other work to the progress of rational development in Judaism, it, on the other hand, also provoked a long and bitter strife between orthodoxy and science; and Judaism was soon divided into the Maimonidians and anti-Maimonidians. Anathemas, and counter-anathemas, were issued by both camps. In the midst of the conflict, which was begun by Samuel ben Ali at Bagdad, Maimonides died, in 1204, at the age of seventy. Whilst his adherents eulogized him by the saying, "From Moses to Moses no one has arisen like Moses," his opponents wrote on his tomb, "Here lies Moses, the anathematized heretic."

Maimuni's Mishna-commentary is to be found in all Mishna editions, and translated also into Latin by Surenhusius. The Mishne-Thora was published at Soucino in 1560: a beautiful edition is that of Amsterdam, 1740, 4 vols. folio. [For the political work have been translated into English by H. H. Bernard: Main Principles of the Creed and Ethics of the Jews, exhibited in Selections from the Yad-Hachazeka of Maimonides, Cambridge, 1832.] The Moreh Nebuchim was translated into Hebrew by Samuel ibn Tibbon, about 1480, published in Venice 1531 and often; it was translated into Latin and the third, by Scheyer, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1838; the second, by Stern [Vienna, 1864]; and the third, by Scheyer, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1838. [Part iii., 26-49, has been translated into English by Townley: The Reasons of the Laws of Moses, London, 1827.] In Arabic and French parts speak of the Jewish religion, the contents of which are all sensuous expressions which are made use of in the Bible in regard to God. The second part speaks of the Jewish religion, the contents of which are also those of true philosophy. The third part speaks of the great heroes of the political re-action. The germ of his whole system, which is no more nor less than a revival of the middle ages in their coarsest form, is found in his Considerationssur la Revolution francaise 1796. The full development followed in Du pape (1819), De VEglise la Revolutionfrancaise 1829, 2 vols. See Sainte-Beuve: Portraits litteraires, vol. ii.

MAITLAND, Samuel Roffey, D.D., F.R.S., F.S.A., b. in London, 1792; d. at Gloucester, Jan. 19, 1865. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge; was called to the bar 1816, but took holy orders 1821, and was appointed perpetual curate at Gloucester 1823. In 1838 he was made, by Archbishop Howley, librarian, and keeper of the manuscripts, in Lambeth Palace; resigned in 1848, on the death of his patron, and settled at Gloucester. He was a voluminous writer and accomplished bibliographer. His earliest works were upon Scripture prophecy (The Prophetic Period in Daniel and St. John, Loud., 1829). But of more permanent value are his historical works: Facts and Documents illustrative of the History, Doo-
trine, and Rites of the Ancient Albigenses and Waldenses, 1832; The Dark Ages, 1844; Essays on Subjects connected with the Reformation in England, 1849. He also prepared an (unpublished, though printed) index to all the books in the Lambeth Library printed prior to 1800.

**MAJOR and the MAJORISTIC CONTROVERSY.** Georg Major, b. at Nuremberg 1502, was appointed rector at Magdeburg 1526, pastor at Eisleben 1533, professor in Wittenberg 1536, pastor at Merseburg 1547, and superintendent at Eisenach 1551, whence he removed to Wittenberg 1556, where he died, Nov. 28, 1574. As one of the subscribers to the Leipzig Interim of December, 1548, he was suspected of having deviated from the straight line of orthodoxy with respect to the doctrine of justification by faith, and was vehemently attacked by Amadorst in 1551. His first answer (Antwort auf des ehrenwürdigen Herrn Amsdorfs Schrift, 1552) was moderate and cautious. But in the course of the controversy extreme views developed, Major declaring good works necessary to salvation, while Amadord declared them detrimental to salvation. The Formula Concordiae occupies the happy middle between those extremes, defining good works as the necessary consequence of faith, but not as a necessary condition of justification. See Planck: Geschichte des protestantischen Lehrbegriffs, iv. 469-532. C. Beck.

**MAJORINI PARS.** See Donatists.

**MAJORISTIC CONTROVERSY.** See Major.

**MAKEMIE, Francis,** the founder of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; b. near Rathmelton, Donegal County, Ireland (date unknown); d. in Accomac County, Va., in the summer of 1708. Licensed by the presbytery of Laggan in 1701, he went to Barbadoes in answer to an appeal from Capt. Johnson for a minister. He soon afterwards came to Maryland, and in 1701 organized the first Presbyterian church in the United States, at Snow Hill, on the narrow neck of land between the Chesapeake and the ocean. Makemie traveled through Virginia and South Carolina. He was appointed rector at Magdeburg 1529, pastor at Merseburg 1547, and superintendent at Eisenach 1551, whence he removed to Wittenberg 1556, where he died, Nov. 28, 1574. As one of the subscribers to the Leipzig Interim of December, 1548, he was suspected of having deviated from the straight line of orthodoxy with respect to the doctrine of justification by faith, and was vehemently attacked by Amadorst in 1551. His first answer (Antwort auf des ehrenwürdigen Herrn Amsdorfs Schrift, 1552) was moderate and cautious. But in the course of the controversy extreme views developed, Major declaring good works necessary to salvation, while Amadord declared them detrimental to salvation. The Formula Concordiae occupies the happy middle between those extremes, defining good works as the necessary consequence of faith, but not as a necessary condition of justification. See Planck: Geschichte des protestantischen Lehrbegriffs, iv. 469-532. C. Beck.

**MAKOWSKY, Johann,** See MacCovius.

**MALACHI.** the prophet who gives his name to the last book of the Minor Prophets and to the last book of the Old Testament. Some (e.g., Hengstenberg) deny that there ever was a prophet of this name, and for the following reasons: (1) The superscription gives no information respecting his antecedents; (2) The oldest Jewish tradition appears to know nothing about him; (3) The form of the name is peculiar. It means "my messenger," in reference to iii. 1. But such a nomenclature is unparalleled, since it is evident that it could not be given by men, but by God alone. Hengstenberg, therefore, considers the name as either ideal, or an official title. In answer it may be said, (1) Among the sixteen prophets whose writings are contained in the Old Testament, the fathers of only eight are known; of three only (Amos, Micah, and Nahum) is the birthplace given; while to only two (Habakkuk and Haggai) is the appellation "prophet" added; and, finally, of two prophets (Malachi and Obadiah) we know nothing more than their names. The first argument is, therefore, extremely weak. (2) In order to put much stress upon the second, we must first determine the time of Malachi's prophecy. This was, as Vitringa (Obser. sacr., tom. ii. L. vi. pp. 331 sq.) has indubitably shown, during the second residence of Nehemiah in Jerusalem, i.e., about the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. The proof is derived from a comparison of Mal. ii. 8 with Neh. xiii. 15, 29; Mal. ii. 10 with Neh. xiii. 29, 37; and Mal. iii. 7-12 with Neh. iii. 10. Hengstenberg (1) denies that the very sins the prophet denounced were those Nehemiah legislated against. See art. Nehemiah. It cannot be maintained that Malachi came shortly after Nehemiah, for then his denunciations would be against extirpated sins; nor much time after, for then Malachi would not be included among the later prophets, but at the most among the Hagiographa. The conclusion is therefore to be drawn, that Malachi seconded Nehemiah (as Isaiah did Hezekiah, and Jeremiah Josiah), and began his prophetic activity when Nehemiah returned the second time. But the determination of the time answers the objection that Malachi is not mentioned in the early Jewish tradition, for the only document of that period is Neh. xiii.; and that is so short and supplementary in its character, that no mention would be expected. In the absence of authentic information, fancy had full play. The name was first seized upon; and the "messenger of God" became an angel. So the LX. and many of the Fathers understand it: Jerome however, since the historical Malachi was personally unknown, while the word comes prominently out in iii. 1, others have considered it symbolical, and supposed that under this name another prophet

**MAKINA, a saintly woman of the fourth Christian century, the sister of Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa; belonged to a wealthy and distinguished family in Pontus and Cappadocia, but retired after the death of her father, together with her mother and a number of virgins, to an estate on the Iris in Pontus, where she founded a monastic institution, and spent the rest of her life in the severest ascetic practices. She is commemorated on July 19; her grandmother, the elder Makrina, on Jan. 14. Her life was written by her brother Gregory: De vita M., in Opp. ii. (Migne: Patrolog. Graec. iii.). See Acta Sanct., Jul., iv. 589. W. Moller.

**MAKOWSKY, Johann.** See MacCovius.
was concealed; and naturally the claims of Ezra were urged. So first the Targum of Jonathan ben Uziel, then in the Talmud; and so many rabbins and Christian theologians. But, since prophecy is a piece of history, there is no prophecy the name of whose author is not put in the forefront, for the real name must be known: therefore, if Ezra really wrote the Book of Malachi, he was in duty bound to sign it with his real name, since a symbolical signature is as good as none. (3) The name Malachi can be a contraction of מָלָכִי (Malachiah), "servant of Jehovah;" the yod being, not a suffix, but yod compaginis. In proof may be quoted the transcription of the LXX., Malachi, which shows that they considered the name a contraction of מַלָּחִי.

Upon the contents and form of the book there remains little to say. The prophet takes in a glance past, present, and future. Starting with the past, he sets plainly before his hearers the love which led Jehovah to choose Jacob, while he rejected Esau. In contrast to this love from long ago, the prophet sets the present conduct of the people. People and priest have sinned, in that they have brought diseased offerings, treacherously reduced the temple revenues, and disgraced the divine name by mixed marriages. For these things comes the judgment, which is to be ushered in by a great, extraordinary messenger, whom Jehovah calls emphatically "my messenger," but who, in turn, is only the forerunner of a still greater one, the angel of the covenant, with whom Jehovah himself will appear, and who, as the counterpart of Moses, will reveal the new law to God's people. The prophet determines yet more closely the time of the coming of the forerunner, when he says that he is the prophet Elijah, who will come to convert young and old. Then comes the Lord to his temple, and the great and terrible day of judgment begins. But the judgment has two sides,—the destruction of the ungodly, and the elimination and purification of the righteous. In what this last prophet says of Elijah, he prophesies of the forerunner of God as revealed to his people. The prophet determines yet more closely the time of the coming of the forerunner, when he says that he is the prophet Elijah, who will come to convert young and old. Then comes the Lord to his temple, and the great and terrible day of judgment begins. But the judgment has two sides,—the destruction of the ungodly, and the elimination and purification of the righteous.

It may seem strange that Malachi's minatory sermon is stern upon mere externals,—the outward observance of the law. But in reality he cites the cases of disobedience as examples. In order to exhort the people to such conduct as befits those in the presence of the day of final reckoning. Israel's duty,—this is his exhortation,—is, up to the final fulfilment of the promise, in general and in particular, to conscientiously obey the law.

The form of the book (in which the sections are i. 2-5; i. 6-ii. 9; ii. 10-16; ii. 17-iii. 24) is dialogistic,—an assertion of the prophet, followed by an excuse of the people, which, in turn, is refuted in a longer or shorter speech (i. 2, 6, 7; ii. 14, 15, lii. 7, 8, 13-16). In the lecture of the rabbinic school upon the prophetic style is unmistakable. The diction of Malachi is of striking purity and choiceless in that late time.

(Tradition says that the name "my angel" was given to Malachi on account of his personal beauty and blameless life. Pseudo-Epiphanius (De Vita Prophet.) relates that he was born in Sophas (Saphir?), in the tribe of Zebulun, died young, and was buried with his fathers in his native land.)

Lit.—See the Commentaries by David Cr- treus (Bostock, 1869), Samuel Böckl (with the Rabbinic comments, Bostock, 1837), Sal. v. Till (Leyden, 1701), Vithinga (Leuwarden, 1712), J. C. Hube (with the Targum of Jonathan ben Uziel, Leipziger, 1731-46, 17 pts.), Vexema (Leuwarden, 1769); C. F. Bähr (Leipzig, 1769), Hasekler (Konigsberg, 1828), Leip- ziger, 1838; 4th ed. by Stein, 1881), Umbreit (Hamburg, 1846), Schego (1854), Reineke [R. C.]; Giessan (1856), Kühler (Erlangen, 1865), Prun- sel (Gotha, 1870), Lange (1876).

Malachi, St. Though the Normans, after conquering the south-eastern part of Ireland, placed themselves under the authority of the Archbishop of Armagh, and received two bishops from him,—Patricius of Dublin, and Malchus of Waterford,—the plan of Gregory VII., of bringing the whole Irish Church under the authority of the see of Rome, could not be carried out. Bishop Gilbert of Limerick, another Norman, city, was appointed papal legate; but his negotiations with the Irish had no effect. It was St. Malachi who finally succeeded in bringing about the annexation. He was born at Armagh in 1093, and belonged to a noble family. While still a youth, he retired from the world, and devoted himself to a life of the severest asceticism under the supervision of Abbot Imar of Armagh. In 1120 he was ordained a priest, and soon after he became the assistant of Archbishop Celcus of Armagh. This position he held, not only to introduce a better administration, but to establish there various Roman institutions, —the canon law, the confession, the confirmation, the canonical hours, the psalmody, etc. In order to make himself better acquainted with the organization of the Church of Rome, he spent some time with Bishop Malchus of Waterford; and after his return he was successively made Abbot of Banger, Bishop of Connor, and, finally, Archbishop of Armagh (1134). In 1139 he went to Rome in order to procure the pallium for the see of Armagh, and thereby give his reforms their final sanction, and stability for the future. Innocent II. received him most graciously, though he did not grant him the pallium. He demanded that the petition should be made by a national Irish synod representing the whole Irish Church. He hastened home; but it was not until 1148 that he succeeded in assembling the national synod, and he died before the papal answer to the petition arrived,—the pallium, and the official recognition of the Irish Church as a member of the Church of Rome. On his voyage
and from Rome, he visited Clairveaux, and it became a passionate desire with him to die there. Immediately after the close of the national synod, he consequently set out for Clairveaux; and, a few days after his arrival there, he expired in the arms of St. Bernard. The latter wrote his life, d'un missionnaire (Geneva, 1842), and made a great sensation. They still be believed in by the sect were poor and illiterate. Many, to avoid persecution, emigrated to Georgia, Asia. See Haxthausen (Studien über Russland, Hanover, 1847) and art. Malakanes, in BLUNT'S Dictionary of Sects.

MALAKANES, a Russian sect which originated in the middle of the eighteenth century, and derived its name from Malako, "milk," the food of the infants (1851), and Chants de Sion, a collection of three hundred hymns, often reprinted, and of great charm. His life was written by one of his sons (1868).

MALAY ARCHIPELAGO, or Indian Archipelago, a large group of islands broken off from the south-eastern extremity of the mainland of Asia, and reaching down towards Australia. For a period of almost three centuries, it was the object of the Portuguese navigators. The largest of these islands are Sumatra (1,200 miles in length by 200 in breadth), Java (700 miles in length by 160 in breadth), Borneo (1,000 miles in length by 750 in breadth), Celebes, the Moluccas, and Philippine Islands. The population is composed of mixed races, some of whom are amongst the most degenerate specimens of the human family. Mohammedanism and Buddhism prevail side by side with the native religion, consisting of the worship of mountains and other works of nature, and magical arts. Many of the islands were originally under the dominion of Portugal, but passed, in the seventeenth century, over to the Dutch, who still hold them. The Dutch government proselyting activity among the natives. The Handelsmaatschappij, founded in 1602, declared it to be one of its first aims to plant the Reformed faith in the Dutch colonies. But unsuccessful were the measures pursued. Baptism was finally made, by some of the Dutch governors (as on Ceylon), the condition of holding even the most subordinate office, yes, of the protection of the laws. All were received who could prove that they knew the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. In Java alone 100,000 were baptized, and in Amboyna, 30,000. Very little fruit remains of this wholesale system. At present the Dutch, the Rhenish Missionary Society, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, support some missions on the islands. It deserves to be remarked, that Holland has not only been guilty of a shameful neglect of its Christian duty towards the natives of these its possessions, but has also, up to a recent date, shown favor to the Mohammedan religion. The Minahassa Mission on Celebes, founded in 1828, has been successful in gathering 90,000 of the natives in 200 congregations. In Java, with its population of 18,000,000, there are only 4,000 Christians; and the island has been under the Dutch crown for more than two centuries and a half. In Borneo the Rhenish Society labors, among the Dyaks, and has 500 native Christians under its control. Its efforts were inaugurated by the blood of seven of its missionaries (four men and three women) in 1859. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel supports a mission in the north-western part of the island, with about 1,600 native and Chinese communicants. On Sumatra the Rhenish Society supports a mission among the Batuas, which includes 5,000 native converts, and has fine prospects. The American Board, in 1835, sent Messrs. Munson and Lyman on a tour of inquiry to this island, both of whom were murdered. See Yvan: Six Months under the Malays, London, 1855; The Martyrs of Sumatra, a Memoir of Henry Lyman, New York, 1858; Cameron: Our Tropical Possessions in Malayan India, London, 1863; Van...
MALCOM, Howard, D.D., L.L.D., b. in Philadelphia, Jan. 19, 1809; d. March 28, 1879. He was educated at Dickinson College, Penn., and Princeton Seminary; was Baptist pastor in Hudson (N.Y.), Boston, and Philadelphia; was president of Georgetown (Ky.) College, 1840-49, and of Lewisburg (Penn.) University, 1851-57, when he retired to devote himself to literary pursuits. As deputy of the Baptist Missionary Society, he visited Hindostan, Burmah, Siam, China, and stations in Africa. He was one of the founders of the American Tract Society and of the American Sunday School Union. His literary activity and popularity were very great. Besides editions of Law's Serious Call (abridged), 1830, Keach's Travels of True Godliness, 1831, Henry's Communicator's Companion, and Butler's Analogy of Religion, 1857, he issued a Dictionary of the Bible, Boston, 1828, new ed., 1858 (more than 100,000 copies of this book have been sold); The Extent and Efficacy of the Atonement, Philadelphia, 1829; The Christian Rule of Marriage, Boston, 1830; Travels in South-eastern Asia, Boston, 1839, 2 vols. (10th ed., Philadelphia, 1857); and Theological Index, Philadelphia, 1870.

MALDONATUS, Joannes, b. at Las Casas in Estremadura, Spain, 1583; d. in Rome, Jan. 5, 1588. He studied at Salamanca, and was in 1556 appointed professor of theology there, but resigned his position in 1562, went to Italy, and entered the Society of Jesus. In 1563 the general of his order sent him to Paris, where a chair of theology was established for him in the college of Clermont. He remained there, with a few interruptions, until 1576, and taught theology with great ability. Concerning the subject of his deepest meditation; and hence he determined to devote himself exclusively to the study of philosophy and to philosophical meditation. In the history of philosophy he stands as the most prominent disciple of Cartesius: at some points he even carried farther the ideas of his master. He is the father of the so-called “Occasionalism.” He adopted the absolute distinction which Cartesius made between spirit and matter, soul and body. But the relation of the two opposites, which Cartesius left unexplained, or only vaguely explained by postulating a perpetual divine mediation between them, Malebranche made the subject of his deepest meditation; and hence he formulated his peculiar doctrine, that events taking place in the one sphere occasioned God to effect corresponding re-adjustments in the other, so that nothing could be truly understood unless “seen in God.” The principal representation of his system is found in his first work, De la recherche de la vérité (Paris, 1674); but further developments are found in his Conversations chrétiennes (1677), De la nature et de la grâce (1850), Méditations chrétiennes et métaphysiques (1683), Traité de morale (1864), and especially in his Entretiens sur la Méthaphysique et sur la Religion (1888). His De la nature et de la grâce has won for him the favor of Bossuet, and implicated him in a long and sometimes very bitter controversy with Arnauld. His doctrines were often said to incline towards Spinozism, but on this point he found a warm defender in Leibnitz. His metaphysics have now only very little interest; but the noble piety of his works still makes impression, and the elegance of the representation still exercises its charm. His works were collected by Genoude and Lourdoueix (Paris, 1837, 2 vols. in quarto); and Ollck Laprune: Philosophie de Malebranche, 1870, 2 vols.

MALMESBURY, William of. See William of Malmesbury.

MALVENDA, Thomas, b. 1566; d. 1628; a Spaniard by birth, and member of the Dominican order; first attracted attention by his criticism of some points in the Annales ecclesiastici and the Martyrologium Romanum. Called to Rome, he was charged with a revision of the breviary, missal, and martyrology of his order, and of La Bigne's Bibliotheca Patrum, and also with writing the Annales ordinis fratum predicatorium, of which, however, he only finished four volumes folio, comprising the first thirty years of the history of the Dominican order. Retired to Spain in 1590, he drew up the Spanish Index librorum prohibitorum, and commenced a literal translation of the Bible, of which, however, only five volumes were completed, reaching Ezek. xvi. Among his other

MALVENDA.

MALCOM.
works (a complete list of which is found in QUETIF and ÉCHARD: Scriptores ordinis prudenciae, ii. 494) is a book, De Antichristo, a collection of all that has been said at various times about Antichrist.

C. SCHMIDT.

MAMACHI, Thomas Maria, b. in 1713; d. in 1792. He was a native of the Island of Scio, but was educated in Italy; entered the order of the Dominicans; was ordained a priest in 1736, and held various positions, as professor of theology, secretary to the Congregation of the Index, etc. In the first work he published (Epist. ad J. D. Mansium, Rome, 1748) he refuted Manasi's computation of the date of the synod of Sardica and of the return of Athanasius to Alexandria. Of much greater importance are his Originum et antiquitatum christianorum libri XX. (Rome, 1749-55), written with steady reference to Bingham's Origines ecclesiasticae, and his De costumi dei primiter Christiani (Rome, 1758). His participation, however, in the Febronian controversy (Ep. ad Justinum Febronium, Rome, 1776) showed that he was not a match for Honthheim.

MAMERTUS. See Rogations.

MAMERTUS CLAUDIANUS. See CLAUDIUS-

NUS.

MAM'MON, a Chaldaean word signifying "wealth" or "riches" (Luke xvi. 9, 11), and used, according to Augustine, in Punic, and, according to Jerome, in Syrian, in exactly the same sense. When Christ uses the word as a proper name (Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13), he simply employs a figure of speech, the personification, without referring to any special idol worshipped under that name.

MAM'RE, near Hebron, identified by the British Palestine Exploration Society with Ballaet Sella, the "oak of rest." Mamre was an Ammonite chief (Gen. xiv. 18); but he seems to have given his name to a certain spot, so that it was called Mamre (Gen. xiv. 24). The "plain" of Mamre, in the Authorized Version, should be oaks. It is expressly described as near Machpelah (Gen. xxiii. 17).

MAN has both a physical and a spiritual nature. In him the physical realm finds the culmination of its development; and at the same time a new kingdom of spirit, of humanity, begins in him. The race as a whole is conscious of this double nature, and the Scriptures corroborate it. They place man in close connection with the preceding works of creation, and at the same time represent him as the product of a new creative thought and act (Gen. i. 26, ii. 7). He is called, on the one hand, to enjoy communion with God, and, on the other, to exercise dominion over the other works of creation (Ps. viii.). We shall in this article only consider man from his physical side, leaving his spiritual nature to be discussed in the articles Image of God, Immortality, Soul, etc.

I. ORIGIN OF THE HUMAN RACE. — Man was created in God's image. The race as a whole (consensus gentium) has given abundant testimony to the truth of this biblical statement. The majority of pagan myths of the creation regard man as the creature of God. It is true, as Heckel likes to emphasize, that traditions exist in some of the natural religions (India, Tibet), that man is a descendant of the ape; but the number of the traditions is greater (West African, South Arabian, Ancient Mexican) which represent the ape as a degenerated descendant of man. (See Tylor: Anthropology, an Introduction to the Study of Man and Civilization, London, 1881.) But more important are the traditions of the civilized nations of antiquity, which almost unanimously agree that man is the creature of God. Of these may be mentioned the Chinese tradition about Fo-hi or Pa-o-hi; the Babylonian with its many points of agreement with the biblical account; the Egyptian Book of the Dead, with its praise of the "Divine Architect, who made the world to be the home of man, the image of the Creator;" Hesiod's poems, etc.

The philosophies of ancient and modern times have also been pretty well agreed that man is not simply the product of nature, but is a spiritual being. It is only since the middle of the last century (Lamettrie, Holbach, Helvetius, etc.) that materialistic philosophy has gained much of a following which degrades man to a level with the beast, or makes him a mere machine. But Linné (d. 1778) classified man at the side of the ape as the highest representative of the vertebrates, but at the same time pronounced him to have been "created with an impregnable character after the divine image," and called him "the only one among the creatures blessed with a rational soul for the praise of God" (Systema Naturae, 6th ed., 1748). And Blumenbach (d. 1804), the real founder of anthropology as a department of natural science, never doubted that man was distinguished from all the other terrestrial creatures by his (1) upright person, (2) perfect hands, (3) protruding chin, and (4) articulate speech. On the other hand, the modern theories of natural descent and biological transmutation (from primordial cells, etc.), using certain results of the study of embryology, paleontology, the practices of breeding and selection of animals and plants, come to the conclusion that man is the result of a process of development; the ape being his immediate ancestor. This hypothesis of apian ancestry, which Lamarck (Philosophie zoologique, 1809), Lord Monboddo, etc., represented, has been bolstered up with facts by Darwin, Huxley, Lubbock, E. B. Tylor, Ernst Haeckel (Naturliche Schopfungsgesch., 1868; Anthropogenie, 1874), Oscar Schmidt, Schaffhausen, etc. The facts these scientists have brought out seem to have made the hypothesis plausible. However, they do not hold that man is a descendant of any of the families of apes now living, but of a family now extinct.

The arguments used in favor of this view are to be regarded as insufficient, and for the following reasons among others. (1) The anatomical differences — especially in the conformation of the skull, and weight of the brain — between the highest types of the ape family (gorilla, chimpanzee) and the lowest types of the human family (Australian, negro) are so great as to make the supposition of a common origin very difficult of belief. According to the investigations of Eby, Bischoff, R. Owen, and others, the capacity of the lowest human skull (the natives of New Holland) is seventy-five cubic inches; while the largest capacity of the gorilla is thirty-four cubic inches. The average weight of the brain of a European is fifty-seven ounces; that of the negro, from forty-eight to fifty-one ounces; but that of the gorilla, only from seventeen to nineteen ounces.
so-called "embryological argument," consisting in the alleged identity of the fetal development of man and the higher vertebrates, especially the ape family, has been much used by Haeckel. But the very discoverer and exponent of the law of the development both before and after birth (von Baur, d. 1876) denied this identity; and Kölliker and others have followed him. (3) The embryological argument is also lacking in conclusiveness. The assumed anthropoid apes, man's immediate ancestors, have no living representatives, nor have the remains of any been discovered. But if the various species of the so-called original man (the Neanderthal, Engis, Cro-magnon, and other skulls), nor the fossil remains of man, have shown any approach to the ape type. The gap which now exists between the skulls of man and the ape has always existed, so far as palaeontological discoveries enable us to speak. (4) The doctrine of man's descent appeals to genealogical changes in the organism; but no single case of a definite and abiding change of an organic nature has been proved. If we assume races of natural selection, such as a gardener or a breeder pursues; but, so far as our observation goes, the great family types of animals and plants have from time immemorial had a fixed character. In order to substantiate this view, its advocates postulate thousands and millions of years. But leaving aside the doubt still existing among geologists, whether such a long period is required to account for the changes in the earth's surface, it may with perfect confidence be stated, that, so far as our knowledge goes, the great families in the animal and vegetable worlds have always been as distinct as they are to-day. The biblical account still remains true, that God created "everything after its kind." (5) The Darwinian system ignores the salient features which distinguish man from the other creation. Man as a spiritual being, endowed with intellect and a moral nature, represents an entirely new stage of being. The whole history of the brotherhood of man and the ape—the former, in the progress of many centuries, having outstripped the latter—really deserves the name which the distinguished investigator, Rudolf Wagner, gave to it, of a romance of natural philosophy. Quatrefages, the representative of one of the most influential medical schools of the day, insists upon the distinction of the human and animal kingdoms; and Wallace, who with Darwin is the author of the theory of natural selection, holds, that, in the case of man, the natural selection was the work of God.

II. Unity of the Human Race. — The human family has descended from a single pair (Gen. i. 27), and all men are of one blood (Acts xvii. 26). The traditions of many nations confirm these biblical statements. (See Lipschütz: _De communi et simplici humano generis origine_, Hamburg, 1864). It is true, however, on the other hand, that some peoples have maintained a descent from an autochthonous (the Greeks). This view, that there were more than one family from which the race descended, has been more recently revived, some holding to a co-Adamite theory (Paracelsus, Postma, &c.), others to the pre-Adamite (Zanini of Solcia, 1450, Isaac le Persier, 1855, Schelling, M'Caulland, &c.). According to the first theory, others were created at the same time Adam was; according to the second, Adam was not the first man on the earth. Frichard, John Herschel, the Humboldts, Blumenbach (De generis humani varietate nativae, 1786), and others have asserted the possibility of the birth of all the human families from one pair. Since the Darwinian theory of development has gained currency, this view has received confirmation; and many of the best representatives of this school, if they do not hold that the race has descended from a single pair, affirm that the human family started at one common hearth (Darwin, Huxley, Wallace, &c.). The strict biblical view, that the human family is descended from a single pair, Adam and Eve, has the following considerations in its favor. (1) The different races of men do not lose their power of procreation by intermarriage. Blumenbach, Buffon (Êvérites, iv. pp. 388 sq.), and many modern physiologists, such as Johann Muller, Rudolf Wagner, and Quatrefages, have emphasized this fact in this connection. (2) They have many physiological features in common; (3) the identity of vertebrate formation, length of pregnancy, temperature of the body, average length of years, etc. (3) The differences of color, conformation of the skull, etc., may largely be accounted for by climatic influences. (4) The present differences of language can and should be accounted for by the movement of peoples. (5) The religious differences of different peoples do not militate with the theory of their original unity: on the contrary, religious traditions are found among peoples separated the most widely, which bespeak an original unity of religion and dwelling-place; and A. von Humboldt, Chevalier (Le Mexique ancien et moderne, 1883). Shields (The Final Philosophy, p. 184), and others derive the American races and their cultivated form from Asia. The best representatives of this school, if they do not hold that the human family started at one common hearth, admit conclusively the truth of this assumption, which used to be frequently denied.

III. Antiquity of the Human Race. — The usual system of biblical chronology makes out the period from Adam to Christ to cover 4,000 years (Ussher and Ideler, 4,004; Calvisius, 3,600; Kepler and Pataviius, 3,884, et cetera). Such a short period seems to be inconsistent with the alleged unity of the race. However, the developing effects of sin must not be left out of account in determining this. Moreover, the facts in the chronological tables of the Old Testament to make any calculation based upon them of questionable accuracy. There is at any rate some truth in the words of Chalmers, that "the sacred writings do not speak of the antiquity of the globe and those of Le Hir and De Sacy, "Il n'y a pas de chronologie biblique." It is quite possible that the
The records of Egyptian history seem to make an extension of the chronology necessary. Even if Egypt's first sovereign, Menes, did not live 4000 B.C., as many Egyptologists affirm, and if he lived, as Lipsius says, 3580 B.C. or, as Bunsen, 3900 B.C., or Wilkinson, 2700 B.C., it would be difficult to harmonize the chronology of Egypt with the usually accepted biblical chronology. Every new discovery of monuments in Egypt only goes to confirm Manetho's statement of thirty royal Egyptian dynasties, beginning with Menes.

Of much less value in this connection are the arguments based upon geological calculations. There is as yet no reliable geological chronometer. It is true that the remains of man have been found in caves with the remains of mammoths, the cave-bear, etc., and must have lived at the close of the great geological deluge; but when this period began and when it ended, remains still a matter of uncertainty. In general, we may, with Quatre-Croix, make no clear distinction between the accounts in Kings and Chronicles respecting his reign, in that the former does not relate his conversion; but then Manasseh and Amon are treated in Kings as briefly as possible; and, besides, it may be that the writer there did not regard Manasseh's conversion as more than a half-hearted. Tradition puts the martyrdom of Isaiah in the first half of this reign. On the basis of the expression "Manasseh shed innocent blood very much," till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another" (2 Kings xxxi. 18), it has been reasonably conjectured that he persecuted the adherents, and particularly the prophets, of the true religion. In the Apocrypha is found a Prayer of Manasseh, supposed to have been uttered by him in Babylon (see art. Apocrypha, p. 102). Upon the curseform inscriptions Manasseh appears as a tributary vassal of Esarhaddon and Asurbanipal. Compare art. Manasseh, by Rütetschi, in Herzog, vol. ix. 203–206.

MANASSEH, Prayer of. See Apocrypha, p. 102.

MANASSEH, Tribe of. See Tribes of Israel.

Mandeville, Bernard de, b. at Dart in 1670; d. in London, Jan. 21, 1733. He studied medicine in Holland, and practised as a physician in London. In 1700 he published The Fable of the Bees, a poem in which he tries to show that all human progress and happiness depend upon fraud and crime, while virtue necessarily leads to barbarism and misery. The poem attracted attention; and he reprinted it several times, accompanied with long notes and discourses, in which he openly attacked the morals of Christianity from the standpoint of deism. He also wrote Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church, and National Happiness, and An Inquiry into the Origin of Honor, and the Usefulness of It.

MANDRAKE, probably the Atropa mandragora, a member of the potato family. In Palestine it is found in Galilee, upon the slopes of Carmel and Tabor, and also south of Jerusalem, but not immediately about the city. It blossoms in the early spring, and bears in May and June the famous "love-apples," which are popularly presumed to excite love, and induce conception (Gen. xxx. 14–16). The plant itself is stemless with broad leaves, and small, reddish-white blossoms, which develop into dirty-yellow, round "apples" about the size of plums. The plant in all its parts has a pungent and unpleasant odor. Compare the monograph by Bartolomi: Commentar. de Mandragora, Bologna, 1835.

Mandyas, a Greek ecclesiastical vestment worn by monks, and occasionally by bishops, because these are usually monks, resembling the cope, and reaching almost to the feet.

Manetho, an Egyptian historian, and priest of Sebenytus, of the third century B.C. He wrote two works, Tow fraus "Erros" ("Epitome of the Physical") and Abyptewa ("Egyptology"); the former treating of the religion, and the latter of the history, of his country. Unhappily we have only fragments of them preserved in Josephus, Julius Africanus, and Eusebius. They will be found collected by Friun (Leyden, 1847) and Muller, in his Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum, Paris, 1848, vol. ii. Manetho's list of dynasties, covering about thirty-five hundred years, has been disputed by Egyptologists, but is now generally accepted as correct. Indeed, recent discoveries have confirmed Egyptologists in the opinion that Manetho has used reliable sources, and is trustworthy. He has been credited with an astrological poem, Aποτελεσματικά ("Relating to Astrology").

Maney, Thomas, D.D., LL.D., b. at Leeds, 1684; d. at Ealing, Middlesex, Mar. 6, 1755. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and was successively rector in London, prebendary of Durham, and vicar of Ealing. He was editor of the best edition of Philo, Phihan'os Judaei omnia Gr. et Lat. notis et obscr. illustravit, THOMAS MANEY, S.T.P., London, 1742, 2 vols. folio.

MANI. See Manichæism.
MANICHÆISM. 1396 MANICHÆISM.

MANICHÆISM. Mani (Greek, Μανείς, or Μοναχος; Latin, Manes, or Manichæus), the founder of Manichæism, descended from a distinguished Persian family which had emigrated from Ecbatana in Bactria, and settled at Ctesiphon in Babylonia; and was b. in Mardin, on the upper part of the Cutha canal, in 215 A.D. At the time of his birth, his father, Fatak, retired from public life, and joined the Mughtaæhils, or Baptizers, a religious sect which flourished in the province of Mesene, on the Lower Tigris, near the Arabian frontier, and may be considered the true ancestors of the Mandæans. There young Mani was educated until his thirteenth year; at which time he separated from the sect, and adopted that scheme of asceticism which he afterwards prescribed for the Perfect among his own followers, and which he seems to have borrowed from his father. The next eleven years he spent in travelling, elaborating the theoretical part of his system, which, indeed, is nothing but a dialectical combination of elements derived from the various religious systems with which he came in contact. The materials he used he borrowed, but in any other sense of the word he does not seem to have had any precursors. The stories commonly accepted by the Occidental tradition, of Scythianus and Terebinthus as his predecessors, are simple misunderstandings of the real facts of his own life, hugely deformed with legendary embellishments. When he was twenty-four years old, his system was completed, and four years later on, at the coronation of King Sapor I. (March 20, 242), he first presented himself to the people of Persia as the founder of a new religion. He claimed to be a messenger from the true God. “What Buddha was to India, Zoroaster to Persia, Jesus to the lands of the West, I am to the country of Babylonia.” The moment of his appearance was well chosen. Multitudes of people had gathered together, and the solemnity of the occasion heightened the general sentiment. But his success was small. The favor of the king he did not win, and for many years he lived and labored outside of the Persian dominion. His missionary tours were directed to the countries north and east of Persia: the Christian countries to the west he hardly visited. When speaking to Christians, he may have proclaimed himself the Paraclete promised by Christ (John xiv. 16), and, like Christ, he surrounded himself with twelve apostles; but otherwise he was so far from recognizing Jesus as a power to save him by cleansing his heart from sin; but, like Gnosticism, it simply intended to defeat Christianity, but simply to supersedes the old religion of Persia, the religion of Zoroaster. When he finally returned to Persia, he found not a few adherents; and even the brother of King Sapor I. was converted. But the Sassanides needed the support of the Persian priests, and any connection with the new religion was consequently a delicate affair. Nevertheless, in a personal meeting between King Sapor and Mani, the former is said to have been so deeply impressed by the latter, that he not only gave his adherents full religious liberty, but even promised to embrace the new religion himself. The cordial relations, however, does not seem to have been of long duration. Mani was once more compelled to go into exile; and though he again returned, and enjoyed the full favor of Sapor’s successor, Hormisdas I., the priest party, now roused to fury while fighting for their very existence, proved too powerful when King Bahram I. ascended the throne. In 276 Mani was seized and crucified; and his corpse was flayed, stuffed with hay, and nailed to that gate of the city which afterwards bore his name.

As above hinted, Manichæism was by no means the mere deviation of a Christian sect. It was an independent religion in exactly the same sense as Mohammedanism; and, during the whole course of its history, Christianity had no more dangerous enemy to encounter. Its theoretical part, its metaphysics, was chiefly derived from the old Parsian; its practical part, its morals, chiefly from the neighboring Buddhism. From Christianity it took only some few loose ideas; but the whole method of combining all those materials, and fusing them into one coherent system, it borrowed from Gnosticism. Indeed, Manichæism may most properly be designated as a Gnostic religion, as the most complete system of Gnosticism. It did not, like Christianity, present itself as the new man as a power to save him by cleansing his heart from sin; but, like Gnosticism, it simply proposed to gratify man's craving for knowledge by explaining the very problem of his existence. The fundamental principle of this explanation is in Manichæism dualistic, and the dualism is carried out with rigorous consistency. The world began from an accidental mixing of two absolutely contrasting elements, — one radically good, and one radically bad, — but both eternal, and both evincing the same formal character, at once spiritual and material. The good element, the light, is God; and his personality comprises five spiritual and five material sub-elements. But God is not alone in the light: its fulness comprehends also an air of light, an earth of light, and numberless glories and magnificences. Upwards and sidewise this realm of light is unbounded; but from below, it is met by the realm of darkness. The bad element, the darkness, is also personality: but that personality is not by Mani called God: and strictly speaking it cannot be said that Manichæism taught two gods. The bad element is in Manichæism simply a personification of the ancient Babylonian idea of chaos. The first movement towards an intermingling of the two different elements took place through the development of Satan within the realm of darkness. The type of that character is another loan from the ancient Babylonian mythology,— the dragon with the head of a lion, the tail of a fish, the wings of a great bird, and the feet of a reptile. Moving restlessly about in the darkness, Satan suddenly discovers a gleam from the realm of light, and with instinctive hatred he flies towards it to attack it and disturb it. To meet the attack, the god of light creates the typical man, the homo primus; and clad in the soft breezes of heaven, and robed in light, man goes to the encounter with the gale in his one hand, and the fire in the other; while Satan rushes towards him, armed with all the pains and qualms of darkness and dulness. Of course we have here only the prologue, but a prologue which gives the essence

...
of the whole drama. What follows—the course of the universe, the history of the human race, the life of the individual soul, etc.—is nothing but a consistent evolution of this first encounter, often painted with a glow of fancy, a power of pathos, a sublimity of vision, which make it easy to understand how Manicheism could strike the imagination of such a man as Augustine, and keep its hold on him for several years, though at last it failed utterly in satisfying the deeper wants of his mind.

The dualistic principle which governs the whole metaphysics of Manicheism is no less apparent in its morals. The Perfect were enjoined to abstain from any thing in which the elements of darkness were considered to be predominant. The prohibitions were generally arranged under three heads (tria signacula);—the signaculum oris, which forbade to tell a lie, to utter a falsehood, to eat meat, to drink wine, etc.; the signaculum manus, which forbade to kill, to steal, to engage in any kind of occupation which might interfere with the progress of the realm of light, etc.; and the signaculum sinus, which forbade all kinds of sensual enjoyment, marriage, etc. The members of the Hearer class, the second and lower class of Manicheans, were much easier. Still they forbade not only to kill, lie, steal, etc., but also to plant a tree, to build a house, to engage in any kind of manufacturing industry, etc. Nevertheless, as the Hearers were allowed to enjoy meat and wine, to live in marriage and have children, to carry on trade, and hold public offices, they could live in society without attracting any special attention. A curious feature in Manichean life was the relation between the two classes,—the extreme veneration with which the Hearers looked up to the Perfect. They considered them as immaterial beings, and not only supported and defended them, but handed them their food in a kneeling position. Common to both classes were the fasts and the prayers,—the two principal features of Manichean worship. Seven days in each month were fast-days, kept in honor of the sun and the moon. Four prayers were said every day,—at noon, in the afternoon before sunset, in the evening after sunset, and the first night-watch. When preparing for prayer, the Manichean washed himself, standing erect, with running water: he then turned towards the sun or the moon, or, if neither of the great heavenly bodies were visible, towards the north, as the abode of the King of Light, and, prostrating himself on the ground, he said the prescribed prayer. The text, however, of those prayers, preserved in Arabic, shows that the Manicheans did not worship the sun and the moon, but simply addressed them as the symbols and visible representatives of the Great Light. The one great Manichean festival was the so-called Bema (βῆμα), "the pulpit," celebrated on the anniversary of the crucifixion of Mani. In his honor a pulpit was raised on five steps in the midst of the temple, and adorned with flowers; but it remained unoccupied. In other respects the whole Manichean worship was very simple. The man who prays is the temple of God, they said. They had no priests, properly speaking, though within the class of the Perfect there was a minor group of select persons, whom Augustine designates as bishops, presbyters, and magistrates. The final result of life on earth, the goal Manicheism aspired to, was somewhat dim. It seems that Mani in this point followed very closely in the track of the old Parseeism. The Perfect was immediately transferred to paradise; the Hearer was put into a kind of purgatory; and the non-Manicheans, as Augustine saw them, were consigned to the trackless waste of the universe, the history of the human race, the Pittsburgh to the spread of Manicheism towards the East, that, in the first half of the tenth century, there lived near the frontier of China a powerful Turkish tribe, which professed Manicheism, and, by their threats of revenge, induced the prince of Samarcand to desist from the persecutions which he had raised against the Manicheans in that region. At the same period, however, their number is said to have been small in Bagdad, and only a little larger in the surrounding country. On its way towards the West, Manicheism first penetrated into Syria and Palestine, where it was encountered and vehemently attacked by Bishop Titus of Bostra. Nevertheless, according to Eutychius, most of the Egyptian metropolitans, bishops, and monks, were Manicheans at the time when Timotheus was Patriarch of Alexandria; and in Northern Africa, the so-called Africa proconsularis, Manicheism founded one of its most flourishing establishments. Tolerated, like all other religions, during the reign of Constantine, it was afterwards treated as a heresy, and very severe edicts were issued against its adherents. But Augustine's writings bear witness to its power and extension. In Italy it succeeded in getting a foothold, even in the city of Rome. Leo the Great (Serm. 41 de quadragesima, Ep. contra Turrimbus Adversus, epi en epistula ad Constantem) gave to the Hearer an anxiety on account of its progress, and asked for the support of the civil authorities in order to extirpate it. In Spain it was connected with Priscillianism; in Southern France, with the movement of the Cathari (the Manicheans were themselves at one time called Catharistae); and in the Eastern Empire, with the Paulicians and the Bogomiles.

Sources.—Mani was himself a prolific writer. Besides seven large doctrinal works (one in Persian, and six in Syriac), he wrote a number of circular letters (seventy-six), but nothing has come down to us except the titles and some stray quotations. Sources of second rank, however, are numerous, both Eastern (Arabic and Persian) and Western (Greek and Latin).—Of Eastern sources the most important is the Arabic liturgical history by An-Nadim, finished in 988, of which the chapter on Mani has been edited by Gustav Flügel, Leipzig, 1882. text, German translation, and commentary. Very important is also the work on religious and philosophical sects, by Abul Fath (d. 1153), edited by William Cure-
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ton, London, 1842, and translated into German by Th. Haarbricker, Halle, 1851. Furthermore, some shorter notices in various Arabic chronicles, by Al-Biruni (1000), edited by E. Sachau, Leipzig, 1879; by Gregorius Patricides, Patriarch of Alexandria, 918; and by Barherrelius, 1286, both the latter edited by Pococke, Oxford, 1828. Of special interest for the biography of Mani are the Persian works by Firdausi (edited by Jul. Mohl, Paris, 1868, v. pp. 472-475) and Minchond (translated by De Sacy, in Mémoires sur diverses antiquités de la Perse, Paris, 1793, p. 294). — Of Western sources the most important is the so-called Acta Archelai, a Latin translation of a Greek translation of a Syriac report of a dispute between Bishop Archelaus of Casar in Mesopotamia, and Mani, printed by Gallandi, in Bibl. Patrum, iii., and by Routh, in Reliquiae Sacrae, v. Very important are also the books which Augustine wrote against the Manichæans: Contra epistolam Manichæorum quam vocat fundamenti, Contra Pufatam, Contra Fidem, Contra Arimani tum, De actis cum Pelio, De Secundinum, De natura boni, De dualis animis, De utilitate credentis; De Moribus Manichacorum; De Heresibus, xlv. Among the Greek writers on heresy the most important with respect to Mani are Epiphanius (60), Theodoret (290) Photius (179), etc.


MANIPLE was originally a linen handkerchief, carried upon the left arm, but it is not until the eighth or ninth century that it appears as a sacred vestment. It symbolizes the fruit of good works, which can be won only through the sweat of the apostolic labors.

MANNA. When the Israelites, in the second month after the exodus from Egypt, arrived at the Desert of Sin, starving, and grumbling at Moses, and the Lord gave them for sustenance manna, a substitute for bread, and continued to furnish it, from day to day, for forty years, until they entered the land of Canaan, and needed it no more. It is fully described in Exod. xvi., — "a small round thing," as small as "the hoarfrost on the ground," " like coriander-seed," " of the color of bdellium," " and the taste of it like wafers made with honey." It was gathered— a certain measure for each person, no more, no less— every morning, except sabbath mornings, when nothing was found. But a double measure could be gathered on the day preceding the sabbath. And while the manna gathered on ordinary days bred worms, and became offensive, when kept over for the next day, that which was gathered for sabbath was continued sound and sweet. It was pounded or crushed in a hand-mill, and then made into cakes with honey and sweet oil. In other places in Scripture it is referred to as "the corn of heaven," " angels' food," etc. The product which at present is gathered in those localities, and used by the Arabs, by Eutychius Patricides, Patriarch of Alexandria, is corn, and under the name of manna, and extracted from the ash-tree in Sicily and in Southern Italy.

MANNING, James, D.D., b. in Elizabethtown, N.J., Oct. 22, 1798; d. at Providence, R.I., July 24, 1871. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey, Princeton, Sept. 29, 1782; went to Rhode Island in July, 1783, and started " a seminary of polite literature subject to the government of the Baptists." It was chartered (1784) as the Rhode Island College, and was first located at Warren; but in 1799 it was removed to Providence. Dr. Manning, besides being president of the college, was pastor of the Baptist Church of Warren and Providence successively, and in both capacities rendered efficient service. During the Revolutionary War the college was closed, and the building used for military purposes. In 1786 Dr. Manning sat in Congress. His death was due to a stroke of apoplexy while engaged in prayer. For an appreciative sketch of this prominent Baptist minister and able college professor, see Lives of the Leaders of our Church Universal, edited by Dr. H. M. MacCracken, pp. 608-614.

MANSE, the Scottish equivalent for parsonage. In unendowed churches the manse is the property of the church, secured and maintained by it: in the Established Church it is built and maintained by law, and belongs to the heritors." See article in Eadie, Ecclesiastical Cyclopedia.

MANSEL, Henry Longueville, Dean of St. Paul's; b. Oct. 6, 1820, at Cosgrove, Northamptonshire, Eng., where his father was rector in the Church of England; d. in London, July 13, 1871. He was educated at Oxford University, where he afterwards became fellow and tutor. In 1855 he was appointed reader in moral and mental philosophy in Magdalen College. In 1858 he was appointed Waynflete professor of moral and mental philosophy, and in 1867 regius professor of ecclesiastical history at Oxford. In the Church of England he became Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, afterwards Dean of St. Paul's, London.

Manse was an eminent logician, and won universal distinction both as a teacher and an author in the department of logic. From this field he passed into that of metaphysics, attracted thither in the interest of apologetic theology. That he commanded a large degree of attention in this region also admits of no doubt, though he did not make an impression as a metaphysician equal to that he had made as a logician. His transition was by the pathway of psychology, to which he uniformly and consistently assigned an essential place. His Prolegomena Logico, an Inquiry into the Psychological Character of Logical Processes (1851; 2d ed., 1880), gives a clear and valuable discussion of the relation of psychological distinctions to logic and ethics. His most noted effort in the department of metaphysics was the Bampton Lectures of 1858, preached in Oxford, and published under the title of The Limits of Religious Thought. His object in these lectures is to interpret and apply Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy of the Conditioned as a metaphysical theory, affording a powerful apologetic in theology. In manse, in England, it is built and maintained on metaphysical grounds it is shown to be impossible to attain a knowledge of the absolute and infinite. All arguments against theological doc-
trines, on the ground of mystery, are thus demonstrated to be futile; and theology is unassailable as matter of faith, not matter of knowledge. There was nothing new in this, except the novel use of the special lines of argument pursued by Hamilton. The value of the defence of mystery in religious belief was generally recognized, as also of the assault upon the arrogance of a self-satisfied rationalism. But the defence of dogmatic theology was not inspiring, and failed to command general approval. To lower theology to the level where such defence could prove valuable was to give it an appearance of insignificance, and assign to it feebler of practical, real value, which made the defence too costly. The historic significance of the combined effort of Hamilton and Mansel became apparent in the readiness with which the doctrine of ignorance was accepted by the sensational school of thinkers, who desired to make all knowledge depend on sensation, and were specially disturbed by the affirmation of transcendent being. To relegate the Infinite existence; the attributes of God, such as holiness and justice, implying personality,—all these in independent of all relation. To think is to condition: the unconditioned cannot be the object of thought. On this ground, Mansel maintained that the whole circle of revealed truth concerning the Deity was beyond the range of logical tests, as incapable of being included within the forms of thought. Creation as a beginning in time; of thought were not as Dean Mansel described them, conditioned, in a somewhat extended form. The defence is complete, only it seems to leave a divorce being proclaimed between reason and faith; consequently the marked sensation produced by publication of The Limits of Religious Thought passed away, and was succeeded by a general conviction that the limits of religious thought were very wide. As Dean Mansel described them, and consequently his apologetic was not available.

The metaphysical argument borrowed from Hamilton was this: the unconditioned is independent of all relation. To think is to condition: therefore the unconditioned cannot be the object of thought. On this ground, Mansel maintained that the whole circle of revealed truth concerning the Deity was beyond the range of logical tests, as incapable of being included within the forms of thought. Creation as a beginning in time; material office. He was first settled at Stoke Newington, near London; then in London, at Covent Garden. During the Commonwealth he was one of Cromwell's chaplains; made the prayer at Cromwell's installation, June 26, 1657; was one of the "tryers," i.e., examiners of candidates for the ministry; and preached frequently before Parliament. He welcomed Charles II. in 1660, was chosen a royal chaplain, refused the deanery of Rochester, took part in the Savoy Conference, but in 1662 was deprived of his living by the Act of Uniformity. He then preached in his own rooms, and suffered arrest in consequence. Dr. Manton was one of the ablest Puritan preachers and theologians, and is still read. Archbishop Usher called him a "voluminous preacher," i.e., one who could reduce volumes of divinity into small compass. But he was voluminous in the modern sense. Among his admired productions are CXC. Sermons on the CXIX. Psalm, London, 1681, 8d ed., with Life of the author, 1841, 3 vols.
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Real (1880), — a reprint of article in the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Mansel's review articles and separate lectures (including lecture on the philosophy of Kant) are republished in a single volume, Letters, Lectures, and Reviews, 1873. He wrote also Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries, ed. by Lightfoot, 1875; and the Commentary on the Gospel of John for the Speaker's Commentary, but died before it was finished.

H. CALDERWOOD.

MANSI, Giovanni Dominico, b. at Lucca, Feb. 16, 1892; d. there Sept. 27, 1769. He entered early the Congregatio Matris Dei, became archbishop of his native city, and developed an astonishing literary activity. He published new and valuable critical editions of the works of Baronius, Baluze, Fabricius, and others. He continued the collection of councils by Labbe-Cossart-Coleti, adding six volumes folio, Lucca, 1745-52, and made his own celebrated collection, Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio (Florence and Venice, 1759-98, 81 vols. folio), reaching to the middle of the fifteenth century. See his Life, by ZATTA, in vol. xix. of the latter work.

MANT, Richard, D.D., Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore; b. at Southampton, Feb. 12, 1776; d. at Balkeymoney, Ireland, Nov. 2, 1848. He was educated at Oxford; entered holy orders; served first as curate at Southampton 1802; was rector in London 1816; was created bishop of Killaloe and Kilfenora, Ireland, 1820; translated to the see of Down and Connor 1828, to which Dromore was added 1832. He is best known by the Commentary on the whole Bible, which he issued in connection with Rev. Dr. George D'Oyly (see D'Oyly). But he also edited the Book of Common Prayer with Notes (1820, 6th ed., 1850), and wrote a History of the Church of Ireland (1839-41, 2 vols.). Bishop Mant early evinced poetical gifts, and published The Book of Psalms in an English Metrical Version (1842), and several volumes of poems. See MILLER: Singers and Songs of the Church, pp. 356-358.

MANTON, Thomas, D.D., a nonconformist; b. at Lawrence Lydiard, Somersetshire, 1820; d. in London, Oct. 18, 1877. He was educated at Oxford; admitted to deacon's orders by Bishop Hall, and never took priest's, because "it was his judgment that he was properly ordained to the ministerial office." He was first settled at Stoke Newington, near London; then in London, at Covent Garden. During the Commonwealth he was one of Cromwell's chaplains; made the prayer at Cromwell's installation, June 26, 1657; was one of the "tryers," i.e., examiners of candidates for the ministry; and preached frequently before Parliament. He welcomed Charles II. in 1660, was chosen a royal chaplain, refused the deanship of Rochester, took part in the Savoy Conference, but in 1662 was deprived of his living by the Act of Uniformity. He then preached in his own rooms, and suffered arrest in consequence. Dr. Manton was one of the ablest Puritan preachers and theologians, and is still read. Archbishop Usher called him a "voluminous preacher," i.e., one who could reduce volumes of divinity into small compass. But he was voluminous in the modern sense. Among his admired productions are CXC. Sermons on the CXIX. Psalm, London, 1681, 8d ed., with Life of the author, 1841, 3 vols.
Expositions of James (1651), Jule (1658), The Lord's Prayer (1854), and The 5th Chapter of Isaiah (1768). His Works were first printed in a collected edition, 1681-1701, 5 vols. folio, reprinted edition by Rev. J. C. Ryle, 1870-73, 22 vols.

MANUEL, Niklaus, b. at Bern, 1484; d. there April 30, 1580; played in the Swiss Reformation a part somewhat similar to that of Ulrich von Hutten in Germany. Originally he devoted himself to art,—painted, carved, and constructed buildings. But he was also a politician, held various offices in the administration and government of Bern, and made in 1522 a campaign in Italy at the head of the Swiss mercenaries under Francis I. Most influence, however, he exercised as a poet, in the service of the Reformation. His two moralities (Vom Papst und seiner Priesterschaft and Von Papstes und Christi Gegenwart), performed at Bern in 1522, completely destroyed there the authority of the Bishop of Lausanne. No less effect had his Letters,—Ablassfragen, Ecks und Fabers Badenfahrt, Testament der Mose, etc. His works have been edited by Dr. Jakob Bächtold, Frauenfeld, 1878. See GRÜNEISEN, Nicolau Manuel, Stuttgart, 1837. DR. LIST.

MAPPANotes. See BIBLE-TEXT.

MAORI. See NEW ZEALAND.

MAPPA denotes the linen cloth with which the communion-table, and afterwards the altar, was covered. That the cloth should be of linen depended upon a reference to the linen cloth in which the corpse of Christ was wrapped, though such a reference would apply better to the corporal. Optatus of Mileno, in his De schismate et schismaticis, speaks of the custom as generally prevailing.

MARANAH (bitterness), a place in the wilderness, three days from the place at which the Israelites crossed the Red Sea, with a spring whose water was so bitter that none could drink it, but which was sweetened by the casting-in of a tree which the Lord showed to Moses (Exod. xiv. 23, 24; Num. xxxiii. 8, 9). It may be identical with the present Ayun Hatoarah, forty-seven miles distant from Ayun Mousa, and also noted for its springs of better water.

MARANATHA, an Ara'mic expression meaning "Our Lord cometh," used by Paul in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, in warning that the approaching advent of Christ would see the curing of those who did not accept Jesus.

MARANOS, a name for the "New Christians" of Spain, because these included not only Jews, but Moors. See SPAIN.

MARANUS, Prudentius, b. Oct. 14, 1683; entered the Congregation of St. Maur in 1703; resided for many years in the abbey of St. Germain des Prés, but was expelled in 1784 on account of his opposition to the bull Unigenitus; resided afterwards in Paris, and died there April 2, 1792. He finished the work of the editions of the works of Cyril of Jerusalem (1720), Baluze's edition of the works of Cyprian (1728), Garnier's edition of the works of Basil (1730), and edited himself the works of Justin (Paris, 1742), accompanying the edition with some very elaborate progemena on Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, etc. He also wrote Dissertation sur les Seminariens, Paris, 1722; Divinitas Jesus Christi, Paris, 1746; La doctrine de l'écriture sur les guérisons miraculeuses, Paris, 1754, etc. See TASSIN: Histoire de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur, 1741-1749. G. LAUBMANN.

MARBACH, Johann, b. at Lindau, on the Lake of Constance, Aug. 24, 1521; d. in Strassburg, March 17, 1581. He studied theology at Wittenberg, and was in 1548 appointed pastor of the Church of St. Nicholas in Strassburg, afterwards, also professor of theology, and director of the church convention. In Strassburg the Swiss Reformation prevailed, and Butzer had worked there through many years for a reconciliation between Calvinism and Lutheranism. Marbach was an ardent adherent of the German Reformation, and labored unintermittingly for the introduction of Lutheranism in Strassburg. He partly succeeded. The Reformed hymns disappeared from the hymn-book. Butzer's catechism was supplanted by Luther's. Some of the Reformed pastors and professors left the city, and others were compelled to subscribe to the Confessio Augustana, etc. But his exclusiveness produced much bickerings and disturbance. See TRENNS: Situation intérieure de l'Église luthérienne de Strasbourg sous la direction de Marbach, Strassburg, 1857. He wrote a couple of pamphlets on the Lord's Supper, etc. See SCHMIDT.

MARBURG BIBLE, The, appeared in 1712 at Marburg, in quartino, under the title Mystische und prophetische Bibel, etc. The text is that of Luther's translation, but revised and improved by Professor Horche, Inspector Scheffer of Berleburg, and others; and to this text are added introductions and explanations, generally after Cocceius, but, in some cases (the Song of Songs and the Revelation according to St. John), after Madame Guyon. The work was highly praised by the theologians of that time, and much used, especially by the mystics. It is, indeed, a precursor of the so-called Berleburg Bible. M. GOEBEL.

MARBURG Conference of. Luther and Zwingli opened the battle with the Pope almost at the same moment, but independently of each other. From the very beginning, the German and the Swiss Reformation moved on different tracks, and the state of affairs caused much anxiety; and Butzer had worked there the authority of the Bishop of Lausanne. The day before, the Swiss had arrived, — Zwingli and Ulrich Funk from Zürich, Ecolampadius and Rudolf Frey from Basel, Butzer,
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Hedio, and Jacob Sturm from Strassburg. On Saturday, Oct. 2, arrived the South-Germans,—Osiander from Nuremberg, Brenz from Swabian Hall, Agricola from Augsburg, and others,—and the conference began. It lasted for three days. Luther was the spokesman of the Germans; Zwingli and Ecolampadius spoke in behalf of the Swiss. But no agreement was arrived at; though Zwingli declared, with tears in his eyes, that there were none with whom he should like better to make common cause than the men of Wittenberg. Luther was hard and unyielding: "You are of another spirit than we," he said. Fifteen articles of agreement were drawn up, however, and subscribed to by all present. But they refer only to the general principles of Protestantism in their opposition to Romanism, not to the special point in question. Afterwards these Marburg Articles were made the basis of the Confessio Augustana.

LIT. — Rich sources of information concerning this notable event are found in the works of Luther, Zwingli, Melanchthon, Jonas, Osiander, etc. See L. I. K. Schmahl, "Das Marburger Religionsgespräch," Berlin, 1871. [Then follow the list of books mentioned in the text.]

MARCELLUS is the name of two popes.—Marcellus I., a Christian, he was ordered by the prefect to be whipped, roasted, burnt alive, etc. The tortures, however, took no effect upon him; and he was put to death in that position at Chalons-sur-Saone, because he was a Christian, but on account of the fact that Maxentius banished him from the city, not because he was a Christian, but on account of the fact that he refused to participate in an entertainment given by the prefect Priseus. He expired on the order of Aurelianus Agricola, prefect of the province of Aquitania, to whom Marcellus had only recently been appointed. He died May 1, same year. See Polidorus: De vita, et moribus M., ii. 1744. ADOLF HARNACK.

MARCELLUS is the name of five martyrs recorded by the martyrologies, besides Marcellinus I., Bishop of Rome. — I. One Marcellus was during the persecution of Antoninus Philosophus, about 140, sunk into the ground to the waist, and left to die in that position at Chalons-sur-Saone, because he refused to participate in an entertainment given by the prefect Priseus. He expired on the order of Aurelianus Agricola, prefect of the province of Aquitania, to whom Marcellus had only recently been appointed. He died May 1, same year. See Polidorus: De vita, et moribus M., ii. 1744. ADOLF HARNACK.

MARCELLUS is the name of two popes. — Marcellus I. died in Paris, June 29, 1652. He studied law at Toulouse, and was in 1651 appointed president of the Parliament of Pau. In 1659 he was called to Paris as councillor of state. On the instance of Richelieu he wrote De concordia sacrorum et imperii seu de libertatis ecclesiae quàm communis at exposito, ad episcopos et laicos de Gallicanorum ecclesiae (1641). But the book was put on the Index; and when, in 1648, the king appointed him bishop of Consegans, the Pope withheld the confirmation until he resigned (1651). In 1652 he was made archbishop of Toulouse, and in 1651 archbishop of Paris. Among his other works are, De Eucharistica (1624), De Constantinopolitana Patriarchata (1830), Histoire de Béarn (1840), Dissertationes posthuma (edited by De Faget, Paris, 1866), and Opera sacra (edited by Baluze, Paris, 1688). Both De Faget and Baluze have written biographies of him in their editions. See ORIGEN: Contra Celsum, v.

MARCELLINUS, Bishop of Rome from June 30, 296, to Oct. 25, 304. The latter date, however, is uncertain. See LIPSII: Chronologia der Römischen Bischöfe, Kiel, 1869. The Liber Pontificiorum states, that, during the persecution, Marcellinus became a thurificatus; i.e., a Christian who offered incense on an idol's altar in order to escape persecution; and there is no reason for doubting the fact. Even Roman-Catholic writers accept it, though probably on account of the moral of the story,—that the Pope can be judged by no man (prima sedes non judicatur a quoquam). His martyrdom, however, seems to be a fiction, and the acts of the synod of Sinnessa (Mansi: Collection of Councils, i. 1250) are a later fabrication. See PAPIER: Acta Sanctorum, in Propyl. Maii, viii.

MARCELLUS is the name of two popes. — Marcellus I., left entirely out by Eusebius and Jerome, but succeeded Marcellinus (according to the Cata. Liberianus) after a vacancy of seven years. Lipsius, however, in his Chronologia der römischen Bischöfe (Kiel, 1869), fixes his reign with great probability from May 24, 307, to Jan. 15, 309. His martyrdom (Acta Sanct., Jan., ii.) seems to be a fiction; but it is a fact (De Rossi: Roma Sotter., ii. 137. Roffe: Roma Sotter., p. 171), that Maxentius banished him from the city, not because he was a Christian, but on account of the fact that he refused to participate in an entertainment given by the prefect Priseus. He expired on the order of Aurelianus Agricola, prefect of the province of Aquitania, to whom Marcellus had only recently been appointed. He died May 1, same year. See Polidorus: De vita, et moribus M., ii. 1744. ADOLF HARNACK.
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MARCELLUS, Bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, as a zealous adherent of the homoeousian doctrine at the synods of Nicaea (325), where he met Athanasius, Tyre and Jerusalem (335), but fell, by his work De suffectione Domini Christi, written against the Arians, under the suspicion of Sabellianism, and was deposed, by the Council of Constantinople, 336. Eusebius of Caesarea wrote against him, Contra Marcellum and De ecclesiastica theologia; and the copious quotations in the books of Eusebius give a tolerably clear idea of his peculiar theology. After the death of Constantine the Great, he was to resume his see. Nevertheless, he was again deposed, probably at the same time as Bishop Paulus of Constantinople, and sought refuge in the West. Bishop Julius of Rome recognized him as orthodox, and restored him, 343. The story is true:—does not seem, however, that he ever returned to Ancyra; and when, under Constantius, the Arians came into ascendency, he was condemned, together with Athanasius, by the synods of Aries (358) and Milan (365). Even his relation with Athanasius was disturbed by his Sabellianism, though the confession which the Marcellians of Ancyra sent to Athanasius was by him accepted as satisfactory. See Eugenii legatio ad Athanasium, in Montfaucon: Nova Coll. Veterum Patrum, ii.; Mansi: Coll. Conc., iii.; and Rettenberg: Marcelliana. After he resigned, with Apanasith, he and his friends have lived in retirement; and, according to Euphemius, he died two years before the publication of Ad. Hær., that is, in 373 or 374. See Zahn: Marcellius von Ancyra, Gotha, 1867. W. MöLLER.

MARCHETTI, Giovannii, b. at Empoli, near Florence, in 1758; d. in Rome, Nov. 15, 1829. He studied law in his native city, and theology in Rome; and was ordained a priest in 1777. His Saggio, etc. (1780), and Critica, etc. (1782), a sharp criticism, in Ultramontanist spirit, of the Histoire eccl. of Fleury, attracted the attention of Pius VI., who gave him a pension. Suspected of having exercised a decisive influence on Pius VII. on the occasion of the excommunication of Napoleon, he was imprisoned, and banished to Elba, but afterwards allowed to live in his native city. After 1815 he returned to Rome, was made archbishop of Ancyra, in paribus, etc. He was a very prolific writer, and for some time a steady contributor to the Giornale Ecclesiastico di Roma.

MARCION and his School played, in the second century, the same part in the history of the Church as the Manicheans in the period from the third to the sixth century. The two sects are, indeed, agreed in many points. Both of them are dualistic, docetic, ascetic, and critically reserved with respect to the canon of the New Testament. And the difference between them is one of form and construction, rather than one of contents and character. While Manicheism at every point dissolves the ethical processes of history and life into metaphysical speculations, the metaphysical principles on which Marcionism rests are twisted around so as to obtain a moral bearing on practical life; but in both cases the speculative foundation is nearly the same.

Marcion was born at Sinope in Pontus, in the first half of the second century, and came to Rome between 140 and 150. His severe asceticism made a deep impression there, and at first his relation to the congregation was very friendly. But it changed after he made the acquaintance of Cerdo, a Syrian Gnostic, whose doctrines he adopted and further developed. In Cerdo's system he found the speculative foundation for his own dualistic conceptions, and the speculative arguments for his personal hatred of Christ. After the time of Valentine, he began to expand his system in Rome. His idea was not simply to gather around himself, as other Gnostic teachers had done, a circle of such as were perfect,—perfect in knowledge, and perfect in asceticism. On the contrary, he proposed to reform the whole Church by eliminating from her doctrines all those elements which were due to Judaism, and had crept stealthily into Christianity by way of tradition. His success may be estimated from the number and violence of his adversaries. He wrote against him, also Rhodon, Theophilus of Antioch, Philippus, and others; and Irenæus intended to devote a separate work to the refutation of his doctrines. Marcionite bishops and presbyters are often mentioned; Epiphanius says that Marcion had adherents in Rome and Italy, in Egypt and Pontus, in Arabia and Syria, in Cyprus and in the Thebaid; and Theodoret tells us, that, in Syria alone, he had converted more than one thousand Marcionists (Ep. 118). [Waddington found in Syria the ruins of a Marcionite temple. See No. 2518 in his Inscriptions grecques et latines, Paris, 1871.] It was, however, not so much the speculative part of the system which fascinated people: on the contrary, the history of the sect shows that to have become its ruin. But the practical part of the system, its ethics, impressed even men like Tertullian. The complete separation from the 6&g (see Gnosticism, p. 879), and the complete absorption in the love of God, was the principle of that ethics. Not only the theatre and the circus were abhorred; but every thing ornamental, even the elegance of refined social forms, was despised. Flesh and wine were forbidden. Marriage was rejected, and martyrdom was looked upon as the crown of human life. Under Constantine the Great the persecutions against the sect began, and they were continued under his successors. But the final disappearance of the sect was not due to those persecutions, but to internal dissensions on speculative reasons.

As the common gnostical, allegorical interpretation did not suffice to bring the Marcionite system in harmony with the New Testament, Marcion formed a canon of his own, consisting of the Pauline Letters (though in an altered form), and of one Gospel, most closely resembling that of Luke. The relation between this Gospel of Marcion and the four canonical Gospels has in the present century been the subject of very minute investigations. Down to the time of Semler, biblical critics generally contented themselves with the statements of the Fathers; but he, the true precursor of the Tubingen school, always
anxious to find the traces of Judaism in the ancient church, thought, that, in the Gospel of the ancients, he had found a reminiscence of that original Christianity by which Judaism had tried to destroy Eichhorn and others further developed the hypothesis; but its true scientific basis it did not obtain until Hahn undertook to restore the text of Marcion's Gospel from the notices of Tertullian and Epiphanius, Das Evangelium Marcionis, Königsberg, 1823. Hahn, however, came to the conclusion, that in their relation to the primitive Gospel from which both the Gospel of Luke and that of Marcion must be considered as derivations, it is Marcion, and not Luke, who has made arbitrary changes from dogmatical reasons. Otherwise, F. C. Baur: Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanon. Evang., Tübingen, 1847. He returned to the hypothesis ofSemler, and even went so far as to try to separate the original Pauline elements in the Gospel of Luke from the later Judaizing additions. This gave rise to further hypotheses. See Hilgenfeld: Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evang. Justins, der element. Homilien, und Marcions, Halle, 1850; and Volkmann: Das Evangel. M., Text und Kritik, Leipzig, 1853. The principal apologetic works and general studies of a like character are found in Eusebius: Hist. Eccl. IV. 11 (Irenæus), and V. 13 (Rhodon); Justin: Apol. I. 62; Hippolytus: Philosophumenon, VII. 29; Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem Libri V.; Adamantius, Dialogus de recta in deum fide (formerly ascribed to Origen, and generally found in the editions of his works); Cyril: Catech. 6, 16; Epiphanius: Haeres., 42; Theodoret: Haeres., I. 24; Enn. — Rétitution des différentes Sectes, Paris, 1853, translated from the Armenian by Le Valliant de Florival; and the Hymns of Ephraim Syrus: Dilthey. MARCUS, Bishop of Rome from Jan. 18 to Oct. 7, 386; was a Roman by birth, and lies buried in the Cam. Balbina. Nothing is known about him. See Lipius: Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe, Kiel, 1869; Catal. Liberian., and the Liber Pontificalis. ADOLF HARNACK.

MARCUS Aurelius, Roman emperor from March 7, 161, to March 17, 180; was b. in Rome, April 26, 121; a son of Annius Verus; and was in 135 adopted by Antoninus Pius, whose daughter Faustina he married in 146. His reign was an almost uninterrupted series of campaigns in the East and in the North; and he died, from the plague, in his camp in Pannonia. Nevertheless, he found time, not only to reform the legislation, and watch the administration of the empire, but also to cultivate philosophy, of which he had been a devoted student from early youth: indeed, he was the philosopher on the throne. His standpoint was that of eclectic stoicism,—a kind of moral rationalism enlivened by a deep faith in an all-pervading and all-governing reason. His works—a Dialogue, twelve books of Meditations, Letters, etc., written in Greek—represent him as a pious and substantial character, equally averse to the vulgar and to the hollow, and intent upon avoiding silliness in religion, and sophistry in philosophy. How far he knew Christianity cannot be decided. The views of the death of Christ, and the condition of death, so common among the Christians (Med., xi. 8), is that generally prevailing among the philosophers of that period. The conditions of the Christian Church were the same under him as under his predecessors, Antoninus Pius, Hadrian, and Trajan; but local persecutions, caused by popular fanaticism, became more and more frequent. There exists on this point a double tradition. The older, which originated from the apologists, was inclined to shut the eyes to what the Christians actually suffered under Marcus. Aurelius, and produced such fabrications as the Decretum ad commune Asiae; and the Letter of 174 from the emperor to the Senate, referring to the legend of the Legio fulminatrix, and ascribing the victory to the prayers of the Christians. The later tradition, which was not restrained by any regard to the powers that be, represented the reign of Marcus Aurelius as the fifth period of persecution. The principal sources of information concerning the true state of the Christian Church during that period are, the acts of the martyrdom of Justin, in his Opera, iii. (ed. Otto), dating between 165 and 186; the Periplus of Lucian, written a few years after 186; the works of Melito of Sardis (Eusebius: Hist. eccl., IV. 28); the works of the apologists; and the authentic report of the persecution in Lyons and Vienne (Eusebius, i. c., V. 1), which show that these persecutions took place, not by the government, which, on the contrary, seems to have taken pains to enforce the laws of Hadrian and Trajan.


MARCUS EREMITA, an Egyptian hermit, who, according to Sozomen (Hist. Eccl., vi. 29) and Palladius (Hist. Laus., 20), lived in the desert of Scetis, towards the close of the fourth and in the beginning of the fifth century; a contemporary of Chrysostom and the younger Macarius. Many wonderful stories are told about him; but in some cases the same stories are told also about Macarius; and the resemblance of the two names seems to have produced a good deal of confusion. (See Tillemont: Mem., viii. 226, 811; Floss: Macarii Εγ. Eptiololα, Cologne, 1850, p. 73; Oudin: De Script. Eccl., i. 902.) Marcus is said to have died 410, more than a hundred years old. He is commemorated in the Greek Church on March 25. (See Act. Soc., M. 5, p. 267.) A Vita Marcii, in manuscript, is mentioned by Montfaucon, in his Palaeogr. Gr., p. 923; and a short Hist. de S. M. Abbate has been published by Floss, in his edition of the works of Macarius.

As Marcus is a frequently occurring name among the monks, it is difficult to decide whether the notices extant refer to one person or to several. Nicephorus (xi. 35, xiv. 30, 54) seems to make a distinction between an older and a younger Marcus, of whom the latter lived during the reign.
of Theodosius (408-460), was a pupil of Chrysostom, and a contemporary of Isidore of Pelusium, Nilus, and Theodoret, and wrote forty treatises on asceticism. There are also mentioned a monk of the name Marcus, from the ninth century (the reign of Leo VI), and a Briton, Marcus Eretmis, or Anthony, who alludes to the Marius of the earlier history. Nevertheless, the supposition of Bellarmine, that the nine treatises which have come down to us under the name of Marcus Eretmis do not belong to the celebrated saint from the fourth century, but to some obscure monk from the ninth century, is entirely unwarranted: both internal and external evidence speaks against it. Photius (Bibl. Cod., 200, p. 102 ed. Bekker, p. 687 ed. Migne) mentions nine treatises identical with those we possess. In the seventh century, Maximus Confessor gives nine passages from him. (Comp. Tillemont, /.c, viii. 801.) Finally, the general resemblance between the treatises is identical with the Marcus Eremita of Sozomen and Palladius, or whether, with Nicephorus, a distinction should be made between an elder and a younger Marcus. See Galland: Prolegom.; De Pin: Now. Bibl., iii. 8; Oudin, l. c., i. 902.; Chellier: Auteurs eccles., xvii. 300; Cave: Script. ecc., i. 372; Tilllemont, l. c., viii. and x.; Ficker, in Zeitschrift f. hist. Theologie, 1866, i. 402.

The nine treatises are, On the Spiritual Law, Useful to such as embrace an Ascetic Life; On Justification by Faith, and not by Good Works; On the Penitence necessary to All; On Baptism; On the Subjugation of Anger and Lust; On Enthusiasm and Envy; On General Moral Questions; A Dialogue between the Soul and the Spirit; and, On the Relation between Christ and Melchisedec with Reference to Heb. vii. 3. They were published in Latin and Greek by Fronto Ducseus, in Auct. Patr. (Paris, 1624, i. 571), but more complete by Galland (tom. viii.) and Migne (tom. 65). By the authors must be considered as contemporaries. But it may be questioned whether the author of the treatises is identical with the Marcus Eremita of Sozomen and Palladius, or whether, with Nicephorus, a distinction should be made between an elder and a younger Marcus. See Galland: Prolegom.; De Pin: Now. Bibl., iii. 8; Oudin, l. c., i. 902.; Chellier: Auteurs eccles., xvii. 300; Cave: Script. ecc., i. 372; Tilllemont, l. c., viii. and x.; Ficker, in Zeitschrift f. hist. Theologie, 1866, i. 402.
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MARIANISTS (Knights of the Holy Virgin, Fratri godenti, Frères joyeux) was the name of an order of knights, consisting of noblemen, which was formed at Bologna about 1233, for the purpose of protecting widows and orphans during the general insecurity and violence caused by the contest between the Guelfs and the Ghibellines. It was founded by Bartolomeo, a Dominican monk, who afterwards became bishop of Vicenza, and was confirmed by Urban IV. As the members were allowed to marry, hold private property, etc., they were called Fratres germani. Commanderies were founded at Modena, Mantua, Treviso, and other cities in Northern Italy. Towards the close of the sixteenth century the order disappeared. In 1589 Sixtus V. transferred its property to the college of Mantalto. See Gruccii: Iconografia storica degli ordini religiosi e cavallereschi, Rome, 1836, i. pp. 128-130. Zöckler.

MARIAZELL, a village of Styria in Austria, with about one thousand inhabitants; has a beautiful church, built in the latter part of the seventeenth century, of Trinity Church, until his death. His principal writings during this period were his History of the German Reformation (Gesch. d. deutschen Reformations) extending to the year 1555, and characterized by a thorough acquaintance with the controversies, and occasioned not a little bitterness. Two of his pupils and friends, Matthies and Vatke, edited a part of his theological lectures in 4 vols., Berlin, 1847-49 (vol. i., Moral: ii., Dogmatik; iii., Symbolik; iv., Dogmengeschichte). A sketch of Marheineke’s life was prefixed to vol. i.

MARIMANNE (the Greek form of the Hebrew Miriam) was the daughter of Alexander, and the wife of Herod the Great, to whom she bore two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, and two daughters, Miriam and Salome. In a fit of jealousy justly killed when he cannot be deposed; and, in harmony with this maxim, Clement was openly attacked its faults. By some indiscretion, his De rege et regin institutio was written at the instance of Garcia de Robays, the tutor of Philip III., and was published at Toledo 1598. It contains the famous proposition, that a king, when he tries to overthrow the Church, may be condemned Photius; and as he was bishop of Caere and Martinus I. is, indeed, in the papal catalogues, recorded under the name Martinus II. His letters are found in Bouquet: Recueil des historiens de l. p. 29; and Jaffé: Regesta Pontif. Rom., p. 292. — Marinus II. (942-946) owed his elevation to the hand of the Jesuits, consisting of noblemen, which was formed at Bologna about 1233, for the purpose of protecting widows and orphans during the general insecurity and violence caused by the contest between the Guelfs and the Ghibellines. It was founded by Bartolomeo, a Dominican monk, who afterwards became bishop of Vicenza, and was confirmed by Urban IV. As the members were allowed to marry, hold private property, etc., they were called Fratres germani. Commanderies were founded at Modena, Mantua, Treviso, and other cities in Northern Italy. Towards the close of the sixteenth century the order disappeared. In 1589 Sixtus V. transferred its property to the college of Mantalto. See Gruccii: Iconografia storica degli ordini religiosi e cavallereschi, Rome, 1836, i. pp. 128-130. Zöckler.

MARIUS is the name of two popes. — Marius I. (882-884) was the son of a prebysiter, Palumbo, and a native of Gaul. Before his accession he was three times sent to Constantinople as papal legate, — in 866 by Nicholas I., in 869 by Adrian II., and in 880 by John VIII.; and every time his errand was the controversy with Photius. His first official act after his accession was to condemn Photius; and as he was bishop of Caere when he was elected bishop of Rome, and such a removal from one see to another was canonically illegal, Photius answered by protesting against the validity of his election. On account of the great similarity between the two names Marinus and Martinus, they have often been confused; and Marinus I. is, indeed, in the papal catalogues, recorded under the name Martinus II. His letters are found in Bouquet: Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France, ix. 198. The sources of his life are given by Muratori: Rer. Ital. Script., iii. p. 289; Watterich: Pontif. Rom. Vita, i. p. 29; and Jaffé: Regesta Pontif. Rom., p. 292. — Marinus II. (942-946) owed his elevation to Alberic, “the prince and senator of all the Romans,” and was nothing but a tool in his hands. The same confusion with respect to the name has taken place with him as with Marinus I. See Watterich: i. c., i. p. 54. R. Zöpfel.

MARINUS.
MARIOLATRY.
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MARIOLATRY. See Mary.
MARIUS OF AVENTICUM descended from a
noble family of Autun, and was in 574 elected
Bishop of Avenches, in the present canton of
Vaud, Switzerland. He afterwards removed the
see from Avenches to Lausanne, and d. there
Dec. 31, 593. He continued the Chronicle of
Prosper Aquitanius from 455 to 581, published
in the Collections of Duchesne and Dom Bouquet,
but best by Rickly, in Me'moires et documens publies par la socie'te d'histoire de la Suisse Romande,
xiii. The principal source of his life is the Cartular. Lausann. See also Arndt: Bischof Marius
v. Aventicum, Leipzig, 1875.
E. F. GELPKE.
MARIUS MERCATOR, an ecclesiastical writer
of the fifth century, who played an important
part in the Pelagian and Nestorian controversies.
He is mentioned only by Augustine (Ep., 193;
Qwest, ad Dulcit., 3) and Posidius (Indie. Libr.
Auguslini 4), and very little is known of his per
sonal life : thus it is doubtful whether he was a
priest, or a monk, or a layman. His spiritual
character and dogmatical views, his style, his
connection with Augustine, and his acquaintance
with African affairs, seem to indicate that he was
a native of North Africa. In 418 he must have
lived in Rome. There he became acquainted
with the chief representatives of Pelagianism,
and wrote a book against them, which he sent to
Augustine for examination. Augustine was, by
a journey to Mauritania, prevented from reading
the book immediately ; and, when he returned to
Hippo, he found a new work by Marius in the
same line. He received both books with great
kindness, exhorted the author to continue as he
had begun, and recommended him to his friends
in Rome. Later on, but before 429, Marius went
to Constantinople, where he spent a part of his
life, as it would seem, in some kind of an official
position ; perhaps as the agent of Ccelestine I.
(422-432) and Sixtus III. (432-440). He spoke
with authority ; and his sole object was to defend
the papal see against the Pelagians, and effect
their condemnation. For this purpose he drew
up, in the Greek language, a Commonitorium, which
he presented to the Emperor Theodosius II., and
translated into Latin. The result of this memoir
was the banishment from Constantinople of Ju
lian of Eclanum, Coelestius, and other Pelagian
leaders, and their condemnation by the synod of
Ephesus (431). In the same year he wrote against
Julian, and translated into Latin, the Anathemata
of Cyril, and other documents pertaining to the
Pelagian and Nestorian controversies. The last
of his translations dates from 449. After 451 all
information of him ceases.
As a translator, Marius is literal and often
awkward : his style is rough and uncouth. As a
polemic, he is violent and often unjust, his own
views being very narrow. But he was a stanch
ehampion of orthodoxy, and his writings contain
much valuable information about his contempo
raries. They fall into two groups ; referring partly
to the Pelagian, and partly to the Nestorian con
troversy. The first group comprises the abovementioned Adversus novas harelicos, written in
Rome 417 or 418, and sent to Augustine for exam
ination and approbation (it is lost, unless it be
identical with the Hypomnesticon formerly ascribed
to Augustine, and generally printed among his
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works); the Commonitorium, also mentioned above-,
another Commonitorium against Julian; and trans
lations of Nestorius' Epistle to Ccelestine, four
Sermons by him, the Symbolum Theodori Mops.,
and extracts from his work against Augustine.
The second group comprises translations of five
Sermons by Nestorius, four Epistles by Cyril,Cyril's Apologeticus adv. Orientates, his Apologeticus adv. Theodoretum, his Scholia de incarnatione
Verbi Unigeniti, fragments of Theodoret, Theo
dore, Diodorus, Ibas, etc. The works of Marius
Mercator were for a long time not known at all ;
though they were evidently used in the ninth
century, during the Gottschalk controversy and
the Pseudo-Isidorian fabrication, which gave rise
to the peculiar fable of an Isidorus Mercator.
A collected edition of them was first published
by J. Gamier, Paris, 1673, 2 vols, folio, and then
by Baluze, Paris, 1684. The latter is the best,
and has been reprinted in Gallandi, Bibl. Patrum.,
viii. ; while Migne has adopted the former in his
WAGENMANN.
MARK, one of the four evangelists, whose name
has passed over to the Gospel by his hand. I.
The Man. — John, surnamed Mark, a born Jew
(Col. iv. 10, 11), comes to view, in the history of
the apostolic church, in company with Barnabas
and Paul, about the year 45. There is no tenable
ground for denying, as Grotius and Schleiermacher did, the identity of John Mark and Mark. He
is not only referred to by both these names,
but also by the simple name of John (Acts xiii.
5, 13). John was his Hebrew name, Mark his
Latin surname. His mother's (Mary's) house in
Jerusalem was a resort for the believers (Acts
xii. 12). He is called by Peter "his son " (1 Pet.
v. 13), which makes it probable that he had been
brought to the faith by Peter. He was a cousin
of Barnabas (Col. iv. 10), and accompanied him
and Paul on their missionary tour as far as Perga
in Pamphylia (Acts xiii. 5, 13), whence he re
turned, against their will (Acts xv. 38), to Jerusa
lem. For this reason Paul refused to take him as
his companion on his second missionary journey.
This was the occasion of a separation between
him and Barnabas, who took Mark to Cyprus
(Acts xv. 36-39). Ten years later, Paul and
Mark stand in friendly relations, and Paul calls
him his co-laborer (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24).
Paul subsequently requested Timothy to send
him to Rome (2 Tim. iv. 11). The last biblical
notice connects his name with Peter in the vicinity
of Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13). [Olshausen, Lange,
Archbishop Thomson, and others, hold it proba
ble that the nameless young man who followed
Christ on the night of his betrayal (Mark xiv.
51, 52) was John Mark.] According to the testi
mony of the early church, the relation between
Mark and Peter was a very intimate one. Papias
(Euseb. 3, 39), who leans upon the presbyter John
as his authority, informs us that he was Peter's
interpreter. He says, " Mark was the interpreter
of Peter, and wrote down accurately what ne re
membered; ... for he neither heard the Lord
himself, nor followed him, but at a later time he
followed Peter " (UapKOC yiv ipufjvcmrjc Herpov yevouevoq, baa tuvtifwvcvoev, dxpt/3uf lypatyev , . . oirc yap
jJKOvae tov Kvpiov ofnc naptiKo/uitiiiaev airy, varepov 6i
ilerp^). A later tradition, that he resided with
Peter in Rome, is less reliable, as it is open to the


suspicion of being founded on the interpretation of Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13) as Rome (Euseb. 2. 15; Jerome: C. Orig., 8). Further traditions state, that, after Peter's death, he went to Alexandria, established a congregation, became its first bishop, and suffered a martyr's death.

II. THE GOSPEL.—The early church placed the second Gospel of the canon in a very intimate relation to Peter, as it did the Gospel of Luke to Paul. Papias relates that Mark wrote down the things he heard from Peter, but did not observe any definite arrangement (ου μετα των ταθεων των Χριστου απ' Αρκαινος λεγοντας των της της δε της τους). Justin (c. Tryph., 106) calls the Gospel the "Reminiscences of Peter" (τα απομνημονευματα Πτερου); and Tertullian (c. Marc., 4, 5) says it is "called Mark" because he edited the Gospel of Peter (evangelium Petri). Ireneaus (Hist., iii. 1) adds, that Mark wrote it after the death (ϕιλος) of Peter and Paul; and at the time of Eusebius (iii. 15) the opinion was universal, that Peter sustained a close relation to the Gospel; while Jerome says (Catal., 8, etc.) that the "Gospel was composed, Peter narrating, and Mark writing." Against this universal testimony, the influence of Peter upon the second Gospel, no tenable objection can be urged. Some (Baur, Hilgenfeld, Kostlin) have argued, from the notice of Papias, that there was an original document by Mark, which contained aphoristic utterances of Peter. This theory goes upon the arbitrary supposition that Papias, in the words ϕιλος του "did not follow a definite arrangement" meant a haphazard collection of sayings; but this cannot be made out to be his meaning. Another theory was set on foot by Grimm, De Wette, Bleek, Delitzsch, Davidson, and others; and looks for its confirmation to the contents (by far the largest portion of which is contained in Matthew and Luke) and to the arrangement of the contents; the compiler using Matthew and Luke alternately (Mark i. 1-20, comp. Matt. iii. 4; Mark i. 21 sqq., comp. Luke iv. 1—vi. 17; Mark iii. 28—35, comp. Matt. ix. 1—vi. 18, comp. Luke vii. 5 sqq.). Another argument is, that the Gospel shows its secondary origin by the prosaic reflections and additions which the author inserts in his narrative (comp. viii. 3, xii. 13, etc.). But this theory likewise lacks all sound foundation. The arguments are deceptive. The first thing to be brought against it is the wide belief of the early church (Melito, Ireneaus, Origen, Jerome, etc.) that the Gospels were arranged according to the date of their composition, Luke consequently following Mark. It cannot be shown that Mark had any partisan purpose in writing his Gospel; and, in the absence of this, no reasons can be given why he should have passed by the infancy of Jesus, the Sermon on the Mount, the raising of the widow of Nain's son, the great discourse against the Pharisees, and other narratives, if he was a mere compiler from Matthew and Luke. Again: the theory is made most improbable by the circumstance that Mark does not contain any of the characteristic peculiarities or excellences of Matthew and Luke.

No: the picturesque freshness and vividness of detail, especially in the sections which are peculiar to this Gospel, betray the hand of an original author. He preserves striking Hebrew expressions (iii. 17; v. 41; vii. 11—34), adds numerous details (i. 20; iv. 38 sqq.; vii. 5, 6, 17; viii. 14; xiv. 3, 5, etc.), and represents Christ's rebukes of His disciples as sharper than the other Gospels (iv. 38; vi. 32; vii. 17 sqq., etc.). But the main point is, that the sections which Matthew and Luke have in common, Mark has; whereas sections which are peculiar to them he has not. This circumstance would rather prove Mark to be the original from which the other two synoptists drew, than vice versa.

There remains only one more question in this connection: Is our canonical Mark identical with the Gospel spoken of by Papias? Holtzmann (D. synth. Evvgenitei) and Bernhard Weiss (D. Mar. evvgeniteum), and also D. Matthauserevgeniteum, the representatives of the two principal classes of views, both accord to Mark much originality, but hold that this is not the original Gospel. Holtzmann thinks the Mark of Papias was the original from which our canonical Mark was derived; after the destruction of Jerusalem, and for the Church in Rome. Weiss, on the other hand, regards the λογια ("discourses") of Matthew (see Matthew) as the original source of our Gospels, and derives our Mark partly from them, and partly from the Mark spoken of by Papias. That Weiss's modifications of the so-called "Mark-theory" (Marcus-Hypothesen) involves more intricate complications than that of Holtzmann, there can be no doubt; and for this reason it has found less acceptance than the labor and skill that have been spent upon it would otherwise warrant.

The purpose of the Gospel of Mark is best expressed in its first words, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." It brings out the divine glory of the person of Christ, its divine individuality and sublimity, with which he impressed an astonished world. The discourses of our Lord are not ignored, but it is the daily deeds of healing and power which the second Gospel emphasizes. A school of critics, denying this purely historical aim, cites viii. 1—38, Matt. xi. 1—19. Another argument is, that the Gospel shows its secondary origin by the prosaic reflections and additions which the writer inserts in his narrative (comp. viii. 3, xii. 13, etc.). But this theory likewise lacks all sound foundation. The arguments are deceptive. The first thing to be brought against it is the wide belief of the early church (Melito, Ireneaus, Origen, Jerome, etc.) that the Gospels were arranged according to the date of their composition, Luke consequently following Mark. It cannot be shown that Mark had any partisan purpose in writing his Gospel; and, in the absence of this, no reasons can be given why he should have passed by the infancy of Jesus, the Sermon on the Mount, the raising of the widow of Nain's son, the great discourse against the Pharisees, and other narratives, if he was a mere compiler from Matthew and Luke. Again: the theory is made most improbable by the circumstance that Mark does not contain any of the characteristic peculiarities or excellences of Matthew and Luke.

No: the picturesque freshness and vividness of detail, especially in the sections which are peculiar to this Gospel, betray the hand of an original author. He preserves striking Hebrew expressions (iii. 17; v. 41; vii. 11—34), adds numerous details (i. 20; iv. 38 sqq.; vii. 5, 6, 17; viii. 14; xiv. 3, 5; etc.), and represents Christ's rebukes of His disciples as sharper than the other Gospels (iv. 38; vi. 32; vii. 17 sqq., etc.). But the main point is, that the sections which Matthew and Luke have in common, Mark has; whereas sections which are peculiar to them he has not. This circumstance would rather prove Mark to be the original from which the other two synoptists drew, than vice versa.

There remains only one more question in this connection: Is our canonical Mark identical with the Gospel spoken of by Papias? Holtzmann (D. synth. Evvgenitei) and Bernhard Weiss (D. Mar. evvgeniteum), and also D. Matthauserevgeniteum, the representatives of the two principal classes of views, both accord to Mark much originality, but hold that this is not the original Gospel. Holtzmann thinks the Mark of Papias was the original from which our canonical Mark was derived; after the destruction of Jerusalem, and for the Church in Rome. Weiss, on the other hand, regards the λογια ("discourses") of Matthew (see Matthew) as the original source of our Gospels, and derives our Mark partly from them, and partly from the Mark spoken of by Papias. That Weiss's modifications of the so-called "Mark-theory" (Marcus-Hypothesen) involves more intricate complications than that of Holtzmann, there can be no doubt; and for this reason it has found less acceptance than the labor and skill that have been spent upon it would otherwise warrant.

The purpose of the Gospel of Mark is best expressed in its first words, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." It brings out the divine glory of the person of Christ, its divine individuality and sublimity, with which he impressed an astonished world. The discourses of our Lord are not ignored, but it is the daily deeds of healing and power which the second Gospel emphasizes. A school of critics, denying this purely historical aim, cites viii. 1—38, Matt. xi. 1—19. Another argument is, that the Gospel shows its secondary origin by the prosaic reflections and additions which the author inserts in his narrative (comp. viii. 3, xii. 13, etc.). But this theory likewise lacks all sound foundation. The arguments are deceptive. The first thing to be brought against it is the wide belief of the early church (Melito, Ireneaus, Origen, Jerome, etc.) that the Gospels were arranged according to the date of their composition, Luke consequently following Mark. It cannot be shown that Mark had any partisan purpose in writing his Gospel; and, in the absence of this, no reasons can be given why he should have passed by the infancy of Jesus, the Sermon on the Mount, the raising of the widow of Nain's son, the great discourse against the Pharisees, and other narratives, if he was a mere compiler from Matthew and Luke. Again: the theory is made most improbable by the circumstance that Mark does not contain any of the characteristic peculiarities or excellences of Matthew and Luke.

No: the picturesque freshness and vividness of
which were unnecessary for Jewish readers (vii. 3, 4, 34; xii. 42; xv. 42). Christ brought the gospel (i. 15), whose destination is a universal one; and the temple itself was to be a house of prayer for all the nations (xi. 17).

The date of the Gospel has been put down by some (Keim, Hilgenfeld) to the latter part of the first century; Holtzmann says, shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem; Weiss, about the year 70. The Gospel itself contains no details which enable us to fix the date with certainty, not even the eschatological discourses of chap. xiii. The testimonies of the early church writers have already been given. Irenæus says it was written after the deaths of Peter and Paul; but, from Clement of Alexandria on, the tendency was to seek an earlier date, until Eusebius at last fixed it at 43. Every thing points to a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem: [Meyer, Hitzig, 55-57; Archbishop Thomson and Dean Alford, 63-70; Lange, 68-70; Riddle, 64, etc.]

The place of composition was, according to the authorities of Irenæus, Irenæus, Eusebius, and Jerome, the city of Rome; and there is no good ground for disputing them. On the other hand, this view is favored by the explanation of Greek by Roman expressions (ii. 4; v. 9, 15, 23; vi. 27, 37; vii. 4, 5; xii. 14, 42; xiv. 5; xv. 15, 30, 44), and is held by Gieseler, Tholuck, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Meyer, etc. The isolated notice of Chrysostom (Hom. I., in Math.), that it was written in Alexandria, is unsupported by any of the Alexandrian Fathers.

Also the authorities of style are the use of hapazelegomena, of diminutives, double negatives, the word ἀνεβάζω ("straightway") forty-two times, the repetition of παρευρεσθαι ("and") , the tautologies, etc. Hitzig's investigation of Mark's language brought him to the conclusion that it is closely related to that of the Apocalypse, and the author of the former the author of the latter (a view which he had the honor of being alone in holding). Mark wrote in Greek. Baronius, on the basis of a notice at the foot of a copy of the Peschito and some Latin manuscripts, started the theory that he wrote in Latin; and even the Latin autograph was said to have been discovered in Venice; but the latter proved to be a fragment of a copy of the four Gospels, containing a preface by Jerome.

The genuineness of Mark has been left unquestioned, except xvi. 9-20. This passage seems to be more than suspicious. Not that the style is so different from the rest of the Gospel, as some have urged, but because the passage is wanting in the Sinaic and Vatican manuscripts, because Eusebius, Jerome, Gregory of Nyssa, and others say the Gospel closed with the words ἐγὼ ἔμεινα ἐν ἀθώῳ υἱῷ ("for they were afraid," verse 8), and the repetition of the first verse, which is found in the eighth. The passage, however, is very old; for Irenæus refers to it (iii. 10, 6). Perhaps the original conclusion of the Gospel was lost: perhaps it remained unfinished. [The genuineness is denied by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort (in their Greek text), also by Fritzsche, Ewald, Reuss, Meyer, Archbishop Thomson, Riddle, but affirmed by Mill, Hug, Scholz, Olshausen, Ebrard, Lange, Burgon, Scrivener, and Morison.]

MARK, MABLORAT.1408

MARK'S DAY, St., the 25th of April; celebrated in the Roman Church by a solemn suppliant procession,—the so-called Litania major. The ceremony is mentioned by Gregory the Great. In those churches where Mark is patron, the priest wears blue at mass upon this day. MARLORAT, Augustin, surnamed Du Pasquier; b. at Bar-le-duc in Lorraine, 1506; hanged at Rouen, Oct. 31, 1562. After the death of his parents, he was educated in an Augustinian convent; entered the order in 1524; was ordained a priest, and became in 1533 prior of a monastery at Bourges. He enjoyed a great reputation as a preacher; but his connection with the Reformation soon became apparent, and in 1538 he was compelled to flee. He sought refuge in Geneva; was appointed preacher at Cressier, near Luzanne; married; removed to Vevey; and was appointed preacher to the Reformed congregation in Paris, in 1569, and in the following year to that of Rouen. Rouen was in that period the second city of France, the centre of great commercial and industrial interests. The Reformation had spread widely among its inhabitants; and, after the massacre of Vassy (March 1, 1562), the Reformed citizens took possession of the city (April 18), and established a government in accordance with their religious principles. Some outbreaks of fanaticism took place May 3; and, though the Reformed pastors were entirely innocent of those excesses, they were made to suffer for them, when, on Oct. 26, the city was recaptured by the Roman Catholics. Marlorat was condemned to death, and executed in front of his own church. [Of his works, parts of his Novi Testamenti catholicae expositio, Geneva, 1581, were
transliterated into English by Thomas Tymme, London, 1570 (St. Matthew), and by others (John, 1574 (Mark), 1583, etc.)

MARNIX, Philipp van (Sieur de St. Aldegonde), b. at Brussels in 1538; d. at Leyden, Dec. 15, 1588; one of the most prominent leaders of the Dutch rising in the sixteenth century. He was very deeply imbued with the political elements of Calvinism. He was a good classical scholar, a learned theologian, and well versed in jurisprudence. His principal studies he made at Geneva, and there he became not only fully converted to the Reformation, but also deeply imbued with the political elements of Calvinism. After returning home in 1560, he lived for several years in domestic retirement, until the whirlwind of events carried him to the front. He drew up the so-called compromise, by which the Dutch noblemen bound themselves to resist to the last the introduction of the Inquisition. After the occurrence of the iconoclastic riots, he published Van de beelden afgetorpen en de Nederlan- den (1566), and Vraie narration et apologie des choses passées aux Pays-Bas (1567). But it was not with the pen alone he served the cause he had espoused. Valenciennes was heavily pressed by the Spaniards, and Marnix and Broederode undertook to re-enforce it. But they were defeated at Austravel, March 13, 1567. Marnix escaped first to Breda, then to Germany; but all his property was confiscated, Aug. 17, 1568. He entered the service of the elector-palatine, Friedrich III., and for several years he was deeply engaged in theological affairs. Meanwhile he had made the acquaintance of William of Orange. An intimate friendship sprang up between the two men; and in 1569 Marnix composed the famous William's Lay, which contributed more than anything else to concentrate the sympathy of the Dutch on Wil- lippe II. de sa seigneurie des Pays-Bas: see also his Rapport fait au prince d'Orange et aux États Géné- raux. But the foolish attempt of the duke (Jan. 15-17, 1583) to break the compact, and establish himself at Antwerp by a coup d'état, threw suspicion even on Marnix; and when, as burgomaster of Antwerp, he surrendered the city to Alexander of Parma (Aug. 17, 1585), after a siege of nearly two years, he fell a victim to calumny. He retired to his estate at Westenborg, near Vlissingen, and lived for several years in deep retirement. As a kind of reparation, the states-general charged him in 1566 with the translation of the Bible; and he moved the following year to Leyden. But he succeeded only in finishing the translation of Genesis before death overtook him.

His principal theological work is De Buenorfe der heilige roomse keerke, a satire on the Church of Rome, her organization, her practices, inspired, no doubt, by the Epistola obscurorum virorum, and often very striking and point- ed. It was published in 1569, often reprinted, and translated into many foreign languages. His stand-point was that of strict Calvinism. It was very much due to his influence, that at the synod at Ant- werp (Aug. 20, 1566), the Wittenberg concordia was rejected; and in the same spirit he was active at the synods of Wesel (1568) and Emden (1571). A Traité du sacrement de la sainte cène du Seigneur; which was published after his death (Leyden, 1569), is very precise and definite in fixing the stand-point from which it is written; and so are his Réponse apologétique (1598), Onder- zoek ende grondelijcke wederlegging der Geest- driehycke Leere (1593), Tableau des différents de la religion (1801), etc. A complete edition of his works does not exist. A selection has been published by Edgar Quinet: Oeuvres de P. van M., Brussels, 1857-90, 8 vols. His theological writings have been published by J. J. van Toorenen- berg, St. Gravenhage, 1781. Many of his letters are found in the Werken der Marnixreuniging.

LIT.—His life was written by Prins, Leyden, 1782; W. Broes, Amsterdam, 1888; Edgar Quinet, Brussels, 1834; Th. Juste, Brussels, 1853; J. Van Hare, Harlem, 1854 (popular); Volkman, Harlem, 1873 (popular); Alber- dink-Thym, Harlem, 1878 (ultramontane). See Motley: Dutch Republic.

MARONITES is the name of a Syrian tribe, which, within the Christian Church, forms a peculiar, half-independent community, or, to speak more correctly, a sect. Members of this sect live scattered all over Syria; larger congregations are gathered in Aleppo, Damascus, and the island of Cyprus; but the proper home of the community is the Lebanon region, from Tripoli in the north, to Tyre and the Lake of Gennesareth in the south. Especially the districts of Kefrawan near Beirut, and Bsherre near Tripoli, are inhabited exclusively by Maronites; while in other places Maronites, Jacobites, Druses, etc., live interspersed between each other. The total number of the Maronite inhabitants of Lebanon hardly exceeds two hundred thousand; at all events, the estimate of the Notizia statisticadelle Missioni cattoliche (Rome, 1843), five hundred thousand, is much too high. They pursue agriculture and cattle-breeding: the cultivation of the silk-worm is also very flourishing among them. They speak Arabic, and have done so for centuries; but they are of Syrian descent. The liturgy employed in their divine service is in Syriac, though only a very few of them understand that language: the readings from the Gospels, however, are in Arabic.

They like to consider themselves a distinct nation; and they have, indeed, always succeeded in vindicating for themselves a certain measure of political independence. They are governed by sheiks, elected from among their own nobility; and to the Ottoman sultan, who appoints a sheikh pacha over them, they only pay a variable tribute.

At the head of their church (the Ecclesia Maroni- tarum) stands a patriarch, who is elected by them- selves, and wears the title of "Patriarch of Antioch and all the East." He resides during summer in the monastery Kannoub, at Lebanon, and during
winter at Bkerke; and he is always named either
Butrus (Petrus), or Bllus (Paulus). But he re-
ceived confirmation from the Pope; for from the
Maronites. a certain relation between the see of Rome and
the Maronites. the Maronites acknowledge as their first patri-
arch lived nearly a century before that time; and,
moreover told that he journeyed to Rome, and
was unanimously elected patriarch. We are
noted only to be mentioned passingly that some
scholars derive it from Maronea, a village thirty
miles east of Antioch; and others from Johannes
Maron, about whom see below. But it must be
noticed that the name does not occur until the
seventh century, in the writings of John of Damas-
cus, and that it is used there to designate a hereti-
cal sect. Exactly in the same manner it occurs
later on in the writings of the Christian authors
in Egypt (who wrote in Arabic), — Eutychius
(Ibn Batrik, from the beginning of the tenth
century), Benassalus (Ibn el-Assal, from the thir-
teenth century), and others. See RENAUDOT:

The First Patriarch. — Johannes Maron, whom
the Maronites acknowledge as their first patri-
arch was born at Antioch near the Anti-
ch, and was educated in Antioch and the monastery of St.
Maron. Later on he studied in Constantinople,
became monk in St. Maron, was ordained priest,
and wrote against the heretics. Having acquired
a great reputation among the Syrians, he was
introduced to the papal legate in Antioch, and by
him appointed bishop of Butrus in 676. He then
converted the Monophysites and Monothelites
in the Lebanon region to the Roman faith, or-
dained priests and bishops, and gave the Maron-
ites their political and military constitution.

When Theopanes, patriarch of Antioch, died, in
the second year of the reign of Justinian II., he
happened, we are told, to be present in the city,
and was unanimously elected patriarch. We are
furthermore told that he journeyed to Rome, and
was consecrated by Pope Honorius. But Honori-
us lived nearly a century before that time; and,
as no one else but the biographer of Maro knows
anything about a patriarch of Antioch of that
name, the whole story of his patriarchate seems
to be fabrication from the Pope; for from the
as to deny the very existence of Maron; but there
is no reason to doubt that he really was elected
bishop of Lebanon, and exercised great influence
therein steady opposition to the Greeks, though
it is apparent that his biography, derived from a
so-called Arabic chronicle of the fourteenth or
fifteenth century, and first published in a Latin
translation by Quaresmius (De Monast. ton-a sapor,
i. 37), and then in the original text by Assemani
(Bibl. Or., i. 496), is much mixed up with legen-
dary matter, and the product of some Maronite,
converted to Romanism, and anxious to establish
an early and intimate connection between Rome
and his co-religionists. The Maronites were
early very jealous of their orthodoxy, and employ
every means at their disposal in order to slurr
over the fact — related by William of Tyre in his
History of the Crusades, and accepted by Jacob
of Vitry, Baronius, Renardot, and all modern
church historians — that they were a heretical
sect, Monothelites and Monophysites, until they,
in 1182, joined the Church of Rome under the
influence of the crusaders, through whom fre-
quent communications took place with the papal
see. Their principal defenders were Abraham
Eschellensis (Chronicon orientale, Paris, 1651),
Faustus Nairon (De origine Maronitarum, Rome,
1679, and Eutupia fiidei, Rome, 1694), i. S. Asse-
mani (Bibl. Orient., Rome, 1719), and Nicolas
Murad (Notice historique sur l'origine de la nation
Maronite, Paris, 1844).

Relation to Rome. — The great conversion to
Romanism in 1182 was not complete. An anti-
Roman re-action soon set in, and was punished
by a papal interdict, from which the country
of Lebanon, 1788; and large extracts from those
acts have been given by Schnurrer; in his two
programmes: De ecclesia Maronitica, Tubingen,
1810-11. See also Nouveaux memoires des mis-
sions de la compagnie de Jésus dans le levant, Paris,
1745, viii. and S. E. Assemani: Bibl. Medie.,
Florence, 1742, p. 118. In 1584 Gregory XIII.
founded the Collegium Maronitarum in Rome, and from that institution issued a number of celebrated scholars,—Georgius Amira, Gabriel Sionita, Abraham Ecchellenis, the Assemani, and others. Meanwhile the people itself, at home on Lebanon, remained in a semi-barbarous state. Two printing-presses were established among them,—at the courts of Francis I., Marguerite of Valois, and Renata of Este; staid for some time at Geneva in friendly intercourse with Calvin, having been compelled to flee from Paris, suspected of inclining towards the Reformation; and settled finally in Turin. In 1538 he began, with the aid of the learned Vatable, to translate the Psalms into French verses; and his undertaking succeeded so well, that it became fashionable, even at the court, to sing them. The first edition dates from 1541, and contains only thirty psalms; but the second, of 1549, with a preface by Calvin, contains the entire collection. See, on this subject, the excellent works by FELIX BOVET: Histoire du psautier des églises réformées, Neuchâtel, 1872; O. DOUVEN: Clément Marot et le psautier huguenot, Étude historique, littéraire, musicale et bibliographique, Paris, 1876, 1878, 2 vols., and the art. Psalmody. C. SCHMIDT. MARRIAGE. is union of a male and of a female human being, without which there could be no family, no parental care, no developed political communities, no general society of mankind. It is, in its essence, not only a union of hearts, but a physical union also. In the first book of the Hebrew Scriptures it is written, “For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall become one flesh.” This passage our Lord has sanctioned, cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall become one flesh. In the first book of the Hebrew Scriptures it is written, “For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall become one flesh.” It is, that neither of the parties can be united at the same time to another person; so that polygamy is condemned by the very nature of marriage. And, still further, the expression “shall cleave” (adhere, or be devoted to) denotes a moral and social union; while “one flesh” implies that they are also bound together in an exclusive sexual fellowship. The permanence also of the union is implied in this closeness.

The apostle Paul, by his parallel comparing the husband and wife with Christ and his church, confesses the highest possible honor on marriage, and shows the closeness of the union: “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it.” “Even so ought husbands also to love their own wives as their own bodies” (Eph. v. 25, 28). Polygamy is not only contrary to the earliest idea of marriage, but both the laws of nature and the experience of the world condemn it. As far as statistics reach, the sexes, at the marriageable age, maintain, on the whole, an equality, or a near approach to equality, at the time of being born, and more females surviving the perils of early and middle life. In the higher races polygamy is almost unknown: elsewhere it cannot be indulged in to any great extent, unless men are killed off in war, while women are spared; or unless the rich and powerful have many wives, and the poorer classes of men lead lives of profligacy. Polygamy, again, makes men sensual, and fills the wives of the same man with jealousy and hatred towards each other. The idea of the family cannot be realized in the harem; and its inmates are often all but slaves, being first acquired by war or money. Yet polygamy, although contrary to the idea of marriage as set forth in Gen. ii. 24, was in the world at an early date. Lamech, of the posterity of Cain, had two wives (Gen. iv. 19), which seems like a record of the first known bigamy; after which polygamy may have soon sprung up. We find it in the family of Abraham: both his granddaughters, Eeau and Jacob, had a plurality of wives,—the first, three; the other, four, of whom two may be called, like Hagar, concubines, being given by Leah and Rachel to Jacob, as Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham, to be a substitute for herself. From this it may be conjectured that bigamy depended at first on the original wife’s consent. Afterwards it became more common among the men of power and wealth. And yet Nabal had one wife only (1 Sam. xxv.); and the same is true of the prophets, where we have any notices of their family relations. Moses also may have lost his first wife when he married the Cushite woman (Num. xii. 1; comp. Knobel in loco). In the last chapter of Proverbs, only one husband and one wife are thought of. No law forbade polygamy, but it faded out of manners without the aid of legislation. All the peoples in the west, of a higher civilization, discarded it, or never had it; and no direct prohibition of it is to be found in the Christian Scriptures. Marriage, unless begun at too early an age, is shown by modern statistics to be decidedly a healthier, as it is a more moral, condition than that of remaining single. M. Michel Chevalier...
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remarks, that if we compare the deaths of celibates, married persons, widowers, and widows, in their sum total, it is found that there is in France an exceptionally great mortality in the class of persons of either sex, married under the age of twenty; but that, in all succeeding periods of life, the death-rates of the married fall below those of the unmarried. In the French census of 1801 the deaths of celibates for a hundred celibates are given as 9 males and 5.72 females between the ages of twenty and sixty, but, of married persons between the same ages, they are 4.02 per cent of males and 4.40 of females. An increase of marriages in our country, says M. Lagoyt, cited by M. Cadet (Marriage, p. 18), would have for its effect, not only a greater fecundity of legitimate births, but also a greater mean duration of life.

The question here comes up, What persons are forbidden in the Scriptures, or upon ethical grounds, to form marriage unions with one another? It must here be remembered that, in primitive times, that the children of the same family, and others nearest of kin to one another, needed to have the utmost sexual reserve maintained between them, in order that the family might not become a hot-bed of vice. Everywhere we find laws prohibiting marriages of near relatives under heavy penalties. The word incestus (that is, in-castus, unchaste, impure) shows how the Romans branded it in their language. Even a parent and an adopted child could not marry, nor an uncle and a sister's daughter. Thus Gregory the Great, in his letter to St. Maximus, and a jftamen diatis). And there can scarcely be a doubt that religious rites, with a high idea of marriage; and, while it teaches that the children of the same family, and others nearest of kin for a wife may have, in time, been given to him by a suitor, for his loss of

her services. To this mohar, as the Hebrews called it, there are several allusions in the Hebrew Scriptures. Shechem was willing to give any amount of mohar and methul to Jacob and his sons in exchange for Dinah as a wife (Gen. xxxiv. 12), in which passage the second word may denote a gift made to the betrothed by the suitor. Jacob paid for his wives in labor; David paid for Michal in evidences of having killed a hundred Philistines (1 Sam. xviii. 20; 2 Sam. iii. 14); Hoses, in a symbolical prophecy, gave for a wife fifteen pieces of silver and a quantity of barley,—the usual price for a slave. The price paid to the next of kin for a wife may have, in time, been given by the father to his daughter. The very ancient practice of bride-stalking, of which traces remained, in many parts of the world, long after the proper seizing of a wife from another tribe ceased, is not shown by any thing in the Old Testament to have been indigenous among the Hebrews. The experiment of the Benjamites with wives, in Judg. xxi., seems to have been suggested by the necessity of the case.

The natural feeling that marriage is a most important and a religious institution found expression among the Israelites in a solemn covenant between the man and the woman, to which there are several references. One of these is in Prov. ii. 17, "Who ... forgettest the covenant of her God;" and another, in Mal. ii. 14, "Yet she is thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant;" i.e., of thy covenant made with him solemnly before God. Still more full is the expression in Ezek. xvi. 8, where God as a husband enters into a covenant with Jerusalem as a wife, so that she becomes his. Of the other ceremonies of marriage very little is said in the ancient scriptures. At Athens the man made known to the members of his phratria the marriage into which he had entered; and a sacrifice followed, together with a feast. And so, in early patrician times at Rome, a cake of spelt was eaten by the man and his bride, with auspices and offerings, in the presence of twelve witnesses (two of whom were the pontifex maximus and a flamen diialis). And there can scarcely be a doubt that religious rites, with a festival, accompanied marriages among the Hebrews.

The New Testament in its precepts shows a high idea of marriage; and, while it teaches that this state of life is not superior to its opposite, regards it also as a doctrine of false teachers that they place it among forbidden things. Our Lord, in Matt. xix. 11, when the apostles had said that it was not expedient to marry, if divorce was allowed only for one cause, replied that it was not given to all to receive this saying (of theirs) in practice, and that some abstain from marriage for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He shows that he thought individual duties and ethical capacities to be the determining considerations when marriage became a personal question. The apostle Paul lets us know that Peter and the Lord's brethren had wives, and considered his right to marry, if he wished, to be as good as theirs; he wishes the younger widow to marry (1 Tim. v. 14); he makes it essential (iii. 2-4) that the overseers in the churches should live a family life; and he regards forbidding to marry as part of an ascetic heresy (iv. 3). One passage only (Rev. xiv. 4)
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seems to look upon marriage as a state of life inferior to celibacy. But whether the words, "we are not defiled with women," and "for they were virgins," denote absolute chastity in the monastic sense, or absolute purity in the moral sense, and especially freedom from defilements accompanying idolatry, it is not altogether easy to decide. (Comp. Dodslock for West.)

Want of purity in thought, speech, and action, was the great vice of heathenism, and is especially denounced in a number of places in the New Testament; and, at the time when Christianity was spreading, an ascetic doctrine invaded the western parts of the civilized world, the leading idea of which was that victory over bodily desires was the principal attainment for man. In reference to marriage, Tertullian could say that second marriage is nothing but a species of fornication (stupri). Thus a state of virginity began to be regarded as one of superior sanctity; and when Origen did is well known. At the Council of Nice, opinions were thrown out that bishops, presbyters, and deacons should refrain from sexual communion with their wives. The good judgment of the Egyptian clergy without requiring such separation; and the difficulty thence arises, which has been a very troublesome one in some parts of Christendom; and still later began the strife between states and the church, especially the Catholic Church, growing out of the permission of civil marriage, as it is called. Each of these subjects—the early impediments to marriage in the Catholic Church (existing in part, also, in Protestant countries to a small extent), mixed marriages, and civil marriages (as it is called) for West.

1. The Impediments which early law in the western church, or canon law, sanctioned, may be divided into such as rendered marriage null, unless the party injured chose to have the marriage continue, and such as, on public grounds, without taking the wishes of the parties law, account, absolutely dissolved it. (a) To the first kind belong force, fraud, error in regard to personal identity or in regard to freedom, antenuptial derangement of mind, crime or pregnancy, concealment of certain matters from the pastor, and seduction (which, however, might be included under force). By free consent all these impediments might cease to be binding, and the marriage then become without a taint. (b) There were public impediments involving a sentence of nullity: such as divorce himself unmarried, prevented this rule from being enacted. Ere long, however, the law became stricter, so as to require priests and deacons in the western church, if unmarried, not to marry, and, if married, to live apart from their wives. The eastern church allowed ordination in inferior ranks of the clergy without requiring such separation; but a married bishop was obliged to leave his wife when raised to this dignity. It took a long time for such laws to prevail in the western church, until Gregory VII., partly out of policy, in order to draw a broader line between the law and the clerical members of the church, threatened excommunication against such laymen as should be present at masses celebrated by married presbyters. An unmarried clergy, thus secured, greatly aided the unity and ascendency of that order amid all the evils which the rule of celibacy brought about.

The most important points connected with Christian marriage in the medieval church are the including of it among the sacraments, and the power which the celebration of marriage with religious rites gave to the priests, of determining who could or could not marry according to Scripture and ecclesiastical canons. Upon the power of deciding questions touching the lawfulness of marriage depended the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of bishops, so far as it reached, over legitimacy, succession to inheritances, and the validity of testaments,—an immense power, which could be used to increase the amount of property held by dead hands. Another control which the medival church exercised in time to marriage was that of deciding what impediments ought to prevent its being celebrated. Of these impediments there were various sorts; some from degrees of consanguinity or of affinity; others from special causes, such as fraud, precontract, clerical orders; others from the religion of one of the parties. In process of time, after the rise of Protestantism, when members of the Catholic Church and Protestants lived near one another, the question of mixed marriages arose, which has been a very troublesome one in some parts of Christendom;
or enact that others besides shall not prevent and separate [marriage], let him be anathema." There is silent reference here to the marriage of Henry VIII. with his deceased brother's wife, which was declared unlawful by some during the controversy on that marriage and his divorce.

II. Mixed or Independent Marriages. — These are marriages entered into according to a form, or in a way, prescribed by the State, and have a validity which is independent of any ecclesiastical solemnization. Such marriages arose out of the unwillingness of dissenting sects in Protestant countries to have their marriages performed by members of the Established churches, or, per-
haps, celebrated according to forms which they could not approve. It is significant of the feeling of some English colonies, as of the Puritan ones in Connecticut and Massachusetts, that at first they required all marriages to be celebrated by a justice of the peace, or other civil officer.

The reason of the evident was, that they had felt what they considered tyranny from the Church of England, or eschewed it as not a true church. In process of time, ministers of the gospel, of any denomination, were allowed to solemnize marriages; and registry laws required that they should keep the proper certificates. In Europe, civil marriage has been subjected to much opposition, especially on the ground that the religious nature of marriage is not properly provided for by laws which render marriage by a minister of religion unnecessary. There are different ways of uniting civil marriage with religious forms. One is to begin with the civil marriage, which is essential, while the religious celebrations are left to the individual's own choice. This is the civil law of Germany since Feb. 6, 1875, according to a brief of Pius VIII., to Prussian bishops in 1872, and to Bavarian bishops in 1832. Of this many religious persons complain, and with reason. "Civil marriage is introduced into the principal countries of Europe, and is destined to extend farther."

Marriage and religion being the two main supports of society in all its forms, from the family to the state, we may ask, in closing, whether marriage is now contributing all that it can to the social system. Our answer must be, first, that it is a bad sign where the number of marriages to a given number of persons is, for a long period together, on the decrease, as that synthetically will be the condition of some of the most cultivated nations at the present time. And again: the reverence for the institution of marriage, either in society as a whole, or in certain classes, is tested by the annual number of breaches of its essential laws, and by divorces and separations. But it is a sad fact that the breaches, such as adulteries and desertions, are, on the whole, increasing, and that separations have still more increased within the present century. If the expense of maintaining families should increase as it has done, and the style of living go along with it at an equal pace, and the apparent desire of many not to have large families should become still more manifest, then we may expect that decay of family life to show itself which involves the decay alike of religion and the state.

Lit. — Marriage has such various and important relations to religion, morals, the family, the State, and the Church, that its literature is too copious to be fully exhibited. For Hebrew marriage we mention the work on Mosaisches Recht, by J. D. Michaelis (2d ed., 1775), that of Saal- schütz with the same title (2d ed., 1858), and the Antiquities of Israel, a translation of a work of Ewald by Solly, 1876. On marriage among the Greeks and Romans, consult especially K. F. Hermann's and Schoemann's Griech. Alterthumskunde, Meier and Schoemann's Attische Proceess (1824), Rossbach's Röm. Ehe (1859), Marquardt, in his and Mommsen's Handbuch, vol. i. of his Privateitzen d. Röm. (1870). For the Roman law of marriage, see Räs: Röm. Privatrecht; and the writers on Roman law, as Vangerow's Pan-
MARRIAGE AMONG THE HEBREWS. From the beginning, fathers selected for and gave to their sons a bride (Gen. xxiv. 3, xxxviii. 6). Where the wishes of the son were consulted, the proposal was made by the father (Gen. xxxiv. 4, 8; Judg. xiv. 2). Where there was no father, the brother selected the bride for her son (Gen. xxii. 21). Besides the customary presents given to the bride and her relations (Gen. xxxiv. 35), a price was stipulated, which was to be paid to the father of the maiden (Gen. xxxi. 13, xxxiv. 12; 1 Sam. xviii. 25, 25; Exod. xxvi. 17). This price could not be paid either in money (Deut. xxii. 29), or by services rendered (Gen. xxix. 20; Josh. xv. 16; 1 Sam. xvii. 25, xviii. 25). A dowry was very seldom given to the bride. The Mosaic law introduced no changes into these usages. It contains no rules as to the marriage contract. Only incidentally does it mention that, in older times, the marriage contract was made between the parents orally, perhaps in the presence of witnesses (Ruth iv. 11), or by sworn promises (Mal. ii. 14). Only in the post-exile period do we meet with written marriage contracts (Tob. vii. 14), concerning which more minute rules and regulations were laid down in the Talmudic treatise Kethubah.

Polygamy was allowed among the ancient Hebrews (Gen. iv. 19; 1 Chron. ii. 18), which at a very early period seems to have been restricted to two wives (1 Sam. i. 2; 2 Chron. xxiv. 3), and which seems to have been customary with kings (2 Sam. v. 13, xii. 8; 1 Kings xi. 3; 2 Chron. xi. 21, xiii. 21; Joseph., Antt., XVII. i. 3, and prominent persons (Judg. vii. 18). Although the Mosaic law did not forbid polygamy, and only restricted it in the case of kings (Deut. xvii. 17), yet its many enactments tended to discourage, and finally to abolish, polygamy (Exod. xxv. 8; Lev. xv. 18). By degrees, monogamy gained a strong foothold in the people, especially through the powerful influence of religion; and marriage was finally regarded as a sacred covenant made before God (Prov. ii. 17; Mal. ii. 14; Hos. ii. 20). Hence marriage is very often used by the prophets as a true emblem of the relation between Jehovah and Israel. This religious connotation of monogamic marriage became more and more prevalent in Israel; its basis being the divine institution of marriage, especially monogamic marriage, at the creation of man (Gen. i. 27 sq.; ii. 18 sq. 24; note especially the expression in ver. 24, unto “his wife,” and the addition of the Septuagint, made in the interest of monogamy, “they twain,” which is also retained in Matt. xix. 5; Mark x. 8; 1 Cor. vi. 16; Ephes. v. 31). To regulate marriage,— partly in accordance with ancient usages, and partly with the spirit pervading the law of Moses,—degrees were prescribed within which a man was permitted to marry. Out of aversion to consanguinity and the evil consequences resulting from it on the one hand, and in opposition to the then existing Canaanitish and Egyptian usage on the other hand, marriages between a certain number of near relatives were forbidden (comp. Lev. xvii. 7 sq.; xx. 20 sq.; Joseph., Antt., III. 12, 1). He that trespassed against it was to be burnt (Lev. xxi. 14). Yet these laws were not always strictly kept (2 Sam. xiii. 13 sq.; Ezek xxi. 10 sq.); and how little the magnates cared for it we see from the example of the Herodians (Joseph., Antt., XVII. i. 3; 13, i. XVIII. 5, 1, 4; comp. Matt. xiv. 4; Mark vi. 17 sq.). Ancient usage, however, favored marriages among more distant relatives (Gen. xxxiv. 4, 48); and only in the case of the inheritance of daughters the law provided that they should only marry in their own tribe (Num. xxxvi. 6 sq.), and made it incumbent upon the brother of a deceased husband who died childless to marry his widow (Gen. xxxviii.; Deut. xxv. 5 sq.; Ruth iv. 1 sq.; Matt. xxii. 24 sq.). The priests, especially the high priest, were not allowed to marry a divorced or profane woman, nor a whore (Lev. xxi. 7); and, whilst the priest could marry the widow of a priest (Ezek. xiv. 22), the high priest was even prohibited from the latter. Only maidens were allowed to the high priests. Out of theocratico-religious reasons, the marriage of an Israelite with a daughter from one of the accursed seven Canaanitish nations was forbidden (Exod. xxxiv. 16; Deut. vii. 3; Josh. xiii. 12), but this command was not always heeded (Judg. iii. 6, xiv. 1; 1 Kings xi. 1 sq.). Marriages with other foreign men and women were permitted (Lev. xxiv. 10; 1 Chron. ii. 34 sq.), since they could acquire the Jewish civil right. After the exile, however, mixed marriages, in consequence of the sad experiences which the people had made as touching their faith, were interdicted, and the more rigorous views were restored. The priests, especially the high priest, were not permitted to marry a divorced or profane woman, nor a whore (Lev. xix. 3; Neh. xiii. 23 sq.). A second marriage was permitted, although it was regarded as a higher degree of sanctity not to marry again (Luke ii. 39 sq.). In general, the Jews thought very highly of the married state, and many children were regarded as a great blessing (Ps. cxxvii. 3, cxxviii. 3 sq.).

Marriage Ceremonies. — The betrothal having previously taken place, the bridegroom on the wedding-day, accompanied by his friends (Judg. xiv. 10 sq.; Matt. ix. 15; John iii. 20; 1 Macc. ix. 80), and attired in his wedding-dress, went to the house of the bride, and conducted the veiled one, accompanied by her companions, under song (Jer. vii. 34, xvi. 9), music, and dancing (1 Macc. ix. 37), by the light of torches (Matt. xxv. 1), and went into the father’s house, where the marriage was kept for seven days (Judg. xiv. 10, 12), and where the many friends were entertained with song (Jer. xxxv. 10; 3 Macc. iv. 6) and riddles (Judg. xiv. 12). The bridegroom was crowned (Song of Songs, iii. 11; Isa. lxi. 10; 3 Macc. iv. 8). In the evening the couple was conducted to
the bridal chamber: and after coition it was ascertained whether the bride had preserved her maiden purity: if she had not, she was stoned (Deut. xxii. 13 sq.).

[Modern Jews celebrate marriages in the following manner. A silk or velvet canopy, about three or four yards square, and supported by four poles, is held up by four men out of doors on the day of the wedding. Under this canopy the bridegroom is led by his male friends, preceded by a band of music, and welcomed by the joyous spectators with the exclamation, Baruch Habdah! i.e., "Blessed be he that cometh!" The bride, with her face veiled, is then brought to him by his female friends, and led three times round the bridegroom, thereby fulfilling the command, "The woman shall compass the man" (Jer. xxxi. 22); when he takes her round once amid the congratulations of the by-standers, and then places her at his right hand, both standing with their faces to the south, and their backs to the north. The rabbi then covers the bridal pair with the tallit, or fringed wrapper, which the bridegroom has on, and the bridegroom, which is sparsommediately over the cup of wine the benediction of affiance, "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast created the fruit of the vine. Blessed art thou . . . who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast forbidden to us consanguinity, and prohibited us the betrothed, but hast permitted us those whom we take by betrothal and marriage. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast sanctified thy people Israel by betrothal and marriage." Whereupon the couple taste of the cup of blessing, and the bridegroom produces a plain gold ring, and, in the presence of all the party, puts it on the bride's finger, saying, "Behold, thou art consecrated unto me with this ring, according to the rites of Moses and Israel." The rabbi then reads aloud, in the presence of appointed witnesses, the kethubah, or marriage contract, and concludes by pronouncing over another cup of wine the seven benedictions, which are given according to the rites of Moses and Israel.

The ground on which the law allows a divorce is termed errath dabar, any "shameful thing" (Deut. xxiv. 1). Whatever this errath dabar meant was much discussed at the time of Jesus in the schools of Shammai and Hillel; and according to Hillel only the burning of food in cooking was a sufficient reason for putting away a wife. The husband had to give his divorced wife a bill of divorcement (Isa. lv. 3 sq.; Matt. xv. 31; Mark x. 4), thus enabling her to marry again. Without such a bill, she was regarded as belonging still to her former husband. A husband who had divorced his wife could not remarry her, even if her second husband had died, or had divorced her (Deut. xxiv. 2 sq.); otherwise the husband was in duty bound to provide his wife with food and raiment, and to fulfil the duty of marriage (Exod. xx. 10), but was released from the latter duty during the time of her menstruation (Lev. xviii. 16, xx. 18; Ezek. xviii. 6, xxii. 10).

Adultery.—Although connection with an unmarried woman was not regarded as adultery so long as polygamy existed, yet at a very early period connection with a betrothed or married woman was looked upon as so sinful that both the guilty parties were stoned (Deut. xxii. 20 sq.; John viii. 5, 7) or burned (Gen. xxxviii. 24; Lev. xxi. 9). The verity by four legal Lev. xxi. 9. The verity by four legal witnesses, was in duty bound to provide his wife with food and raiment, and to fulfil the duty of marriage (Exod. xx. 10), but was released from the latter duty during the time of her menstruation (Lev. xviii. 16, xx. 18; Ezek. xviii. 6, xxii. 10).

Adultery.—Although connection with an unmarried woman was not regarded as adultery so long as polygamy existed, yet at a very early period connection with a betrothed or married woman was looked upon as so sinful that both the guilty parties were stoned (Deut. xxii. 20 sq.; John viii. 5, 7) or burned (Gen. xxxviii. 24; Lev. xxi. 9). The verity by four legal witnesses, was in duty bound to provide his wife with food and raiment, and to fulfil the duty of marriage (Exod. xx. 10), but was released from the latter duty during the time of her menstruation (Lev. xviii. 16, xx. 18; Ezek. xviii. 6, xxii. 10).
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century, noted for spirituality and learning; and his book was originally issued in 1644. It consists of religious dialogues of an original and sprightly kind, discusses the doctrine of the atonement, and guides the reader safely between the Scylla and Charybdis of Antinomian error and Neonomian heresy (see arts.). A copy of it was brought into Scotland by an English Puritan soldier, and devoured by Thomas Bonus (see art.), who was much pleased with it, and spoke of it to several; and so it was republished in 1718, with a commendatory preface by Rev. James Hog of Carnock. The book displeased the Neonomians very much, and they were the leading men in the Church of Scotland. One of their number, principal Haddow of St. Andrews, assailed it in his opening sermon at the synod of Fife, April, 1719; and a "committee for preserving the purity of doctrine" was chosen at the Assembly that year, whose business really was to discredit the book. This was attempted by garbled extracts. In their report in 1720 the committee condemned the book as Antinomian, and the Assembly approved. Then the friends of the book rallied to its defense. Twelve men, who were called "the Representers," formally called the attention of the Assembly to the anomaly that it had condemned, because taught in the book, propositions which were couched in Scripture language, and others which were expressly taught in their symbolical books. The Neonomians, however, carried the day; and in the Assembly of 1722 the twelve Representers were solemnly rebuked; and subsequently every effort was made by the Neonomians to prevent the settlement of ministers holding the Marrow doctrines. No action was taken against Haddow. The case was, however, decided, and the book was freely sold and read in the church courts. But the irritation lasted, and ultimately led to the formation of the Secession Church. See Herterington: History of the Church of Scotland, chap. ix., American edition, pp. 342, 344-347.

MARSAY, Charles Hector de St. George, Marquis de, b. in Paris, 1688; d. at Ambleben, near Wolfenbüttel, 1746. His parents belonged to the Freimuthige uncichristliche Disburse, oder Zeit, in 1705. Von Fleischbein. He afterwards also visited Arolsen, Altona, and other places. His writings (Freimütige und christliche Diskurse, oder Zeugniss eines Kindes; Über die Magie; Wider die Herrnhuter, etc.) are of less consequence; but by transplanting the quietististic mysticism of B. Bourignon, Guyon, Berbot, etc., to Germany, he exercised an influence which became visible in the Berleburg Bible. An autobiography, letters, etc., are found in manuscript in the church archives of Coblenz. See Goebel: Christ. Leben. M. GOEBEL.

MARSDEN, Samuel, the "Apostle of New Zealand;" b. in England, 1764, of humble parentage; d. in Australia, May 12, 1838. He was a tradesman in Leeds, and at first a member of the Wesleyan Church, but, uniting with the Church of England, studied at St. Joseph's College, Cambridge. In 1794 he went out as chaplain to the penal colony at Paramatta, near Sydney, Australia. Deviating from the usual course of missions, he established a farm, and sought to train the convicts to habits of industry. On a visit to England in 1806, he appealed for missionaries for the Maoris in New Zealand. The Church Missionary Society was slow to his appeal; but Lady Margaret Hall and John King, offered themselves, and accompanied him on his return journey. Arriving in Australia, Marsden purchased a small vessel, "The Active," at his own expense, and with it cruised to New Zealand, and established a mission; and, though he retained his residence in Australia, visited the island often, and contributed much by his appeals and advice to the christianization and civilization of the people. See Miss Yonge: Pioneers and Founders, pp. 216-240.

MARS' HILL, so called because Mars was judged on it (Pausan., i. 28, 5), north-west of the Acropolis, is commonly called the Areopagus, and forever associated with Paul, who therefrom delivered a memorable address (Acts xvi. 22-31). It was the seat of the highest of the Athenian courts.

MARSH, Herbert, D.D., Bishop of Peterborough; b. Dec. 10, 1757, at Faversham, Kent; d. at Peterborough, May 1, 1839. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and took a fellowship in 1772. He became Lady Margaret professor of divinity at his alma mater; bishop of Llandaff 1818; transferred to Peterborough 1819. He was a vigorous opponent of Calvinism and Roman Catholicism. While professor, he substituted English for Latin in the delivery of his lectures, and the effect was so marked that they were adopted by other divinity schools.

MARSH, James, D.D., b. at Hartford, Vt., July 19, 1794; d. in Colchester, Vt., July 3, 1842. He was graduated at Dartmouth College 1817, and at Andover Theological Seminary 1822; in 1824 was professor of modern languages in Hampden-Sidney College, Virginia. From 1829 to 1833 he was president of the University of Vermont. In 1839 he edited Coleridge's Aids to Reflection, preface a fixing a remarkable essay upon the poet. He also translated Herder's Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, Burlington, 1823, 2 vols. His Remains, with memoir, appeared, Boston, 1843, 2d ed., 1845.

MARSHALL, Stephen, b. at Gorton, near Manchester in Huntingdonshire, Eng., at an unknown date; educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge; became minister at Wethersfield, and then at Finchingfield in Essex, where he was silenced for nonconformity. In 1640 he was made lecturer at St. Margaret's, Westminster. He was one of the chief's in the SMectymnuan Controversy (see Edmund Calamy) with Bishop Hall in 1641; was made a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines in 1643. He was the greatest preacher of his times and the most popular speaker. He
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was an active man, and a judicious adviser in all ecclesiastical affairs. He preached before Parliament, the Lord-Mayor, and the Assembly, more frequently than many others combined. He was the most influential member of the Westminster Assembly in ecclesiastical affairs. He represented the English Parliament in 1645; attended the commissioners of Parliament at the treaty of Uxbridge in 1644; was one of the Committee of Accommodation in 1645; attended the commissioners sent to the king at Newcastle for the accommodation of peace in 1646; attended the commissioners at the treaty of the Isle of Wight in 1647. He was a moderate and judicious Presbyterian under Cromwell's administration, and as an acknowledged chief was appointed one of the committee to draw up a catalogue of fundamental and basis of toleration, to be presented to the House of Commons in 1654, and became one of the Tryers. He died in November, 1655; and his remains were interred in Westminster Abbey, but were shamefully dug up at the Restoration.

Large numbers of his sermons on special occasions were published. The faults in method and style characteristic of the times, are models of eloquence and fervor. Among these we will mention, A Peace-Offering to God, Sept. 7, 1641; Reformation and Desolation, Dec. 22, 1641; Meres cursed, Feb. 23, 1641 (2); Song of Moses the Servant of God, and the Song of the Lamb, June 15, 1643; Sacred Panegyrics, 1644; Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants, 1644; Right Understanding of the Times, Dec. 30, 1646; Unity of the Saints with Christ the Head, April, 1652. The only systematic work he published was A Defence of Apostatizing against John Tombes, London, 1646, 4to, pp. 256. C. A. BRIGGS.

MARSHMAN, Joshua, one of the first Baptist missionaries and most distinguished missionaries to India; b. at Westbury Leigh, Wiltshire, Eng., April 20, 1708; d. in Serampore, India, Dec. 5, 1837. He had a scanty education, but early developed an insatiable thirst for reading. He was sent to the loom, and continued till his twenty-sixth year a weaver (his father's occupation). In 1729, having previously been married to Miss Hannah Shepherd, he took charge of a school in Bristol, where he found time to acquire a knowledge of the classic, Hebrew, and Syriac languages. Under Dr. Ryland's influence, he joined the Baptist Church, and in 1739, with Mr. Ward and two others, sailed for India. Not being permitted to disembark at Calcutta, they landed (Oct. 13) at Serampore, then under the Danish flag, but destined, by their labors and those of William Carey, to become the most prosperous and spiritual centre in the country. Here for nearly forty years he continued to labor in the pulpit and the school, and through the press, for the moral and intellectual elevation of the natives.

In 1800 Mr. and Mrs. Marshman opened two boarding-schools, the incomes of which were to be devoted to the support of the mission. At the close of these two years, their annual revenue amounted to one thousand pounds, and in 1811 to two thousand pounds, only a hundred pounds of which Mr. Marshman reserved for himself. He began preaching in Bengalee Oct. 1, 1800. His services in the department of education, construction, and in 1818 he issued, with Carey and Ward, the prospectus of a college for the "instruction of Asiatic, Christian, and other youth, in Eastern literature and European science," which was established and fostered amidst many discouragements. It was chiefly due to him that the Serampore missionaries undertook the publication of the first periodical work in Bengalee (the Dig-durpun), and on May 31, 1818, the first native newspaper (the Sumachur-Durpun, or "Mirror of News"). The same year, he began the monthly publication of the Friend of India in English (in 1820 changed to a quarterly). Mr. Marshman likewise contributed to the literature of the native tongues by the preparation of dictionaries of the Mahratta (1 vol., 1811) and Bengalee (3 vols.) languages. In 1806 he undertook the study of the Chinese, with the purpose of translating the Bible into that language. After fifteen years of labor, he published in 1822 a Chinese version of the New Testament. In 1814 he had published Clavis Sinica, or "Key to the Chinese Language."

In 1829 Mr. Marshman visited England. The relations of the Baptist Missionary Society and the Serampore Mission had been strained for many years; the former seeking to secure control of the missionary property, which the missionaries, who had won it by their self-denial, and contributed at least fifty thousand pounds to the mission, properly refused to relinquish. These circumstances deprived his visit of much of the pleasure he would otherwise have had; and he gladly returned in 1829 to India, but still pursued by the suspicious and attacks of the Missionary Society, which imbibed not only his own last years, but those of Carey and Ward. On June 9, 1834, his old associate William Carey died, and he was left the patriarch of the famous Serampore Mission. His health was completely broken up after that event, and his mental faculties partially failed. In his last hours he prayed in Bengalee, and confessed that his faith in the Saviour was gone. The former seeking to secure control of the missionary property, which the missionaries, who had won it by their self-denial, and contributed at least fifty thousand pounds to the mission, properly refused to relinquish. These circumstances deprived his visit of much of the pleasure he would otherwise have had; and he gladly returned in 1829 to India, but still pursued by the suspicious and attacks of the Missionary Society, which imbibed not only his own last years, but those of Carey and Ward. On June 9, 1834, his old associate William Carey died, and he was left the patriarch of the famous Serampore Mission. His health was completely broken up after that event, and his mental faculties partially failed. In his last hours he prayed in Bengalee, and confessed that his faith in the Saviour was gone...

Dr. Marshman stood in close relations with Lords Hastings, Bentinck, and other governors-general of India, whose sympathies and protection he secured for Serampore and its enterprises. Brown University conferred upon him in 1811, as it had previously done on Carey, the degree of D.D. One of his daughters, the wife of Gen. Havelock, died in 1882. See J. C. Marshman: Life and Times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward, 2 vols., London, 1859; and art. India.

MARSILIUS PATAVINUS, b. at Padua between 1270 and 1280; studied canon law and philosophy in his native city; and was rector of the university of Paris in 1312, which presupposes that he had taken a degree, and delivered lectures there. The latter part of his life he spent in Germany, at the court of Lewis the Bavarian, and there he died, probably in 1342. While in Paris he witnessed the contest between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair, and no doubt conversed with many, who, in that conflict between Church and State, sided with the king. When, then, in 1328, the contest broke out between John XXII. and Lewis the Bavarian, he himself appeared in the arena with his Defensor pacis,—a most audacious attack on the papal fabric, which just at that moment stood towering victorious in all its splendor and power. The work (which was first printed...
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at Basel, 1522, then at Frankfurt, 1592, and afterwards often] consists of three books. The first book develops the idea of the State; the second, the idea of the Church; and the third sums up the whole exposition in the form of theses. The polemical centre of the work lies in the second book, which, by a series of trenchant arguments, undermines the whole foundation on which the papal power is built up. The priest, the author says, has no secular power,—no power to enforce obedience. The administration of the Word and the sacraments is his only business. All power is spiritual, all his influence moral. All priests, he further says, are essentially equal in power and dignity. The New Testament knows no difference between a presbyter and a bishop, and no difference between Peter and the other apostles. The sole head of the Church is Christ, and the highest representation of this Church is the Ecumenical Council. The work was by the author presented to Lewis the Bavarian, and exercised a decisive influence on his policy; but his policy was not successful. Once more Marsilius stepped forward, opposing the Pope on occasion of the divorce of Margaretha of Tyrol from Johann Heinrich of Luxemburg, and her marriage with Lewis of Brandenburg, the son of the Emperor Lewis. He defended the emperor's right to dissolve her first marriage; while William Occam defended the legitimacy of her second marriage, in spite of her marriage; but his policy was not successful. While Marsilius was stepping forward, opposing the Pope on occasion of the divorce of Margaretha of Tyrol from Johann Heinrich of Luxemburg, and her marriage with Lewis of Brandenburg, the son of the Emperor Lewis. He defended the emperor's right to dissolve her first marriage, while William Occam defended the legitimacy of her second marriage, in spite of her marriage to Lewis the Bavarian, and exercised a decisive influence on his policy; but his policy was not successful. Once more Marsilius stepped forward, opposing the Pope on occasion of the divorce of Margaretha of Tyrol from Johann Heinrich of Luxemburg, and her marriage with Lewis of Brandenburg, the son of the Emperor Lewis. He defended the emperor's right to dissolve her first marriage, while William Occam defended the legitimacy of her second marriage, in spite of her marriage to Lewis the Bavarian, and exercised a decisive influence on his policy; but his policy was not successful.

MARTÈNE, Edmond, b. at St. Jean de Lone, in the diocese of Dijon, Dec. 22, 1634; d. at St. Germain-des-Prés, in Paris, June 20, 1739. In 1672 he entered the order of the Benedictines at Rheims, but was soon after removed to St. Germain-des-Prés, where he enjoyed the friendship and advice of D'Achery and Mabillon, and which continued his headquarters, though at various times he resided at Marmontier and in the monasteries of Vaucelles and of Mussy. He was ordained, in the beginning of June, 1690, in the diocese of Dijon, Dec. 22, 1654; d. at St. Germain-des-Prés, but was soon after removed to St. Germain-des-Prés, where he enjoyed the friendship and advice of D'Achery and Mabillon, and which continued his headquarters, though at various times he resided at Marmontier and in the monasteries of Vaucelles and of Mussy. He was ordained, in the beginning of June, 1690, and in order to support his claim on Greece, he put the Byzantine emperor, Michael Paleologus, under the ban, though he thereby brought all negotiations for a union between the eastern and western churches to a sudden end. But March 31, 1282, the Sicilian vesper took place. Charles not only lost his crown, but also his influence in Rome, where a "tribune" was elected in his stead; and it was only by the influence of Charles, that the Pope escaped from the storm which overtook his ally. See his biographies in Muratori.
MARTIN MARPRELATE

Rer. Ital. Script., iii. pars i.; Duchesne: Histoire de tous les cardinaux français (Paris, 1860), and Histoire de chancelliers de France (Paris, 1880).—Martin V. (Nov. 11, 1417-Feb. 20, 1441). Oddo Colonna was made a cardinal by Innocent VII., and charged by Alexander V. with the investigation of Étus's appeal. After the deposition of John XXIII., Gregory XII., and Benedict XIII., by the Council of Constance, he was unanimously elected Pope, and crowned in the Cathedral of Con-

MARTIN OF TOURS, Saint, b. at Sabaria, in Pannonia, 319; d. at Canadis, in Gaul, 400. His parents were Pagans; and by his father, a tribunus milietum, he was compelled to enter the army. But his inclination led him towards the Christian church and a life of asceticism and meditation; and, after a few years' service in Gaul, he gave up the military career, and was ordained a deacon by Hilary of Poitiers. On a visit to his home he converted his mother; but his zeal against the Arians roused peculiar regulations, by confining the actualy-called and opened in Paris in 1423, it was—by the appointment of a committee working discussion to certaingeneral points, by concluding particular concordats with each state, etc. His solemn promise to call a new council within five years he also evaded; for, though the council was actually called and opened in Paris in 1423, it was dissolved on May 29, 1429, without doing any thing. To the city of Rome, which he did not enter until September, 1420, he brought peace and order; and in his personal habits he was unpretentious and parsimonious. He was, however, not very scrupulous in his method of amassing wealth, and still less so in the way of using it. When he died, most of the great offices and beneficiaries of the church were in the possession of his relatives. His bulls are found in Mansi: Con. Coll., xxvii. Biographies of him were written by Crocco (Foligno, 1638), Cantelore (Rome, 1841), and in Muratori: Rer. Ital. Script., iii. pars ii. See arts. Benedict XIII., John Hus, and Council of Constance. R. Zöpfel.

MARTIN OF BRAGA or DUMIA (S. Martinus Bacaracensis seu Dumiensis). Of the life of this remarkable man, regulations, by confining the discussion to certain general points, by concluding particular concordats with each state, etc. His solemn promise to call a new council within five years he also evaded; for, though the council was actually called and opened in Paris in 1423, it was dissolved on May 29, 1429, without doing any thing. To the city of Rome, which he did not enter until September, 1420, he brought peace and order; and in his personal habits he was unpretentious and parsimonious. He was, however, not very scrupulous in his method of amassing wealth, and still less so in the way of using it. When he died, most of the great offices and beneficiaries of the church were in the possession of his relatives. His bulls are found in Mansi: Con. Coll., xxvii. Biographies of him were written by Crocco (Foligno, 1638), Cantelore (Rome, 1841), and in Muratori: Rer. Ital. Script., iii. pars ii. See arts. Benedict XIII., John Hus, and Council of Constance. R. Zöpfel.

MARTINEZ: Thes. anec. See also Achilles Dupuy: Geschichte des heiligen Martins, Schaffhausen: His-
MARTIN.
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Church was attacked. The tracts appeared between November, 1588, and July, 1590, under the manifest pseudonym of Martin Murprelate, Gentleman, and were printed secretly, and at the risk of life. Notwithstanding, or perhaps in consequence of, the mystery of their appearance, they obtained a wide circulation, and even raised a storm of opposition. Their author was a vigorous defender of the extremest independency. Dr. Dexter ascribes their authorship to Henry Barrowe, and their publication to John Penry. See his Congregationalism as seen in its Literature, Lec. iii. pp. 181-202.

MARTIN, Sarah, philanthropist, b. at Caister, near Great Yarmouth, June, 1791; d. at Great Yarmouth, Oct. 15, 1845. By trade a dressmaker, and destitute of the refinement, social position, and education of Mrs. Frye, she yet was able, almost unassisted, to do a great work among the pauper and criminal classes of Yarmouth. As early as 1810 her interest was excited by the prisoners there; but it was not until 1819 that she ventured to visit them, finally giving up one euern for their assistance upon discharge, taught them, and also those in the workhouse. In 1826 she fell heir to ten pounds yearly, whereupon she gave up dressmaking, and devoted her whole time to her philanthropic work. But she was compelled to live in great poverty. In 1841 the corporation of Yarmouth granted her an annuity of twelve pounds. See A Brief Sketch of the Life of the Late Miss Sarah Martin of Great Yarmouth... and her Private Journals (Yarmouth, 1844), Selections from the Poetical Remains of Miss S. M. (Yarmouth, 1845), and especially The Edinburgh Review for April, 1847 (pp. 320-340).

MARTINIA. See MARTINMAS.

MARTINUS, Matthias, b. at Freienhagen, in the countyship of Waldeck, 1572; d. at Kirchtimke, near Bremen, 1630. He studied theology at Herborn, under Piscator, and was appointed curate of Mr. Simeon at Cambridge; and July 17, 1623, which is still used. MALLET.

MARTINMAS, Festival of, Nov. 11, in honor of St. Martin of Tours. In Germany the festival is called Martinalia. Luther derives his first name from his being born on St. Martin's Day, "In England and Scotland the winter's provisions were in olden days cured and stored up at that time of the year, and were hence called a marti.

MARTYR, Henry, one of the most devout and noble missionaries in the annals of the Christian Church; b. at Truro, Eng., Feb. 18, 1781; d. atocat, Asiatic Turkey, Oct. 18, 1812. His father, who had once been a miner, rose to the high office of chief clerk in a store, and was able to send his son to the grammar-school, which he continued to attend till 1797, when he entered St. John's College, Cambridge. He developed a remarkable talent for mathematics, and in 1801 achieved the highest academical honor, that of senior wrangler. This high distinction failed to satisfy his mind; and with regret he wrote, "I obtained my highest wishes, but was surprised to find that I had grasped a shadow." In 1802 he was chosen fellow of St. John's College, taking the first prize in Latin prose composition. His college subsequently elected him twice public examiner. In 1802 Mr. Martyn formed the resolution of devoting his life to missionary labors. To this state of mind he had been brought, in part, by the perusal of the biography and diary of David Brainerd, with whose life his own had much in common. They both developed a fervid piety, devoted themselves with their whole soul to the work of missions, wrote diaries which are replete with the records of rich spiritual experiences, and died at an early age, leaving behind examples which have been a fruitful source of stimulus and encouragement to others. Mr. Martyn paid his devoted portion to the Society for Missions to Africa and the East; but, suffering from pecuniary losses which gave him some anxiety about the welfare of a sister, he ultimately went to India as a chaplain of the East India Company. He had served from 1806 as the curate of Mr. Simeon at Cambridge; and July 17, 1803, sailed for his new home, actuated purely by spiritual motives, and leaving behind him rare opportunities for establishing a reputation as a scholar, and securing a position of ease and comfort. The words of his diary of Sept. 28, written as the vessel was passing out of sight of Europe, indicate well the measure of his consecration: "We are just to the south of all Europe, and I bid adieu to it forever, without a wish of ever revisiting it, and still less with a desire of taking up my rest in the strange land to which I am going. Ah, no: farewell, perishing world! To me to live shall be Christ," etc.

On April 21, 1806, Mr. Martyn's "eyes were gratified with the sight of India." The impression made upon his mind by idolatry was very painful. "The sight of men and women all idolaters makes me shudder, as if in the dominion of hell." On another occasion he writes, of seeing natives bow before a hideous image: "I shivered as if standing, as it were, in the neighborhood of hell." He did not go to his station, Dinapore, till Sept. 13. In the mean time he remained at Calcutta. His tolerant Christian spirit was displayed in the cordial friendship which sprung up between himself and the Sarampo missionaries. In 1806 one of them, Mr. Carey, wrote, "A young clergyman, Mr. Martyn, is lately arrived, who is possessed of a truly missionary spirit. We take sweet counsel together, and go to the house of God as friends" (Marshman's Life of Carey, etc., i. p. 246). At another time, writing in regard to sending a Baptist missionary to Patna, he said, "Wherever Mr. Martyn is placed, he will save us the expense of a missionary" (i. p. 250).

Mr. Martyn's work in India was accomplished at the military stations of Dinapore and Cawnpore, and within the space of less than four years and a half. In addition to his labors among the
MARTYN.

In the urgency of his friends, Mr. Martyn asunder completed a Hindostanee version of the New Testament, which is said to be very idiomatic. At a part of the Book of Common Prayer into the New Testament, which is published by Assemani, Acta Martyrum Orientalium, B.D., London, 1819, and often since, e.g., 1881; J. B. WILBERFORCE: Journal and Letters of Henry Martyn, Lond., 1827, 2 vols.; C. D. BELL: Henry Martyn, New York, 1881. D. S. SCHAF.

MARTYN and CONFESSOR. The Greek word μαρτύρ and ματωτ denotes simply "a witness," and is often used in the New Testament (Acts xxii.20; Rev. ii. 13, xvii. 6). As, however, the conflict between Christianity and Paganism began, the mere profession of Christianity might expose a man to sacrifice his life, the word rapidly assumed that technical sense in which it is now generally used (Acts xxii. 20: Rev. ii. 13. xvii. 6). As, however, the conflict extended, and the State officially placed itself at the head of Paganism, the mere profession of Christianity might expose a man to the dangers of torture, banishment, etc.; and those who underwent such sufferings willingly and unhesitatingly, without retracting, or concealing, or prevaricating, were honored as "confessors." Both terms are of frequent occurrence in the writings of the early Fathers.

MARTYRS, The Forty, a title in the martyrologies, referring to those forty soldiers at Sebaste in Armenia, who in 320, during the reign of Licinius, were placed, by the order of Lysias the commander, naked, on a pond covered with ice, and kept there during the whole night, because, as Christians, they would not sacrifice to the gods. Their corpses were then burnt, and the ashes strewn on the waters. Basil of Cesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Gaudentius of Brescia, and Ephraim Syrus often mention the event in their homilies. See PETRUS DE NATALIBUS: Catalogus Sanct., Lyons, 1508; BARONIUS: Martyrologium Romanaum, Mayence, 1831; RUINART: Acta Martyrum, Amsterdam, 1713; GÖRRES: Licinius Christenverfolgung, 1875.

L. HELLER.

MARUTHAS, the famous Bishop of Tagrit in Mesopotamia. In 408 he journeyed to Constantinople to urge Arcadius to come to the rescue of the Christians persecuted by the Persian emperor Yazdegard, and again, in the year following, on behalf of his banished friend Chrysostom. Later on, Theodosius I. sent him to Yazdegard to urge the cessation of persecution, and an alliance with the Roman Empire. Maruthas made such an impression upon the Persian monarch, that the latter was almost converted. He is the reputed author of a history of the Persian martyrs, published by Assemani, Acta Martyrum, Rome, 1748, translated into German by Zingerle, Innsbruck, 1838.

E. NEVILLE.
MARY.  

MARY.  

MAPHIS, or MAPHIS, is the Greek form of the Hebrew Miriam, which occurs (Exod. xv. 20; Num. xii. 1; Mic. vi. 4) as the name of the poetess and prophetess, sister of Moses.

1. The mother of our Lord. She is not often spoken of in the Gospels; and the worship of which she afterwards became the subject has no foundation in the New Testament. She is first mentioned as the espoused of Joseph the carpenter, of the house of David (Luke i. 27). The real meaning of the words of her son (Luke ii. 40) she understands as little as Joseph. At Cana she tries to induce Jesus to show his power, and is severely rebuked (John ii. 1-12). In the face of the open disbeliefs of the brethren of Jesus, she remains passive; and his words of blame touch also her (Matt. xvi. 46-50; Mark iii. 31-35; Luke viii. 19-23). Deeply impressive, and genuinely moving, she appears when standing under the cross; and the words with which Jesus recommends her to John prove the tenderness he felt for her (John xix. 25-27). After the ascension, she moves in the circle of the apostles as one of the faithful (Acts i. 14). The question whether, after the birth of Jesus, she lived in a real marriage with Joseph, and bore children to him, must be answered in the affirmative; but he adds that the view itself has something repulsive to the pious feeling. The prototype of this wonder they found in the eastern gate of the temple, which, according to Ezek. xlv. 1-3, should remain closed forever, because Jehovah once passed through it (Ambrose: De institut. Virginis, c. 8, No. 52; Ep. ad Siricius, Nos. 4, 5; Jerome: Ado. Pataginius, ii. 4); and the miraculous process in the they explained by referring to the entrance of the risen Christ through the closed door into the room where the disciples were assembled (Gaudentius of Brescia: Sermo ix.; Gregorius the Great: Hom. in Evang., ii. 26).

These views were embodied in a series of apocryphal narratives intended to supplement the meagre information given by the Gospels concerning the infancy and youth of Christ. The most important of those narratives is the Prototypae Michaelis Jacobit, printed in Cod. Apocryph., New Testament, by Thilo (i. 159) and by Fabricius (i. 66). But though, in the Roman-Catholic Church, this whole literature of legends was condemned by the decrees of Gelasius, many of its details, nevertheless, crept into the tradition of the church, — such as the names of Joachim and Anne, the education of Mary in the temple, the marriage to conceal the mystery of the virginal condition of his humanity, and on his humanity depended the whole work of redemption. Next, the passion for asceticism, more especially for unmarried life (which, after the fourth century, spread rapidly in Christendom), found in Mary its type of virginity. Tertullian, without any qualification (De monogam., viii.), that it was a virgin, about to marry once for all after her delivery, who gave birth to Christ in order that each title of sanctity might be fulfilled in Christ's parents, by means of a mother who was both virgin and wife of one husband. Basil acknowledges (Hom. in Chr. Generationem, 5) that the literal sense of Matt. i. 25 is in favor of that view; but he adds that the view itself has something repulsive to the pious feeling. Epiphanius goes still farther (Her. 78), attacking, under the name of Antidioconarianites, those who maintained, that after the birth of Jesus, Mary lived in true wedlock with Joseph, and bore children to him; and Jerome designates (De perpetua virginitate Mariae) Helvidius, who held Antidioconarianite views, as a Heresitas, destroying the temple of the Holy Spirit; that is, the virginal womb of Mary. In opposition to such heretical notions, the marriage of Joseph and Mary was explained as a merely formal marriage, or as a marriage, but without the vi, and the birth of Jesus was considered either as chil-
every century. In one of his laws (Lib. I., Cod. tit. 27 de offic. dract. Afric., i. 1) Justinian prayed to her for the restoration of the Roman Empire. Nurses, the numeral, expected from her the designation of the right moment of making an attack (Evagrius: Hist. Eccl., iv. 24). In 608 Boniface IV. dedicated the Pantheon of Agrippa to Maria ad Martyres, and thus the Christian Olympus superseded the Pagan.

The iconoclastic controversies contributed still further to the spreading and consolidation of the worship of the Virgin. After the Council of Nicaea (787), images of her became very frequent in churches and houses, in the streets, and along the roads. Candles were lighted, and incense was burnt in front of them. Real portraits of her also existed. The most celebrated was that painted by St. Luke. Spain and Italy possessed several painted by angels. Some of them were black, according to Canticles 5: 5: most of them wrought miracles. In the eleventh century, more than one hundred monasteries, and a still greater number of cathedrals, were dedicated to her. Her relics were numberless, as were the miracles they wrought. One church possessed a skirt of hers; another, a drop of her milk; a third, a bit of her veil, etc. The emperor, Charles IV., had a whole museum of such relics. In 1784 the emperor, Joseph II., ordered all the hearts, hands, and feet of gold and silver, which had been presented on the altars of Mary as votive offerings, removed from the churches. But by a singular coincidence, which shows how close by each other light and darkness may be, in the very same year Alfonso da Liguori published at Venice his Le gloria di Maria, which probably goes farther than any other book on the subject in fantastical assertions and visionary fictions.

For the later development of Mariolatry, see the article on the IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

Of the festivals instituted in honor of the Virgin, the principal are,—Annunciatio, celebrated nine months before Christmas, on March 25, and first mentioned in the seventh century by Andreas Cretensis, which raises her above all other creatures, and brings her nearer to God. The enthusiasm of the preacher was shared by the poet and the artist. The minnesinger and the troubadour offered their homage; and the hymnologist sometimes went so far as to attribute the suspicion of travesty. (See Psalterium Mariae Magnae.) The painter generally represented her as a maiden between fifteen and twenty years old, and of ideal beauty. The statue gave her a crown, with twelve stars on her head. In the liturgy she won a prominent place. Saturday was consecrated to her, as Sunday was consecrated to Christ; and the twenty-fifth canon of the synod of Tours (1229) fixed a fine for every housefather or house-wifewho, on a Saturday eve, neglected to visit the church in honor of the Virgin. Towards the close of the eleventh century, more than one hundred monasteries, and a still greater number of cathedrals, were dedicated to her. Her relics were numberless, as were the miracles they wrought. One church possessed a skirt of hers; another, a drop of her milk; a third, a bit of her veil, etc. The emperor, Charles IV., had a whole museum of such relics. The most wonderful of all her relics was, of course, her House of Loreto. See art.

In Roman-Catholic countries the worship of the Virgin experienced only a passing disturbance from the Reformation. The Jesuits were immediately on hand; and they succeeded in imbuing that, like so many other medieval institutions, with new life. Salmeron, Ant. Possevin, and others taught that Mary was the mystical point of unity in the Scriptures; and it was even insinuated, that, in the composition of the New Testament, she had been more active than the Holy Spirit. In the practical sphere, the foundation of quite a number of new female orders in the honor of Mary—such as the Sorores Theatrani Conceptionis Immaculatae, Religiosa Annunciationis, Visitationis, Præsentationis, Septem Dolorum, etc. - gave evidence of a kind of revival of such greater influence was the liberal tendency, which, in the seventeenth century, arose within the pale of the Roman-Catholic Church itself. Adam Baillet, in his De la devotion a la Ste. Vierge (Paris, 1688), declared the doctrines of the church concerning Mary to be empty flattery, and demanded great limitations and modifications of her worship. Muratori, in his Esercizi spirituali (1723), admits that the worship of the Virgin may be useful, but asserts that it is not necessary. In 1784 the emperor, Joseph II., ordered all the hearts, hands, and feet of gold and silver, which had been presented on the altars of Mary as votive offerings, removed from the churches. But by a singular coincidence, which shows how close by each other light and darkness may be, in the very same year Alfonso da Liguori published at Venice his Le gloria di Maria, which probably goes farther than any other book on the subject in fantastical assertions and visionary fictions.
secured her unwavering allegiance and constant attendance. She followed him from place to place; was at his crucifixion (John xix. 25) and burial (Mark xv. 47); prepared spices, and came on Easter morning, with other female friends, to embalm his body (Mark xvi. 1); told Peter and John of the empty tomb, lingered after they had gone, and was honored with the first appearance of the risen Lord (John xx. 1-18). Mary of Magdala is mentioned fourteen times in the New Testament (Matt. xxvii. 56, 61, xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 1, 9; Luke viii. 2; xxiv. 10; John xxi. 25, xx. 1, 11, 16, 18). Cakl BUKGEK.

Testament (Matt. xxvii. 56, 61, xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 1, 9; Luke viii. 2; xxiv. 10; John xxi. 25, xx. 1, 11, 16, 18). MARY (TUDOR), Queen. See England, Church of.

Masada, an almost impregnable fortress on the western shore of the Dead Sea, south of Engedi, was built by Jonathan Maccabaeus, and much strengthened by Herod the Great. In the final struggle of the Jews against the Romans, it was taken by Flavius Silva; but the whole garrison, comprising about one thousand persons, including women and children, had killed themselves before the enemy entered. See the description by Josephus, in his Jewish War.

Masch, Andreas Gottlieb, D.D., court-preacher, and superintendent of the Stargard circuit; b. at Magdeburg, March 20, 1778; d. at Berlin, Oct. 26, 1807. He was a famous preacher, but particularly noteworthy as the author of two volumes in continuation of LeLong's Bibliotheca Sacra, Halle, 1778-90.

Mason, Erskine, D.D., youngest child of John M. Mason; b. in New-York City, April 16, 1805; d. there May 14, 1851. He was graduated at Dickinson College 1823, and Princeton Seminary 1824; entered the Presbyterian ministry, and was pastor in Schenectady from 1827 to 1830, and of the church at New-Berline, Oct. 5, 1724; d. at New-Berline, Oct. 26, 1807. He was a famous preacher, but particularly noteworthy as the author of two volumes in continuation of LeLong's Bibliotheca Sacra, Halle, 1778-90.

Mason, Francis, missionary to Burmah; b. in York, Eng., April 3, 1799; d. in Rangoon, Burmah, March 3, 1874. In 1818 he emigrated to the United States, and, going at once to Missouri, worked at the shoemaker's trade until 1824, when he went to Massachusetts. At Canton in that State he met, associated with the Baptist Church, studied at the Newton Theological Seminary, and in 1830 was dispatched by the Baptist Missionary Union to Burmah. He became the successor of Dr. Boardman in the work amongst the Karens. He edited for many years The Morning Star, a monthly periodical in the native language, and published a number of books for the Karens, the first of which was the Sayings of the Elders. Among his English works are a Life of Kho-Thah-Byu, the Karen Apostle (Boston), Memoir of Mrs. H. M. Mason (New York, 1847); Burmah, its People and Natural Productions (ed., Rangoon, 1860), and an autobiography, The Story of a Working-Man's Life, with Sketches of Travel (New York, 1870). He received the degree of D.D. from Brown University.

Mason, John, b. at Dunmow, Essex, 1706; d. at Cheshunt, Hertfordshire, 1768, where he had been pastor since 1756. He is widely known (formerly much better than now) as the author of Self-Knowledge, a Treatise, London, 1754, very often reprinted in England and America; edited, with Life, by John Mason Good, London, 1811. It has been styled "the best manual of practical Christianity;" but is "somewhat sparing of evangelical peculiarities."

Mason, John Mitchell, D.D., b. in New-York City, March 19, 1770; d. there Sunday, Dec. 26, 1826. He was graduated at Columbia College, New York, 1789; until 1791 studied theology with his father, a minister of the Associate Reformed Church, but in the latter year went, for further study, to Edinburgh. His father died the next year, and he returned home; was licensed by the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Pennsylvania, Oct. 18, 1792; supplied the pulpit of his father's church for some five months, when, by unanimous wish of the congregation, he became their pastor, April, 1793. He soon took a prominent place in his denomination, particularly by his earnest Letters on Frequent Communion (1793), directed against the Scotch custom of communing only once or twice a year. In 1801 he was sent to Great Britain and Ireland by the synod to procure additional ministers. But the manifest advantage of a departure from the plan of a foreign educated ministry led to the appointment, in 1802, of a committee of two, of which Dr. Mason was one, to draught a plan for a theological seminary. In 1804 they rendered their report, and Dr. Mason was unanimously appointed the professor. In 1805 he received the degree of D.D. from the University of Pennsylvania. In May, 1805, the plan was matured; and the seminary opened in November, with eight students. The Bible itself, in the original, rather than any body of divinity, was intended to be the text-book of the institution. The course extended over four years. Dr. Mason was "its life and animating principle." It had originated with him as early as 1796, and it was his darling project through life. "Dr. Mason's Seminary," as the institution was usually called, was the earliest American seminary. In 1807 he began the editorship of The Christian's Magazine, and wrote nearly the whole of each number. The contents were mainly polemical, directed against Bishop Hobart's claims for episcopacy. The Magazine was dedicated to the defence of Presbyterian doctrines and polity, but was only maintained a few years. In 1809 Rev. James M. Mathews was appointed assistant professor in the seminary, and served until 1818. On March 12, 1810, Dr. Mason called a meeting of his congregation, and announced his firm intention to resign. The reasons he assigned were the impossibility of his maintaining his outside duties among them, owing to the multiplicity of his outside duties, especially the seminary, and their unwillingness both to provide him an assistant and to build a new church. On May 26 the presbytery released him from his charge; but, with a part of the congregation, he began a new
chapel. While they were seeking a temporary church home, prior to building this new church in Murray Street, which was finished in 1812, they were in the habit of meeting in the Cedar-street Presbyterian Church (Dr. Romeyn's), and thus led to unite at communion. This action was looked upon with great disfavor by some in the Associated Presbyterian Church of New York (Dr. Romeyn's), and thus was treated with the utmost contempt. His ecclesiastical relation to the Presbyterian church was in devotion to her interests. As a teacher, he was particularly successful in impressing the students with the necessity of familiarity with the word of God in the original, and in accustoming them to think for themselves. It is, however, as a preacher, that he is best remembered. He stood forth pre-eminent in America. On occasion, he rose to an extraordinary height, as in the two famous sermons, Messiah's Throne (preached in London, 1802, before the London Missionary Society) and Living Faith (in Edinburgh, the same year, before the Society for Relief of the Destitute). He preached extempore, out of a full mind and loving heart, with a great flow of apposite expressions, tones, and gestures at once the most significant and the most becoming. His imagination was both powerful and vivid, but under the control of a sound judgment and good taste. He possessed originality and power. Notwithstanding his denominational restrictions, and lack of means, he inaugurated a system of ministerial education which has since been extensively followed. He thus rid his denomination of dependences upon foreign-instructed ministers. But he also led his brethren to broader views in respect to communion and fellowship. He was associated with every good scheme; e.g., he was one of the earliest and ablest advocates of foreign missions and of the American Bible Society. Even in church architecture he showed the originality in designing a pulpit, which, although ridiculed when proposed, has been accepted substantially ever since. Besides the books already mentioned in the course of this article, a number of sermons, etc., were collected and published by his son, Rev. Ebenezer Mason, New York, 1849. His Life was written by his son-in-law, Rev. J. Van Vechten, New York, 1856.

MASS, Lowell, b. in Medfield, Mass., Jan. 8, 1792; d. in Orange, N.J., Aug. 11, 1872. He began to give public musical instruction in Savannah, Ga.; but in 1827 he removed to Boston, Mass., whence he ultimately went through all New England, bent upon exciting popular taste for music. By his instrumentality the Boston Academy of Music was established, and an enormous impetus given to musical education. He early (1828) became an advocate of what is called the Pestalozzian method of teaching music. In 1837 he visited Europe for purposes of study. But while he did much to increase the love for music by the organization of choirs, and also by fostering congregational singing, he did little to advance the art, or to raise the popular standard. His collections, from his first (Handel and Haydn Collection of Church Music, Boston, 1821) to his last (The Song Garden, 1866), number more than forty. In the line of church and Sunday-school music he did more than any one of his day. In 1855 the University of New York made him a "doctor in music," the first degree of the kind given in the United States. His musical library has passed into the possession of Yale Seminary.

MASORAH. See Massora.

MASS, The (the designation of the Lord's Supper, as understood and practised in the Roman-Catholic Church), has the significance not only of a sacrament, but of a sacrifice which the priest offers for the living and the dead, in which the atoning sacrifice of Christ on Calvary is daily repeated.

1. HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE.—Jesus nowhere declared the Israelites who believed on him from the sacrificial ritual of Moses. His words in Matt. v. 29 rather presuppose their participation therein. But when he places mercy above sacrifice (Matt. ix. 18, xii. 7), declares love to be the highest commandment, and proclaims a worship of God in spirit and in truth, apart from Jerusalem (John iv. 21-24); and when, finally, the apostles testify that Christ was the true sacrifice (1 Cor. v. 7; Eph. v. 2; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; Rev. v. 6, etc.), given for the sins of the world,—we have the premises from which the abrogation of the Mosaic ritual of necessity follows. The Epistle to the Hebrews carries out this argument in detail, and shows that the offering of Christ as the eternal High Priest was made once for all, and need not to be repeated.

On the other hand, the apostles were far from discarding the idea of spiritual sacrifice from religion. This idea was included in the priesthood of all believers (Exod. xix. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9). In this sense the Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 15, 18) calls the praise of the Lord, and doing good, sacrifices. And likewise Paul (Rom. xii. 1) calls the sanctification of the body, and the gift he had received from the Philosophians...
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even after they were separated, the members of the congregation brought offerings of bread and were connected with the communion; and to these, "oblations" (oblationes) and "sacrifices" (sacri-wine, wnicTi were used, not only at the commun-reliefof the poor. These gifts, which were called
ion, but in the support of the clergv and for the
prayers (ii.25, 11), were offered by the bishop
In the apostolic age the agapce, or "love-feasts,"
spiritualpriesthood can offer them up acceptably
act (Iren. iv. 18. 3) ; and the difference between
system, and regarded as the true sacrificesa heart
consecrated to God, faith, obedience, righteous-
ness (Iren., iv. 17,4), and prayer; and only the
spiritual priesthood can offer them up acceptably
to God.

It was in this sense that the idea of sacrifice
was at first associated with the Lord's Supper.
In the apostolic age the agaper, or "love-feasts,"
were connected with the communion; and to these,
even after they were separated, the members of
the congregation brought offerings of bread and
wine, which were used, not only at the communion,
but in the support of the clergy and for the
relief of the poor. These gifts, which were called
"oblations" (oblationes) and "sacrifices" (sacri-

motic sacrificial ordinances only a temporary
spiritual sacrificeas correlativenotions, and treated the
worship of God. The old sacrifices were for the most part, con
prominent than the sacrificial; while Theodoret
sacrificialnotion. Gregory the Great (Horn, in
Evang. 37, Dial. iv. 57). Masses were offered
for the dead; and Augustine (Serm., 172, 2) hoped
that God would deal wit the sins merited.
Gregory, by his doctrine of purgatory, established a final warrant for this custom,
and taught that the dead were helped out of pur-
gatory by the prayers, and especially the masses,
of the living. He even knew a monk who was
so delivered by thirty masses (Dial. iv. 65);
whence the so-called trigesima.

The celebration of the Lord's Supper, which
in the early church was, for the most part, con-
stituted as a confraternization of the martyrs, at a later period was repeated every
day, and, after the time of Leo the Great (Ep.
ix. 2, etc.), was repeated several times on the same
day. In the eighth and ninth centuries, when
the number of chapels was greatly increased, the
priest often found himself without a congregation
at the time of the celebration. Hence arose pri-
ivate masses, against which Theodulf of Orleans,
in his Capitulary of 797 (c. 7), and the synoda of
Mainz (813, c. 43) and Paris (829, c. 48), pro-
tested, but which Wallafried Strabo (d. 849)
advocated. In this disjunction of the eucharistic
celebration from the congregational communion
was involved the idea of a priestly sacrifice; that
is, an act independent of the sacrament. But this
isolation of the sacrificial notion did not gain
full currency till the thirteenth century; Robert
Puleyn (d. about 1180), in his Sentences, treating
of the Lord's Supper as a sacrament, and Peter
Lombard (d. 1160) himself not going beyond the
figurative significance. The latter says (Sentent.
lib. iv. dist. 12, G.). That which is consecrated
by the priest is a sacrifice (sacrificium et oblatio),
because it is a memorial and representation of
the true sacrifice on the cross (memoria et repre-
sentatio veri sacrificii et sanctae immolationis factae
in cruce).

The beginning of the thirteenth century marks
a new epoch in the history of the doctrine of the
Eucharist. The doctrine of transubstantiation
was fixed in 1215; and, in proportion as the ser-
mon was neglected, the sacrificial functions of the
priesthood were emphasized. Thomas of Aquinas
said openly that the priest, like Christ, was the
mediator between God and man; and even
Chrysostom makes the sacramental meaning more
prominent than the sacrificial; while Theodoret
declares the Lord's Supper to have only a com-
memorative significance. On the other hand, the
Latin Church laid an increasing emphasis on the
sacrificial notion. Gregory the Great (Hom. in
Evang. 37, Dial. iv. 56) saw a victim (victimam)
on the altar, through which the sufferings and
death of Christ are repeated: Christ is now sac-
ificed (immolatus).

The effects of the communion were regarded
as expiatory, but at first only for venial sins; for
mortal sins were to be expiated by penance. But
it conferred blessings in every relation of life.
In the Gregorian Sacramentarium there are masses
against drought and too much rain, storms, sick-
ness, etc. Its effects were magical. According
to Gregory, a prisoner's chains had been loosed
as often as his wife prayed for his soul; and a
ghostly appearance offered a shipwrecked sailor
bread at the moment that a bishop who thought
him drowned offered a mass for his soul (Hom.
in Evang. 37, Dial. iv. 57). Masses were offered
for the dead; and Augustine (Serm., 172, 2) hoped
that God would deal with the sins merited.
Gregory, by his doctrine of purgatory, established a final warrant for this custom,
and taught that the dead were helped out of pur-
gatory by the prayers, and especially the masses,
of the living. He even knew a monk who was
so delivered by thirty masses (Dial. iv. 65);
whence the so-called trigesima.

The celebration of the Lord's Supper, which
in the early church was, for the most part, con-
fined to the Lord's Day and the anniversaries of
the martyrs, at a later period was repeated every
day, and, after the time of Leo the Great (Ep.
ix. 2, etc.), was repeated several times on the same
day. In the eighth and ninth centuries, when
the number of chapels was greatly increased, the
priest often found himself without a congregation
at the time of the celebration. Hence arose pri-
ivate masses, against which Theodulf of Orleans,
in his Capitulary of 797 (c. 7), and the synods of
Mainz (813, c. 43) and Paris (829, c. 48), pro-
tested, but which Wallafried Strabo (d. 849)
advocated. In this disjunction of the eucharistic
celebration from the congregational communion
was involved the idea of a priestly sacrifice; that
is, an act independent of the sacrament. But this
isolation of the sacrificial notion did not gain
full currency till the thirteenth century; Robert
Puleyn (d. about 1180), in his Sentences, treating
of the Lord's Supper as a sacrament, and Peter
Lombard (d. 1160) himself not going beyond the
figurative significance. The latter says (Sentent.
lib. iv. dist. 12, G.). That which is consecrated
by the priest is a sacrifice (sacrificium et oblatio),
because it is a memorial and representation of
the true sacrifice on the cross (memoria et repre-
sentatio veri sacrificii et sanctae immolationis factae
in cruce).

The beginning of the thirteenth century marks
a new epoch in the history of the doctrine of the
Eucharist. The doctrine of transubstantiation
was fixed in 1215; and, in proportion as the ser-
mon was neglected, the sacrificial functions of the
priesthood were emphasized. Thomas of Aquinas
said openly that the priest, like Christ, was the
mediator between God and man; and even
Chrysostom makes the sacramental meaning more
prominent than the sacrificial; while Theodoret
believers, but in the consecration of the elements (perfectio hujus sacramenti non est in use fidelium sed in consecratione materie, Summa iii. qu. 80, art. 12). The real founders of the doctrine of the Mass were Thomas, and Albert the Great. The former makes a sharp distinction for the first time between sacrifice and sacrament. The participation of the sacrament effects for the believer what the sufferings of Christ had accomplished for humanity as a whole, and consumes venial sins. The Mass, however, regarded as a sacrifice, is propitiatory, and removes even mortal sins. The benefits of the Mass are not confined to the participants, but extend ex ope operato to the absent, among whom the dead are included. Albert the Great said the Mass was not merely a representation, but a true imolation by the hands of the priest (Comm. in 4 Sent. dist. 13, art. 23).

In the Greek Church private masses have not been introduced; no church has more than one altar; and the Mass is celebrated only on Sundays and festivals, and is not repeated.

II. THE TRIDENTINE DEFINITION. — The Council of Trent gave the doctrine of the Mass its final form on Sept. 17, 1562, at its twenty-second sitting, and defined it as at once a sacrament which is received as a sacrifice which is offered. The keenest interpreter of this definition has been Bellarmin. He appealed for its confirmation (1) to Christ's eternal priesthood (Heb. vii. 11), which implies that his sacrifice was to continue to all times; (2) to the prophecy of a pure sacrifice to the heavenly sanctuary (Heb. ix. 28), for they are spoken only in the Mass; and (3) to the meaning of "This do (facere) in remembrance of me," as meaning sacrifice both in the Latin and Hebrew usage, etc. With such arguments he seeks to prove that in the Mass a real sacrifice is offered up.

This doctrine of the Mass follows legitimately from the doctrine of transubstantiation; and, if the body of Christ is truly offered up in the Eucharist, it follows that it is the same as the body offered on the cross, except that in the one case it is bloodless. Thus in the Mass has also a propitiatory power in effecting the forgiveness of sins, and preserving from the commission of mortal sins. It is also useful for all the perplexities and difficulties of life.

In the Tridentine Decrees the idea of sacrifice, in the Mass is brought out in all its baldness; and that which alone is indispensable to its efficacy is not the participation of communicants, but the act of consecration by the priest interceding for the living and the dead. We mention also the practice, which the council confirmed, of mixing the wine with water as a representation of the union of the church with its head, and before its consecration. The act is the sole act of the celebrating priest, who, for that reason, utters the larger number of the prayers in an undertone; for he is acting for the church, but speaking only to God. The words of consecration are likewise uttered in an undertone; for they are spoken only to the elements, and to change them into Christ's body and blood. Thus in the Mass the central idea of propitiatoryism is involved; and namely, the mediatorial and propitiatory functions of the church, which believes that the incarnation and sacrifice of Christ are repeated every day.

Against this doctrine, Protestantism sharply protested; but it lost nothing thereby, for the atoning death of Christ on Calvary, and his high priestly intercession, effect all that the Mass pretends to offer. It secures their blessings by prayer, the proclamation of the Word, and the communion. The immediate effects of the Mass, on the other hand, are inconsistent with God's Word, and are absolutely unattainable.

III. THE CELEBRATION. — In the apostolic age the celebration of the Lord's Supper consisted in teaching, breaking of bread, and prayer (Acts ii. 42), and singing (Eph. v. 19). At a later period Justin (Ap. maj., 65, 67) describes the public services thus: "On Sunday the Scriptures are read, followed by a homily and prayer. After the fraternal kiss, bread and a mixture of wine and water are taken from the gifts of the congregation, the leader offers a prayer of thanksgiving and consecration (εὐλογία), the congregation responds with an amen, and then follows the distribution; the elements being carried to the houses of those who are absent."

Under the influence of the disciplina arcaea the didactic and sacramental portions of the service were distinguished,—the former part called the Missa catchemenorum; the latter, Missa fidelium. The service was closed by the deacon, with the word ἀνάστησις, or ict, missa est (ecclesia, "Depart, for service is dismissed"). A third period in the development is marked by a change of the earlier part of the service into a mere preparatory service.

Gregory the Great established the liturgy of the Latin Church. Notwithstanding this, however, many distinct books for the Mass were prepared during the middle ages. The Tridentine Council appointed a commission to prepare a new book for universal use; but, failing to act, a commission appointed by Pius V. prepared one on the basis of the Gregorian. It was promulgated July 14, 1570, but was revised by Clement VIII. and Urban VIII.; and by the appointment of Sixtus V., 1587, a congregation of rites, whose duty it was to watch over the purity of the ritual, still exists.

The Mass falls into two main parts, the first being a preparatory celebration (introitus, graduale); the second, the sacramental (offertorium, canon missae), followed by the post-comunione. Each of these five services is introduced by the words of the priest, "The Lord be with you," and the response of the congregation, "And with thy spirit;" which proves that the early idea included the presence of a congregation. It was at the celebration of the offertorium, that, in the ancient church, the gifts were offered; and a relic of this practice still exists in the Ambrosian ritual of the church in Milan, where, on festival occasions, two old men and two matrons take up vessels of wine and bread to the ministering priest at the altar. It was also the custom to sing psalms while the gifts were being offered; but in the middle ages this practice was likewise abandoned, and a single verse of a psalm substituted, and five priestly prayers, which bear the name of the offertorium; and namely, the mediatorial and propitiatory functions of the church, which believes that the incarnation and sacrifice of Christ are repeated every day.
which "I offer thee for my innumerable sins, and for all circumspect [sins], and for all faithless Christians, both the living and the dead," etc. The second is offered at the mixing of the water and wine. The third asks that the sacrifice being consummated may be well pleasing in God's sight. In the fourth and fifth the priest asks the Sanctification of the blood, and the Church of the altar. The last, the fourth part of the service, or the canon missae, occur the words "This is my body," after uttering which the priest bows his knees, and prays to the Christ, who is present in the host, and then shows it to the congregation, that it may do the same. He then places it on the corporale, and again kneels before it. He does the same with the cup; and the whole process is called "the elevation and adoration of the host." In 1203 Cardinal Guido, papal legate in Cologne, ordained, that when the host was elevated, the congregation should fall on its knees at the ringing of a bell, and remain kneeling until the consecration of the cup. Honorius III. in 1217 raised this enactment to the dignity of a permanent and universal obligation. This portion of the service is concluded by the celebrant raising the host over the mouth of the chalice, and allowing a piece to fall into the cup, thus signifying both Christ's suffering and the reunion of his soul and body, and communicating himself, with the words, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ keep my soul unto eternal life," and dispensing the bread to the communicants, if any are present. The fifth part of the service, called the post-communio, consists of prayers, responses, and the reading of John i.1-14. All these various services are prescribed in the Book of the Mass or missal.

A distinction is made between public and private, sung or spoken, most solemn, solemn, and less solemn masses. Practically the public mass is both a solemn and sung mass. Private masses are those said at side-altars. The public and solemn mass is said in all churches on Sundays and festivals, and every day in cathedrals. Masses are also distinguished into Missa de tempore, celebrated on the usual Sundays, Christmas, and other festivals; De sanctis, on saints' days: Votivie, on the place of prayer, and meditation upon the Word, in the Protestant, and binds the people indissolubly to the priest, without whom the principal part of her worship cannot be performed. A mysterious and pompous ritual is connected with its celebration; and Roman-Catholic theologians refer to the contrast which the beauty of this worship presents to the baldness of the Protestant service, with a sermon and a few hymns. The service is in Latin; and not only have Protestants denounced this, but even some Roman Catholics have regretted it. Eugène of Wurttemberg in 1786, with the permission of Pius VI., introduced the German Mass into his chapel; and in 1806 the diocese of Constance began the use of the German tongue. But in neither case did the custom last long.

**MASS.**

**MASSILLON.**
ness and virtue. D'Alembert pronounced his eulogy in the French Academy.

In his Essai sur l'éloquence de la Chaire, ascribes the decline of French public eloquence to the influence of Massillon. But this decline had begun before his time, and was due to the growing corruption of morals and taste. Massillon was the last great pulpit orator of France. In some respects he stands higher than Bossuet. With him, in its full sense, eloquence was a virtue, an earnest effort to lead men to peace in God. He was more simple and sympathetic than the brilliant and courtly Bossuet, and more sincere and warm-hearted than Bourdaloue (who was the more opulent of thought), and therefore more edifying than both. The purity and unadorned beauty of his style were unsurpassed. He was acquainted with the secret movements of the heart, and made his appeals to it. [His memory was unreliable; but he committed his sermons, calling those the best which were memorized the most accurately.]


C. SCHMIDT.

MASSINGBERD, Francis Charles, b. in Lincolnshire, 1800; d. at South Ormsby, Lincolnshire, December, 1872. He was graduated at Magdalen College, Oxford, 1822; took orders in the Church of England, and became rector of South Ormsby 1825; in 1847 prebendary of Lincoln, and in 1862 chancellor of the cathedral. He distinguished himself by his efforts to revive the powers of convocation. He wrote, besides many pamphlets, History of the English Reformation, London, 1852, 3d ed., 1857; Law of the Church and State, 1837; Lectures on the Prayer-Book, 1894.

The most important Massoretic manual is the Okeah ve-Okeah, so called from the first two words with which it begins [comp. Pic, Okeah ve-Okeah, in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia, s.v.]. From that period the most important period of the study of the Massora had been in flourish condition for a long time. Here lived the famous Massorete, Aaron ben-Moses ben-Asher, commonly called Ben-Asher, in the beginning of the tenth century, who finally fixed the so-called Massoretic text. Those who came after him, and paid special attention to the text, are called "Nag-danim."

The most important Massoretic manual is the Okeah ve-Okeah, so called from the first two words with which it begins [comp. Pic, Okeah ve-Okeah, in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia, s.v.]. From that period the most important period of the study of the Massora had been in flourishing condition for a long time. Here lived the famous Massorete, Aaron ben-Moses ben-Asher, commonly called Ben-Asher, in the beginning of the tenth century, who finally fixed the so-called Massoretic text. Those who came after him, and paid special attention to the text, are called "Nag-danim."

The Massora is divided into the Massora magna and Massora parva. In the Rabbinic Bibles, where the Chaldee is printed side by side with the Hebrew, the Massora parva occupies the empty space between these two columns and that of the outer margin. Above and below the text, the Massora magna is given. At the end of the fourth volume the Massora finalis (which must be distinguished from the Massora marginalis, and which is a kind of Massoretic lexicon alphabetically arranged) is given. The Massora finalis is followed by a list giving the differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, and those of the Western and Eastern Jews. The Eastern Massora differs from the Western not only with re-
spect to vowels and accents, but also in the system of punctuation (cf. Strack: Prophetarum posteriorum codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus, Petersburg, 1876, p. vii.).


MASS-PRIESTS were anciently secular priests, as distinguished from regulars; afterwards priests kept in chaptries (i.e., chapels endowed by wealthy persons, in which masses were said for the souls of the donors), or at particular altars, to say mass for the name sake.

Massuet, René, b. 1665, at St. Ouen in Normandy; d. in Paris, Jan. 11, 1716. He entered the congregation of St. Maur in 1682, and made his literary début in the controversy with the Jesuits concerning the edition of Augustine which the congregation had published. In 1689 he answered Langlois' anonymous attacks by his Lettre d'un Ecclesiastique, etc., also anonymous. In 1703 he settled at St. Germain-des-Pres in Paris, the principal centre of Benedictine learning; and in 1710 he published his edition of Irenaeus, his chief work. After the death of Ruinart, he continued the Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, and published in 1718 the fifth volume. Five interesting letters from him to Berth. Pez are found in J. G. Schellhorn's Analectes Literarie, xiii. 286–310. See Tasini: Hist. litür. de la congrégation de St. Maur, Paris, 1750–65.

G. Laubmann.

Matamoros, Manuel, a devoted Spanish Protestant, whose imprisonment, personality, and early death aroused an interest in Holland, Switzerland, and Southern Germany, in the evangelization of Spain; b. Oct. 8, 1839, at Lepe in the Province of Huelva; d. at Lausanne, July 31, 1866. His father was a captain in the Spanish artillery, and at his wish he entered in 1850 the military school at Toledo. But, conceiving a dislike for a military life, he was sent to Malaga, where his mother, then a widow, was residing. On a visit to Gibraltar he casually attended a service held by Francisco de Paula Ruet, who had been brought to a knowledge of the gospel by the sermons of Luigi de Sanctis in Turin, and had been banished from Spain for preaching the gospel in Barcelona. The sermon made an indelible impression upon his mind; and he bought a New Testament, which opened his eyes to the errors of the Roman Church. Through Ruet, Matamoros came into relations with a committee in Edinburgh, and, later, with one in Paris, which prosecuted the evangelization of Spain. He went, under commission of the latter, to Granada, Seville, and Barcelona (1860). At Granada he became acquainted with Alhama, a hat-maker, who had been converted through the instrumentality of an American tract, and was preaching the gospel. Thrown into prison, on his person from Matamoros, Marin, Carrasco, and Gonzalez, all of whom were likewise thrown into prison. Matamoros laid there two years, awaiting trial, and contracted the disease (consumption) which caused his death.

Through the influence of a deputation of the Evangelical Alliance he was released (May 28, 1868), and condemned to nine years' labor in the galleys, which was afterwards changed to nine years of banishment. Matamoros then made a visit to England, where he was cordially welcomed, and afterwards went to Lausanne, where he attended the theological seminary. On a visit to Pau in Southern France, in the interest of his health, he established, through the liberality of an American lady, a Spanish school. Returning to Lausanne, he died just a few days before the time set for his ordination, and two years before his country was opened to Protestant missions (1868). In his last days he exhibited an undiminished interest in the evangelization of Spain; and his rich spiritual experiences have been to this day an incentive to the Swiss to aid in that work. His name will not be forgotten.

F. Fliekerer (Madrid).

Mater Dolorosa (the mourning mother), a term denoting a certain class of pictures of the Virgin Mary, which represent her alone, without the child, generally as a middle-aged woman, weeping and mourning. See Mrs. Jameson: Legends of the Madonna, London, 1852.

Materialism, as its name indicates, is the theory which seeks to trace all things in nature to matter as their sole and ultimate source; or, in other words, the theory which professes to explain the universe in terms of matter. This definition may appear clear and precise. The thing defined is, however, essentially obscure and vague, owing to the number and diversity of the conceptions formed as to the nature of matter. Materialism never answers strictly to its name, because it always attributes to matter properties which have not been proved to belong to it. Instead of being a single system, which advances from stage to stage by a self-consistent development, it comprises a crowd of heterogeneous and discordant hypotheses. The ruder tribes of men are unable to conceive either of mere matter or of mere spirit; and hence their religious beliefs are, to a large extent, materialistic. Anti-religious materialism makes its appearance only when thought has become speculative and sceptical. Such materialism was propagated in ancient China by Yang Choo (about B.C. 300), and in ancient India in the Charvakas system. Materialism, in a form entitled to be called philosophical, was originated by the Greek thinker Leucippus and Democritus, developed and popularized by Epicurus, and "wedded to immortal verse" by the Latin poet Lucretius. All things, according to their theory, were explicable by the "empty" and "the full," — the limitless and immesurable void of space and numberless atoms which are ungenerated, infrangible, unchangeable, and
INDESTRUCTIBLE, which possess no merely qualitative differences, but vary quantitatively in form, magnitude, and density. The general neglect of physical science, and the general acceptance of Christianity, secured the rejection of materialism during the middle ages. In the period of transition from medieval to modern times it began to re-appear. Gassendi gave it currency in France, and Hobbes in England. The so-called "materialism" of C. W. Goddard, H. Hartley, and Priestley, denied the spirituality of the soul, but not the existence of God. La Mettrie and Von Holbach first advocated the atheistical materialism which has since become so common. This form of materialism has never had more advocates than at present. The causes of its prevalence are as such, as the still operative influence of the thought of the eighteenth century, reaction from the excessive idealism of the transcendental philosophies, political and social disaffection, the spread of rationalism and of unbelief in the supernatural, the predominance of material interests, and the rapid progress of physical science, especially unfolded by the microscopic, and gradually engrossing attention, to the comparative neglect of mental and spiritual truth, and also largely engendering undue confidence in a particular class of hypotheses. The materialism of the present day claims to be distinctly scientific; and, of course, it largely incorporates, and freely applies, modern scientific theories. As to its primary principles or assumptions, however, it has no more title to be deemed scientific than the materialism of earlier times. In fact, contemporary materialism shows a manifest tendency to represent matter as essentially endowed with qualitative differences, and even with spontaneity, life, intelligence, "mind-stuff," "soul-organs," etc., which is surely a tendency, not towards science, but towards feticism.

Mr. Herbert Spencer, Professors Huxley and Tyndall, and some other authors, while tracing back all life, intelligence, and history, to matter or to physical force, object to being classed as materialists, on the ground that they acknowledge that matter in its ultimate nature is unknown, and can no more be conceived of, except in terms of mind, than mind can be conceived of otherwise than in terms of matter. Were the objection admissible, we must equally cease to speak of Democritus and Epicurus, Hobbes and Von Holbach, as materialists, seeing that they as fully recognized the truth on which it is rested. It is, however, quite inadmissible. Whoever holds that matter, or material force, is eternal, and originates all mind and mental force, is a materialist.

Materialism claims to be the most rational and philosophical theory of the universe on the following grounds. First, that it best satisfies the legitimate demands of the reason for unity. It professes to be the only self-consistent and adequate system of monism,—the only philosophy which seeks to explain all things, from the lower by the higher; and to co-ordinate with matter, every atom must be dual, and, if the cause of matter, materialism must be abandoned; that it is the reverse of scientific to assume without proof that matter and force are eternal, and explain everything; that it is a violation of the law of causality to account for the lower by the higher; and that all thought is seldom figurative or pictorial thought.

Materialism involves the affirmation that matter is eternal, but it has as yet entirely failed to produce any good reasons for the opinion. The conditions of atoms and elements of matter strongly favor the contrary view. The relationship of matter to force presents difficulties which materialism has likewise failed to overcome. Force cannot be accounted for by aggregation, or self-determination, of matter, and thus shown to be an effect; yet to represent it as co-ordinate with matter is to fall into the dualism which materialism professes to despise; and to suppose it the cause of matter involves the surrender of materialism. Life must be shown to be either a property or an effect of matter, before materialism is entitled to be accepted. It has certainly not been shown to be either the one or the other. The attempts of M. Pouchet, Dr. Bastian, etc., to prove experimentally the hypothesis of spontaneous generation, have utterly failed. Materialism finds it still more difficult to explain life than force, there being a greater likeness between mental and physical facts than between vital and mechanical facts. Matter, in its transformations, never loses properties which mind never possesses in any of its phases. Molecular changes in the nerves and brain not only have not been shown ever to pass into mental states, but cannot even be conceived to do so. Such facts as the unity of consciousness, the consciousness of personal identity, self-consciousness, self-activity, and the moral sentiments, cannot be resolved into states of matter. The universe as a system of cause and order presupposes a Supreme Intelligence. On these and other grounds it may be held that materialism is far from a satisfactory doctrine.

The mass of literature on materialism is enormous. F. A. Lange's Geschichtedcs Materialismus is the only able general history of the subject. It has been translated by Mr. Thomas. Büchner's Matter and Force and Man's Place in Nature, Vogt's Lectures on Man, Heckel's Natural History of Creation and Anthropogenece, and The Old and New Faith of Strauss, may also be named. In an English translation of German works devoted entirely or mainly to the advocacy of materialism.
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H. SPENCER'S First Principles, HUXLEY's essay on The Physical Basis of Life, and TYNDALL'S Bell-fastr Lecture, need only to be mentioned. In England, materialism has been combated by Beale, Birks, Carpenter, Elam, MacVicar, Martineau, Clerk-Maxwell, Milart, Balfour Stwart, Hutchison Stirling, Stokes, Tate, Thomson, Duke of Argyll, etc.; in America, by Bowen, Bowne, Chadbourne, Cocker, Joseph Cook, Dawson, Fisher, Hickok, Hodge, Le Conte, McCosh, Porter, etc.; in France, by Caro, Janet, Pasteur, etc.; in Germany, by Fabri, J. H. Fichte, Harms, Hoffmann, Huber, Lotze, Bona Meyer, Schaller, Ulrici, Weiss, Wigand, Zöckler, etc. The chief works relating to particular periods of the history, and special points of the theory, of materialism, will be found indicated in notes v.-xix. on Lectures ii.-iv. of Antitheistic Theories, by the author of this article. R. FLINT (University of Edinburgh).

MATERNUS, Julius Firmicus, is, according to the signature of the only manuscript of the work still extant, the name of the author of the book, De errore profanarum religionum, dedicated to the sons of Constantine, — Constantius and Constans. According to xxviii. 6 and xxix. 3, the book must have been written after the expedition of Constantius to England, and before the defeat of Constantius at Singara; that is, between 343 and 348. Its purpose was to induce Constantius and Constans to adopt a policy of active suppression of Paganism: the apology is here transformed into polemics. The work is not complete: the leaves 1, 2, 7, and 8, of the manuscript, are missing. The plan of the composition, however, is perfectly clear. The manuscript, formerly in Minden, is now in the Vatican. It was first edited by M. Placius, 1662, then by Münter, Copenhagen, 1826; reprinted in Migne (Patrol., xii.) by Bursian, Leipzig, 1856, and C. Halm, in Corp. Scr. Er.cl. ii. Of the author's personal life and character nothing is known: he is nowhere mentioned. According to Bursian's investigation, he is not identical with the Maternus who wrote the Libri Matheseos. HAUCK.
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that he should have exercised an influence as vast as it mainly was salutary. In 1682 he married Maria, daughter of John Cotton, by whom he had three sons and seven daughters. His sons — Cotton, Nathaniel, and Samuel — graduated at Harvard in 1678, 1685, and 1690 respectively. Of these, Cotton, the eldest, of whom the following is a sketch, died March 13, 1703; d. Feb. 10 (23), 1663; d. Feb. 13 (23), 1729, — became the most renowned of the lineage; although, conceding his omnivorous scholarship and exceptional labors, it may be doubted whether he was even the peer of his father or grandfather in intellectual ability. He took his B. A. when less than five years and six months old; taught for a time; overcame an impediment of speech which had threatened to interfere with his success in the study of his profession; acted as his father's assistant at the Second Church, Boston; and was ordained, as joint pastor with him, May 18 (23), 1685, — a place which he surrendered only at his death, at the age of sixty-five. During these nearly three and forty years he was indefatigable as a preacher, systematic and thorough as a pastor, eminent as a polemical writer, — at great personal risks, he succeeded in introducing and defending the inoculative prevention of small-pox; — and amazing as an author; being known to have printed three hundred and eighty-two separate works, of which several were elaborate volumes, and one a stately folio of eight hundred pages; while, to his sore and amazed grief, the great work of his life (in his own esteem), his Biblia Americana, remains in manuscript to this day, in six big volumes. It was his misfortune that the weak and whimsical side of his multiform greatness most impressed itself upon the public, and that, for sharing with other good and eminent men of his day in the witchcraft delusion, he has most unfairly been singled out for a specialty of censure and contumely which in no degree fairly belongs to him. He was no more guilty for not being, as to that, in advance of his age, than were Richard Baxter and Sir Matthew Hale in England, and the Capuchin convent at Cork; attained a wide popularity; was appointed a member of the Board of Direction of the House of Industry (workhouse), Cork. One of his fellow members was the Rev. John Martin, a Friend, and one of the pioneers in the total-abstinence cause. It was he who first impressed Father Mathew with the fearful curse drink entailed, and how it was the cause of the wretchedness the workhouse so strikingly exhibited; and he urged the priest to start a crusade against the evil, maintaining firmly that he was just the man to do it. On April 10, 1888, Father Mathew, who was then in his forty-eighth year, signed the total-abstinence pledge inside of three months; and, by January of the next year, two hundred thousand persons, most of whom lived in Cork and its vicinity, had embraced the new gospel. Father Mathew extended his labors over all Ireland, visited Scotland and England (1842–43), and spent two years in America (1849–51), going as far west as St. Louis, everywhere making converts by the hundreds. Much of his success was due to the man,—his exhaustless flow of animal spirits, his humor and wit, his downright earnestness, his courage and high character. To
MATHILDA. Countess of Tuscany, b. 1046; d. in the monastery of Bondeno de' Roncori, July 24, 1115; a daughter of Count Boniface of Tuscany and Beatrice of Lorraine; inherited, while Northern and Central Italy,— Tuscany, parts of Lombardy, Mantua, Parma, Reggio, Piacenza, Ferrara, Umbria, Spoleto, etc. Her parentage was German, and her ancestors were firm adherents of the German emperors; but the treacherous manner in which Henry III. treated her father induced him to throw himself into the opposite camp; and during the reigns of Nicholas II., Alexander II., Gregory VII., Urban II., and Paschal II., the Countess Mathilda was the mainstay of the Papacy. Specially intimate was her relation to Gregory VII., whom she sheltered more than once against the fury of Henry IV. She continued the war against the emperor, even after Gregory's death. She was twice married,— first to Godfrey of Lorraine, then to Duke Welf of Bavaria; but her first marriage seems never to have been completed; and from her second husband she was divorced. Her enormous wealth she bequeathed to the papal chair. It formed part of the so-called "Patrimonium Petræ." See MATTHIAS; LUIGI TOSTI: La contessa Matilde ed i romani pontefici, Florence, 1859; and the arts. GREGORY VII. and PATRIMONIUM PETRÆ, with the literature there given.

MATTHILDA. See TRINITARIAN BROTHERS.

MATINS. See Canonical Hours.

MATTER, Jacques, b. at Alt-Eckendorf, Alsace, May 31, 1791; d. at Strasburg, June 23, 1864. He studied at Göttingen and Paris, and was appointed professor of history in the college of Strasburg in 1819, and in the following year also professor of church history in the theological faculty. In 1832 he was called to Paris as inspector-general of the university, but returned in 1846 to Strasburg as professor of the philosophy of religion. Of his works the following have specific theological interest: Histoire critique du Gnosticisme, Paris, 1828, 2 vols.; Histoire universelle de l'Église Chrétienne, Paris, 1829-32, 3 vols.; Schéma et la philosophie de la nature, 1842; Histoire de la philosophie dans ses rapports avec la religion, 1857, 2 vols.; La philosophie en France aux temps de Fénélon, Paris, 1864.

MATTHEW. (Markiaw, or, according to the Sinaitic manuscript, B and D, Matthiaw.) I. THE MAN. — Matthew was one of the twelve apostles, and is mentioned in the lists of the disciples in Matt. x. Mark iii., Luke vi., Acts i. He was a publican, and was sitting at the receipt of custom when Jesus called him to be his disciple (Matt. xii. 9). In Mark ii. 14, Luke v. 27 sqq., he is called Levi. The circumstances in these three cases are the same, and there can be no reason for doubting that the same person is meant. Levi, no doubt, was his original name, which was subsequently exchanged for Matthew. This apostle is not mentioned in the Acts, except once (i. 13); and the early traditions about his career are often contradictory to each other. According to Clement of Alexandria (Paedag. 2, 1), Irenæus (Adv. Her. 3, 1), Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 6, 24), and others, he remained in Jerusalem for fifteen years after the ascension, preaching to the Jews. At the end of this period, he went to other peoples (Euseb., H. E., 3, 1; Hieron. catal., 4), — to the Ethiopians (Rufinus, H. E., 10, 8; Socrates, H. E., 1, 19), the Macedonians (Isidore Hisp., De Nace., 77), the Persians (Ambrose, in Psalm xiv.) etc. The Roman-Catholic and Greek churches celebrate his martyrdom; but there are no notices of it till after Heraclien, Clement, Origen, and Tertullian; and the tradition is at variance with the representations of these authors.

II. THE GOSPEL. — One of the oldest, least questioned, and most generally believed church traditions is, that Matthew was the author of a Gospel written in Hebrew. Papias (Euseb., H. E., 3, 39) relates that for the first time in the discharge of his mission as an apostle he here has said. In spite of these explicits testimonies, Jerome (Catal., 3) says, "Matthew composed the Gospel of Christ in Hebrew letters and words, but it is not made out who it was who afterwards translated it into Greek." Further: this very Hebrew text is preserved unto this day in the Cæsarean Library. But then he says that this volume was used by the Nazarenes in Beroea, a city of Syria. He speaks of the Gospel in other places (Protag. in Matth.; Prefat. in IV. Evv. ad Omos., etc.), but in the main point agrees Mill, Michaelis, Storr, Corrodi, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Oehler, Sieffert, Guericke, Ebrard, Baur, Thiersch, Delitzsch, Meyer, and others. No copy of the Hebrew Gospel is extant. Some of the old scholars identified the Hebrew Matthew with the Gospel to the Hebrews often mentioned by Irenæus (Adv. Her., i. 26, 2; ii. 11, 7), Jerome (c. Pelag., 2; Ad Matth., 12, 13), and also called the Hebrew Gospel (ţa lăpăsor), or the Gospel of the Ebionites, the
to the original Hebrew Gospel of the apostle? The divergence in the testimonia seems to point us to a common original, from which the Hebrew Matthew and the other work were derived. And certainly there is no sufficient ground for regarding (with Schneckenburger, Schwegler, Baur) our present Gospel according to Matthew as a translation of this Gospel to the Hebrews; and Jerome, the translator of the latter, specially distinguishes it from our Matthew.

But what relation does our Greek Matthew hold to the original Hebrew Gospel of the apostle? We do not believe, with some, that the author of the original Hebrew Gospel (Matthew) translated it into our present Greek version, or revised it. An apostle who had been an eye-witness of the events would not be the author of the account as we now have it. Many of the discourses are placed out of the environment in which they were uttered. The discourses and miracles are given in groups, and in connection with notices of time such as an eye-witness would not have given (comp. vii. 1, 5, 14, 18, 28, 29; ix. 1, 9, 14, 18, 27, 32; or xii. 38, 46; xiii. 1, 36). Here belong also such concluding statements as vii. 28; xii. 46; xiii. 1, xvi. 1, at the end of discourses which make the impression that they were spoken in the connection reported, whereas this often was not the case.

But that our canonical Greek Matthew is a translation from the Hebrew, Jerome assures us (Catal., 3), and in a way which leaves no doubt that he had good reasons for so doing. He moreover expressly says that the name of the translator was not ascertained; and later writers regarded him to be James, the Lord's brother, or John (Theophylact, Prolog. in Matth.). Nor does Jerome indicate that there was any difference between the Hebrew Matthew (a copy of which he made) and the Greek or canonical Matthew. It cannot be denied, therefore, that an exceedingly close relationship must be assumed to have existed between our canonical Matthew and the Hebrew Matthew. To this assumption we are forced by the view which the early church had of the first Gospel in our canon. Nowhere do we find a breath of suspicion of its genuineness. The very superscription, "According to Matthew," is weighty in this connection, as no reason can be thought of for ascribing a Gospel to an apostle who left behind no traces of his activity in the church, unless he really was his author. Barnabas (Matt. xx. 16; xx. 14, etc.), Polycarp (ii. 6, 7), and Ignatius (Ad Polyc. 2, etc.) seem to have traces of Matthew. According to Epiphanius (Hær. 24, 5), Basilides made a false use of Matt. vii. 6. Celsus and others seem also to have used the Gospel. After the middle of the second century, we find many evidences of its use in Justin, Athenagoras, Hegesippus, etc. From these testimonia and quotations it is evident that the first of our Gospels was considered to be canonical after the first quarter of the second century. This testimony of the ancient writers is confirmed by the contents of the Gospel itself.

The canonical Gospel, as we have already stated, does not seem to us to be a literal translation of the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, but was derived from a Gospel which stood in very intimate relations to the Hebrew Matthew. Papias speaks of the λόγια (the Lord's discourses) which Matthew arranged. Schneckenburger, Lachmann, Credner, Wieseler, Ewald, Köstlin, Reuss, Meyer, and other critics, following the lead of Schleiermacher, have concluded from this statement that Matthew in the first instance made only a collection of the Lord's discourses, the narratives of events being inserted afterwards. We cannot agree with this view, and hold that there is more to favor the opinion that the expression λόγια included narratives of events, than to favor the contrary opinion, limiting it to discourses. Papias denominated his own work an Exposition of the Lord's Discourses (λογια ευαγγελιων λογιου). It contains historical details; and, if he had written an account of the Lord's life, he would no doubt have called it Discourses of the Lord (λογια ευαγγελιων). A conclusive argument for this view is, that, immediately after characterizing the contents of Mark as "what was said or done by the Lord," he designates the same thing by τα ευαγγελια λογια ("The Lord's Discourses"). The original Gospel of Matthew, which Papias calls λογια, was more than a collection of the Lord's sayings. The quotations from the Old Testament which have been used to confirm the theory of a Greek as well as a Hebrew original, seem to favor our view. Just those quotations (ii. 6, 15, 23; viii. 17; xii. 18–20; xiii. 35, etc.) which are added by the writer himself are independent of the LXX.; while those (about thirty) which are from the discourses of Christ are almost unanimously with the LXX. From this circumstance we draw the conclusion that the Hebrew writer used the Hebrew text of the Old Testament in his quotations, and the translator of our Greek Gospel took these quotations from the LXX.; whereas, when he added his own reflections, he went immediately to the Hebrew for his quotations, and translated into Greek.

[The view of the writer of this article is certainly not strengthened by the explanation to which he is forced of the quotations of Matthew from the Old Testament. There are three views historically possible in regard to our canonical Greek Matthew: (1) It is a close translation of a Hebrew original (by Matthew himself, or another), called by Papias λογια, and referred to by many of the Fathers; (2) It is a free reproduction and enlargement (either by Matthew himself, — as Bengel, Guericke, Schott, Olshausen, Thiersch, Schaff, and Godet hold, — or by another) of these same λογια ; (3) Papias made a mistake (as did the other Fathers who are in this case regarded as having followed him), and our canonical Greek Gospel is the original. This last view, held (in addition to the scholars above mentioned) by Keim, Alford, Elliot, Roberts (Discourses on the Gospels), Ellicott, Athanasius, and others, is affirmed on the ground of the quotations, so many of which are from the LXX., and its "too decidedly Greek character" (Keim), etc. The tendency seems to be rather in favor of this view. But we prefer to hold to the opinion that a Hebrew Gospel of Matthew did exist, and that our canonical Gospel is a reproduction and enlargement of it (by his own hand), on the ground of the strong
and unquestioned testimony in favor of a prior Hebrew Matthew, the inherent probability that a Gospel for the Jews would be written in their own language, and the universal regard in which it is held among Jews and Christians of all denominations.

The date of the Gospel is put (on the ground of xxvii. 8; xxviii. 15, etc.) down quite a time below the ascension, yet (on the ground of v. 23; xxiii. 36; xxiv. 29, etc.) before the destruction of Jerusalem, and between 69 and 70 (Alford, Archbishop Thudium, Godet, 154; Schaff, Keim, 86; Lange, 67-69, etc.). Volkmar puts it down to 105-110; and Gudé, while assigning the Hebrew Gospel to a date before the destruction of Jerusalem, assigns the Greek Gospel to a date subsequent to that event.

The Gospel, as Irenæus, Eusebius, and Jerome observed long ago, was meant for Jewish Christians in Palestine. A knowledge of Jewish customs, topography, etc., is presupposed in the Gospel. The aim of the Gospel was to be a comprehensive proof that Jesus was the promised Messiah. He is represented as David's and Abraham's son (i. 1; ix. 27, etc.), was born in Bethlehem, fled as the new-born king from Herod's wrath (ii. 13-15), was brought up in Nazareth (ii. 23), had John for his forerunner (iii. 3; xi. 10), labors in Galilee (iv. 14 sq.), heals the sick (viii. 17; xii. 17), speaks in parables (xiiii.1 sqq.), enters in triumph into Jerusalem (xiiii. 5-16), was rejected by his people (xxi. 42), and forsaken by his disciples (xxvi. 56). All these things occurred according to prophecy.

In the disposition of his matter he follows an arrangement based upon the matter, giving the discourses (v.-vii.) and parables (xiii.) in groups, as also the miracles (viii., ix.). The Gospel is divided into three main divisions: (1) The early history of our Lord (i.-iv.); (2) His activity in Galilee (v.-xviii.); (3) The continuance of this Lord's career by death and the resurrection (xix.-xxvii.).


GUDÉ.

MATTHEW BLASTARES. See Blastares.

MATTHEW'S DAY, St. (Sept. 21 in the Roman and Anglican churches, Nov. 10 in the Greek), was first generally observed in the eleventh century.

MATTHEW OF BASI (Matteo di Basio). See Capuchins.

MATTHEW OF PARIS (Matthæus Parisius), b. in the beginning of the thirteenth century; d. 1259; one of the most learned men of his age, a poet, orator, theologian, and historian. His surname he received, according to some, from his having been born in Paris; according to others, from his having studied there. He entered the order of the Clarissæcum at St. Albans in 1217. Innocent IV. sent him to Norway to reform the monastery of Holm. At his instance, King Henry III., who held him in great esteem, granted several privileges to the university of Oxford. Besides biographies of the founder of St. Albans and of several of its abbots, he has a history of England from 1066 to 1259. The first part (to 1236) is simply a transcription of the Chronicle of Roger of Wendover; but the latter part of the work is original, and forms one of the principal sources, not only to the history of England, but to the general church history of the time. It was continued by William Rishanger, a monk of the same monastery, down to 1273. Its general title is Historia anglica maior, in contradistinction from the Historia minor, an extract from the work, made by the author himself. (Best edition of the first by Luard, London, 1872-83, 7 vols.; of the second, by Madden, 1866-69, 3 vols.; Eng. trans. of both works in Bohn's Antiquarian Library, 5 vols.)

C. SCHMIDT.

MATTHEW OF WESTMINSTER, the imaginary author of Flores Historiarum, which is really an abridgment by himself of Matthew of Paris' Historia major. See Matthew of Paris.

MATTHEW OF YORK, b. in Bristol, 1546; d. at Cawood Castle, March 29, 1582. He was graduated at Oxford, 1563; canon of Christ Church, 1579; prebendary of Sarum, and president of St. John's College, 1572; dean of Durham, 1588; bishop of Durham, 1595; archbishop of York, 1606. He was a man of much learning and great eloquence; but his only printed production is Concilia apologetica contra Capianum, Oxford, 1581 and 1638. In York Cathedral there are manuscript notes of his upon all the ancient Fathers.

MATTHEW Thomas. See English Bible Versions (p. 738), and Rogers, John.

MATTHIESEN. See Bockhold.

MAULBRONN (a Cistercian monastery in the diocese of Spires, founded by Bishop Günther in 1148) belonged originally under the jurisdiction of the Empire, but passed in the fourteenth century under that of the Palatinate, and was in 1504 conquered by the Duke of Württemberg, and incorporated with his dominions. When the Reformation was established in Württemberg (in 1535), Maulbronn was set apart for those monks...
who wanted to remain Roman Catholics. In 1557 it received an evangelical abbot, and was transformed into a cloister-school. At present it is the seat of a theological seminary. Its buildings, still in good repair, have some architectural interest. See Hartmann: Wegweiser durch das Kloster Maulbronn, 1877; E. Paulus: Beschreibung des Klosters M., 1881.

In 1564 a conference was held at Maulbronn between the Lutheran theologians of Württemberg and the Calvinist theologians of the Palatinate,—the so-called Colloquium Mündliche Harmonie,—for the purpose of effecting a reconciliation between the two parties. The occasion was the establishment of Calvinism in the Palatinate, and the issue of the Heidelberg Catechism in 1563. The conference lasted from April 10 to April 15, but no result was arrived at. Both parties ascribed the failure, at Maulbronn, Jan. 19, 1576. It resulted in the so-called Protocollum Mündlicher Harmonie, which afterwards became the basis of the Formula Concordiae.

What the Congregation of St. Maur has done for history in general, and more especially for the history of France, can hardly be overrated. Such works as La religion des Gaulois (1727, 2 vols.), by Dom Martin, and Histoire des Gaules (1752, 2 vols.), by Dom de Brezillac, may be considered as antiquated; but the Histoire du Languedoc (1730-45, 5 vols. fol.), by Vaissette and De Vic, the Histoire de Bretagne (1725, 2 vols.), by Dom Benard, ninth and Lobineau (remodelled and completed by Morice de Beaubois in 1742), the Histoire de Bourgogne (1738, 3 vols. fol.), by Plancher, the Histoire de la ville de Paris (1723, 5 vols.), by Felibien and Lobineau, the Histoire littéraire de la France (1733-33, 12 vols., after 1814 continued by the Académie des Inscriptions), etc., are invaluable contributions to the history of France, not to speak of the great collections of sources made by the Congregation: the Scriptores rerum gallicarum et franciarum of the eight first volumes by Dom Bouquet, ninth to eleventh by Dom Handig, twelfth and thirteenth by Dom Clément, fourteenth and fifteenth by Dom Briat, afterwards continued by the Académie des Inscriptions), the Spicilegium veterum Scriptorum, 1688-71, 10 vols., by D'Achery; the Vetus Gallicana, 1730-40, 4 vols., by Mabillon; the Collectio nova veterum Scriptorum, 1700, by Martène; the Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum, 1717, 5 vols. fol., by Martène and Durand; the Bibliotheca Manuscriptorum Nova, 1739, 2 vols. fol., by Montfacon, etc. Of no less importance are the contributions of the Congregation to universal history or the science of history. The science of diplomacy was founded by its members: De re diplomatica, 1681, by Dom Mabillon; Nouveau traité de diplomatique, 1750-55, 5 vols., by Dom Toussaint and Dom Taschir; and of equal interest to medieval history are
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the additions to Ducange's Glossarium by Dom Dantin and Dom Carpentier.

Principally, however, the labor of the Congregation was devoted to the church. The Benedictine editions of the Fathers (Latin and Greek), and of the great ecclesiastical writers of the middle ages, are still models of correctness of text, of acuteness, moderation, and circumspection of accompanying notes, commentaries, introductory essays, etc., and of typographical outfit. The first of the Latin Fathers whose works the Congregation undertook to edit, was, characteristically enough, Augustine. The work was begun in 1679, in the midst of the Jansenistic controversy, by Dom Delfau, and finished by Blampin and Coustert, 1706, in 11 vols. fol. In 1779 appeared Cassiodorus, 2 vols. fol., by Garet; 1686—80, Ambroise, 2 vols. fol., by Du Frische and Le Nourri; 1693, Hilary of Poitiers, by Coustert; 1693—1706, Jerome, 5 vols. fol., by Martianay; 1726, Cyprian, begun by Baluze, who did not belong to the Congregation, but completed by Dom Mame. Of the Greek Fathers, the Epistle of Barnabas was published in 1645 by Ménard; Athanasius, 3 vols. fol., by Montfaçon, 1698; Ireneus, by Massuet, 1710; Chrysostom, 13 vols. fol., by Montfaçon, 1698; Cyril of Jerusalem, by Toulle, 1720; Basil the Great, by Garnier, 1721—30, 3 vols. fol.; Origens, by Charles and Vincent de la Rue, 1733—59, 4 vols. fol.; Justin and the other apologists, by Maran, 1742; Gregory of Nazianzen, 1788, by Maran and Clémente (interrupted by the Latin writers), etc. Of medieval writers, the Concordia Regum was published in 1628; Lanfranc, 1748, and Guibert of Nogent, 1651, both by D'Achery; Robert Pulleyn and Peter of Poitiers, by Mathoud, 1665; St. Bernard, by Mabillon, 1687; Anselm of Canterbury, by Gierberon, 1765; Gregory the Great, 4 vols. fol.; Denis de Sainte-Marthe, 1705; Hildebert of Mann, by Beaugendre, 1708, etc. Directly bearing on church history were, the new edition of Gallia Christiana, 15 vols., 1715—55, continued in 1850 by Hauréau, the first attempt at ecclesiastical geography, the life of Justin, Sacra, Iuris sacra, España sagrada, etc.; the Histoire de St. Denis, by Félipon, 1706, and Histoire de St. Germain-des-Prés, by Boullart, 1724; the celebrated works on the history of the Benedictine order: Acta Sanctorum O. S. B., by D'Achery; 9 vols. fol., 1698 et seq., and Annales O. S. B., by Mabillon, 6 vols. fol., 1703 et seq.

When the monastic orders were dissolved in France by the Revolution, the Congregation of St. Maur was also compelled to disperse. Many works begun were thus broken off; but some of them were, as above mentioned, taken up by the Académie des Inscriptions. Dom Brial, the last member of the Congregation, died in 1833 as a prominent member of this new Congregation of St. Maur is Dom Pitre, and his most prominent work the Spicilegium Solesmense, of which the first volume was published in 1837.

LIT. — PEF: Bibliotheca benedicto·maurianae, Vienna, 1710; LE CERV: Bibliothèque historique et critique des auteurs de la congrégation de S. M., 30—II

MAURICE, John Frederic Denison, b. in Norhampton, Suffolk, Aug. 8, d. in London, April 1, 1872. He was the son of a Unitarian minister, and was brought up amidst corresponding theological influences. — a circum—
stance which should be kept in mind when we examine the character of this remarkable man. If a person be met midway on a mountain's side, it is important, if we would judge of his relative position, that we should ascertain whether he be coming up or going down. Mr. Maurice's was an ascending progress, and he rose from lower views of our Lord and Saviour to infinitely higher ones. He made a mark on the university in his own acknowledgments it also appears that he formularies with uncommon zeal. From his position, that we should ascertain whether he be established the first working-man's college; and in 1860 he was appointed incumbent of Vere-street Chapel, Marylebone. He accepted the professorship of moral philosophy at Cambridge in 1866, and down to the time of his death continued publishing various works, and laboring hard to improve and elevate "the working-classes" of his countrymen. His History of Mental and Moral Philosophy—treated of speculations before the time of Christ, the metaphysical divinity of the Fathers, and the scholasticism of the medieval age— is a characteristic performance, in which one sees the opinions of former days expressed with a certain coloring, the result of having passed through the alembic of the author's mind. We cannot enumerate all his publications; but, besides those already noticed, we may mention The Epistle to the Hebrews (three Warburtonian Lectures, 1848), The Lord's Prayer (nine sermons, 1848), The Church a Family (twelve sermons on the occasional services of the Prayer-Book, 1850), Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries (1854), Learning and Working (lectures published the same year), The Gospel of St. John (a series of lectures on Christian ethics, 1857). The orthodoxy of Mr. Maurice was attacked by Dr. Candlish in a lecture at Exeter Hall, before the Young Men's Christian Association, occasioned by the fact of the wide influence of his teaching in thoughtful circles of society. He had no sympathy with the Tractarian and Evangelical parties in the Church of England; and, though he strenuously maintained the divinity of Christ, his opinions on the subject of the atonement and justification by faith did by no means satisfy orthodox divines of various communions. There is a transparency in his style out of keeping with the occasional obscurity of his thoughts; and, whilst apparently logical in the connection of his thoughts, there are few distinguished authors in whose reasonings may be found so many non-sequiturs, according to the judgment of attentive readers. He was a great philanthropist, a sincere and earnest Christian, and a man of considerable genius. He led a most laborious life. In the posthumous volume, The Friendship of Books, and other Lectures, edited by Thomas Hughes, London, 1873, will be found a Memoir. See The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, ed. by his son, London, 1884, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1885. JOHN STOUGHTON.

MAURITIUS. See Legion, The Thebaic.

MAURUS, a pupil of Benedict of Nursia, but better known to legend than to history. His name became celebrated only by the Congregation of St. Maur. According to legend he first brought the rules of Benedict to France, founded the first monastery of that order in France, at Glanfeuil in Anjou, wrought many miracles, and died in 584. But the legend dates from the ninth century, and Gregory of Tours knows nothing of him. Its chronology is utterly confused; and Mabillon and Ruinart have in vain tried to establish its trustworthiness. See Acta Sanctorum O. S. B. sec. 1, 274, and Annales Cambriae, 107.

MAURY, Jean Biffrein, Cardinal, b. at Valrèes in Venaissin, June 26, 1746; d. at Montesfacone,
Catholic faith in the realm. At his accession to the throne in 1769, he showed in his younger days a decided inclination towards the Reformation; and of the constituent assembly, he played a conspicuous part as the orator of the Extreme Right, defending the prerogatives of the crown, the privileges of the nobility, the immunities of the church, etc. Compelled to emigrate in 1792, he repaired to Rome, where he was received by Pius VI. as a saint and martyr; made archbishop of Paris, of Nicaea, bishop of Montefiascone, and cardinal 1784. At the instance of Pius VII., it is said, he wrote a humble letter to Napoleon, Aug. 22, 1804, which resulted in his reconciliation with the French Government. In 1806 he returned to Paris; and so absolutely did he devote himself to Napoleon, that he became an object of hatred to the legitimists and the ultra-Catholic party. Friedrich of the Palatinate, and Philip of Hesse, unwilling to grant religious liberty, arguing that it would lead to quarrels, and, when he was crowned Roman king, placed himself disapproved of by the minority, and could so much the less reasonably insist on the appointment, and the Pope refused his sanction. Consequently he was expelled from his see as soon as the Bourbons returned; and, when he went to Rome to lay the case before the Pope, he was imprisoned in the castle of San Angelo, and not released until he resigned his see. A selection of his works was published by his nephew, Paris, 1827, 5 vols. His life was written by Ponc-joulat, Paris, 1835. See also SAINT-BEUVE: "Causerie du Lundi IV."

MAXENTIUS. See CONSTANTINE.

MAXIMILIAN II., emperor of Germany (1564-76), showed in his younger days a decided inclination towards the Reformation, was well acquainted with the writings of Luther and Melanchthon, listened cold and silent to the remonstrances of the Jesuits, retained for a long time Pfauser as his intimate friends among the Protestant princes,—he took an oath that he would preserve the Roman hierarchy; and his plan was afterwards adopted by the republicans, and of the constituent assembly, he played a conspicuous part as the orator of the Extreme Right, defending the prerogatives of the crown, the privileges of the nobility, the immunities of the church, etc. Compelled to emigrate in 1792, he repaired to Rome, where he was received by Pius VI. as a saint and martyr; made archbishop of Paris, of Nicaea, bishop of Montefiascone, and cardinal 1784. At the instance of Pius VII., it is said, he wrote a humble letter to Napoleon, Aug. 22, 1804, which resulted in his reconciliation with the French Government. In 1806 he returned to Paris; and so absolutely did he devote himself to Napoleon, that he became an object of hatred to the legitimists and the ultra-Catholic party. Friedrich of the Palatinate, and Philip of Hesse, unwilling to grant religious liberty, arguing that it would lead to quarrels, and, when he was crowned Roman king, placed himself disapproved of by the minority, and could so much the less reasonably insist on the appointment, and the Pope refused his sanction. Consequently he was expelled from his see as soon as the Bourbons returned; and, when he went to Rome to lay the case before the Pope, he was imprisoned in the castle of San Angelo, and not released until he resigned his see. A selection of his works was published by his nephew, Paris, 1827, 5 vols. His life was written by Ponc-joulat, Paris, 1835. See also SAINT-BEUVE: "Causerie du Lundi IV."

MAXENTIUS. See CONSTANTINE.

MAXIMINUS THRAX, Roman emperor (235-238); the first Barbarian on the throne of the Roman Empire; on the throne of the empire for the training of recruits. On the revolt of the soldiers against Septimius Severus, he was proclaimed emperor by the army, and the frightened Senate confirmed the election. But he never visited Rome. He remained with the army, defeated the Germans, removed into Pannonia, and was assassinated. After his accession, he issued edicts against the Christians, ordering all the leaders of the congregations to be decapitated. (See EUSEBIUS: Hist. Eccl., vi. 28; RUFINUS, vi. 20; ORSYUS, vii. 19.) It is certain that the edict was not carried out. Eusebius speaks of no martyrs; Rufinus, only of a great number of confessors. Sulpicius Severus counts the persecution of Decius as the seventh. The whole period from Septimius Severus to Decius he designates as a term of peace, and, under the reign of Maximinus, he speaks only of annoyances, not of persecutions. Nevertheless, if Eusebius' report of Maximinus' edict is correct (which cannot be doubted), that edict, however inoperative it may have been in reality, must be considered as the first attempt of a general and systematic persecution of the Christians. Maximinus understood the great importance of the Christian hierarchy. He saw, that, in order to kill the church, he must strike the hierarchy; and his plan was afterwards adopted by Valentinian and Diocletian. G. UHLHORN.

MAXIMUS CONFESSOR, b. in Constantinople about 580; d. in the castle of Shemari, on the eastern shore of the Black Sea, Aug. 13, 689; was the chief champion and martyr of the orthodox party in the Monothelite controversy, and one of the most acute theologians and most subtle mystics of the Greek Church. His personal life is in several points obscure. The principal sources of it are, besides the notes scattered around in his own writings, the Acta et Collationes Maximi,—of which a Latin version is found in Anastasii Bibl. Collectanea (edited Simond, Paris, 1820), and a Greek and Latin version in Cod. Migne: Patrolog. Grac. (90)—and a Vita Maximi, extant in a shorter and longer recension, and printed by Combeffs and Migne, i.e. According to that vita ("life"), Maximus descended from a distinguished family, and received a very careful education. Though he was small and feeble of body, and his mind naturally inclined towards study and authorship, he entered the political
career, and was appointed secretary to the Emperor Heraclius. But he afterwards gave up this position, — at what time and for what reason is not known, — and became a monk in the monastery of Chrysopolis, near Constantinople. When the Monothelite controversy broke out (638), he was in Alexandria; and when the Enchiridion was promulgated (638), he placed himself at the head of that movement which swept through the whole Northern Africa, and made that country the principal seat of the opposition, both to monophysitism and to monothelitism. He was supported by the imperial governor, Gregorius, or Georgius, who thought of making himself independent, and hoped to use the movement to his own advantage. After the death of Heraclius (641), Pyrrhus, patriarch of Constantinople, having been implicated in the intrigues of the empress widow Martina, sought refuge with Gregorius; and the latter arranged a disputation between him and Maximus. It took place at Carthage in July, 645; and its Acts, printed by Combechis, Migne, Mansi, etc., belong to the most remarkable monuments of Monothelitism. The controversy was completely vanquished: he recanted, and adopted the orthodox view of a double will corresponding to the double nature in Christ. In 646 the bishops of North Africa assembled in a synod, condemned Monothelitism, and exiled Bishop Theodore of Alexandria, who then recognized him as the legitimate patriarch of Constantinople. Thus a most formidable alliance stood arrayed against the Monothelites; but as Gregorius fell in a battle against the Saracens (647), and Pyrrhus made his peace with the Emperor Constans by recanting once more, the alliance collapsed without producing any effect. Meanwhile, Maximus remained in Rome, steadily active in his opposition to the Monothelites; and when, in 648, the emperor promulgated the Typos, forbidding all further discussion of the Monothelite controversy. In his epistle to the presbyter Severus, in the sixth century, taught one compound nature in Christ. Still more numerous and important are his writings against the Monothelites, — twenty-one, besides the above-mentioned Acta disputationis cum Pyrrho: they form, indeed, the chief monuments of the whole controversy. In his epistle to the presbyter Marinus of Cyprus, he treats the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit; and in his De animae natura et affectionibus, that of the immortality of the soul. His ethico-ascetic works consist of treatises and collections of apologetic propositions. Of the former the most celebrated is the so-called Liber Aseticus, a dialogue between an abbot and a young monk on the duties of ecclesiastical life, and one of the most invaluable specimens of the ascetic literature of the Greek Church. It was translated into Latin by Pirkheimer (Nuremberg, 1530), and again by Nobilius, together with some treatises of Basilis and Chrysostom, Rome, 1857. Of the latter the so-called Corpus Ascetica, or Saltus per exeprum, or Loci communes, is the largest; but it contains
MAXIMUS, Bishop of Turin, lived in the middle of the fifth century. His numerous writings consist of homilies and sermons, and are very rich in interesting notes on the history and character of Christian life in those days when the waves of the migration of nations rolled heavily over the country, and Paganism was still powerful outside of the cities. One of his homilies refers to the destruction of Milan by Attila (452), another, to the martyrs who suffered death from the fury of the Pagans at Anaunia, in the Rhetic Alps (807), during the celebration of the Pagan festival of Ambervalia; a third, to the baseness of people in many cities of Northern Italy, who, when their fellow citizens were made prisoners, bought their prisoners to keep as slaves, etc. The principal edition of his works is that of Rome, 1794, reprinted by Migne.

W. MOLLER.

MAXWELL, Lady Darcy, b. in Ayrshire, Scotland, 1742; d. in Edinburgh, July 2, 1810. She was married to Sir Walter Maxwell in 1759, but left a childless widow two years later. In 1764 she first heard John Wesley preach; and, from that time on, she was connected with the Methodists. In 1770 she established a school in Edinburgh for the Christian education of poor children. She not only supported this during her life, but left provision for its continuance. She was a most exemplary Christian. See LANCaster: Life of Lady Maxwell, New York, 1837.

MAY, Samuel Joseph, Unitarian minister and earnest antislavery advocate; b. in Boston, Sept. 12, 1797; d. in Syracuse, N.Y., July 1, 1871. He was graduated at Harvard College 1817; entered the ministry, and was pastor at Brooklyn, Conn., 1822-35; in 1835 was general agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society; in 1836, pastor in South Scituate, Mass.; from 1842 to 1844, principal of the Lexington Normal School for Girls; and from 1845 to 1868, was pastor in Syracuse. Wherever situated, the cause of the slave received his enthusiastic advocacy, and more than once his zeal excited the controversy of our Anti-Slavery Conflict, Boston, 1869. See his Memoir, by T. J. MUMFORD, Boston, 1873.

MAYENCE (a city of Germany, on the Rhine, opposite the influx of the Main) was for centuries the seat of one of the most magnificent ecclesiastical establishments of the country. Of the Christianization of the place, the foundation of the bishopric, and the history of the see down to the middle of the sixth century, our information is very fragmentary, and of a legendary character. St. Crescens, the pupil of Paul (2 Tim. iv. 10), is said to have been the first to preach Christianity in those regions. In 476 Boniface was appointed bishop of Mayence, and in 747 the see was formed into an archbishopric, and made the metropolitan see of Germany,—a rank which it retained until 1803. From the tenth century the archbishops of Mayence were often chancellors of the realm; and from Christian I. (1514-45) the title of arch-chancellor of Germany became permanently connected with the see of Mayence. As the electoral dignity arose in the twelfth century, the archbishop of Mayence became one of its principal bearers: of the three ecclesiastical electors,—Mayence, Cologne, and Treves,—Mayence had the precedence. During the period of the Reformation the two archbishops—Albert II. (1514-45) and Sebastian (1545-55)—governed with great wisdom and moderation, and successfully resisted the spreading Protestantism without having recourse to violence. At the beginning of the present century the elector of Mayence ruled over about three hundred and twenty thousand souls, and had an annual income of about two million gilders. Ten suffragans see belonged to his province,—Wittelsbach, Speyer, Sarre, Trier, Commerz, Wurzburg, Eichstadt, Paderborn, Hildesheim, Constance, and Augsburg, and he was the primate of the German clergy. But all that splendor came to a sudden end. By the peace of Lunievil, 1801, the whole left bank of the Rhine was ceded to France, and the prince-archbishopric of Mayence was established under the authority of the archbishop of Freiburg. See WERNER: Der Dom zu Mainz, Mayence, 1827, 3 vols.; SCHAAB: Geschichte der Stadt Mainz, Mayence, 1844, 3 vols.

MAYER, Johann Friedrich, b. at Leipzig, Dec. 6, 1650; d. at Stettin, March 30, 1712. After studying theology at Leipzig, he was appointed superintendent of Leisnig 1673, of Grimm 1678, professor of theology at Wittenberg 1684, pastor of St. Jacob of Hamburg 1686, being at the same time professor in the university of Kiel, and superintendent-general of Pommerania, and professor in the university of Greifswald 1701. He had great gifts as a pulpit orator, but acquired a rather unenviable reputation as a polemic, especially in his controversial works (Recollections and Horbe). He was indeed appropriately styled by S. B. Carpzov "the hammer of heretics and pictists." The Lexikon d. hamburg. Schriftsteller, vol. 5, pp. 89-184, Hamburg, 1867, gives the titles of 381 writings of his. See J. GEFFCKEN:
MAYER, Lewis, D.D., minister of the German Reformed Church; b. at Lancaster, Penn., March 26, 1783; d. at York, Penn., Aug. 25, 1849. He was ordained, 1807, pastor at Shepherdstown, Va., until 1821, and at York until 1825, when he assumed the presidency of the theological seminary of his denomination, which was first established at Carlisle, Penn., but afterwards removed to York. He retired in 1835, and devoted his remaining years to a history of the German Reformed Church, of which only the first volume, carrying the story down to 1770, has been published (Philadelphia, 1850). To the volume is prefixed a Memoir by Rev. E. Heiner.

MAYHEW. I. Experience, b. in Martha's Vineyard, Mass., Jan. 27, 1673; d. there Nov. 29, 1758. He passed his days as a missionary among the Indians on Martha's Vineyard and adjoining islands; being familiar with their language from infancy, his direct ancestors being also Indian missionaries. In 1709 he finished a version of the Psalms and of John, for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He also published a work upon Indian Converts (1727), giving an account of thirty Indian ministers and some eighty other pious Indians (reprinted 1729). In connection with a Discourse, he gave in 1720 a history of the Martha's Vineyard mission from 1694 to 1720. II. Jonathan, son of the preceding; b. in Martha's Vineyard, Mass., Oct. 5, 1720; d. in Boston, July 9, 1768. He was graduated at Harvard College 1744; entered the ministry, and in 1747 he was called to the West Church, Boston. But only two members came of the first council called to ordain him, owing to the suspicion of his heresy; and so a second and selected council had to be assembled. Although settled with such difficulty, and long under the ban, he still maintained his connection with the West Church all his life. He was an ardent patriot, and vigorous opponent of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He foretold the Reformed); founded in 1795, which themysterious doctrine of that Prince's saintship was unri pled (reprinted in Thornton's Pulpit of the American Revolution, Boston, 1860); and in 1763 Observations on the character and conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. In 1751 he received the degree of D.D. from the University of Aberdeen. In theology he was a Unitarian. See his Memoir by A. Bradford, Boston, 1838.

MAYNOOTH, County Kildare, Ireland, fifteen miles west-north-west from Dublin; seat of the Royal College of St. Patrick's, founded in 1795, by the Irish Parliament, for the education of Roman Catholic clergy. In 1801 he was ordained, 1807, pastor at Shepherdstown, Va., until 1821, and at York until 1825, when he assumed the presidency of the theological seminary of his denomination, which was first established at Carlisle, Penn., but afterwards removed to York. He retired in 1835, and devoted his remaining years to a history of the German Reformed Church, of which only the first volume, carrying the story down to 1770, has been publishe...
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McCLELLAND, Alexander, D.D., b. at Schenectady, N.Y., 1794; d. at New Brunswick, N.J., Dec. 19, 1864. He was graduated at Union College 1809; studied theology under Dr. J. M. Mason; was licensed by the Associate Reformed Presbyterian presbytery 1815; and was pastor of the Rutgers street Presbyterian church, from 1815 to 1822, when he became professor of logic, metaphysics, and belles-lettres in Dickinson College, Carlisle, Penn. From 1829 to his death he taught in Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J. (as professor of languages, 1830-39; and of Evidences of Christianity, 1840-51), and his career is another illustration of how much one man can do, even in the compass of a brief life, when the Spirit of God is with him; and his name, for this as for other reasons, will be coupled with those of David Brainerd and Henry Martyn, for all three had both the fire and the holiness of the seraph. See Memoir and Remains of the Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne, by Andrew A. Bonar (original edition), Dundee, 1845, frequently reprinted in Great Britain and America. WM. M. TAYLOR.

McCLELLAND, Alexander, D.D., b. at Schenectady, N.Y., 1794; d. at New Brunswick, N.J., Dec. 19, 1864. He was graduated at Union College 1809; studied theology under Dr. J. M. Mason; was licensed by the Associate Reformed Presbyterian presbytery 1815; and was pastor of the Rutgers street Presbyterian church, from 1815 to 1822, when he became professor of logic, metaphysics, and belles-lettres in Dickinson College, Carlisle, Penn. From 1829 to his death he taught in Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J. (as professor of languages, 1830-39; and of Evidences of Christianity, 1840-51), and his career is another illustration of how much one man can do, even in the compass of a brief life, when the Spirit of God is with him; and his name, for this as for other reasons, will be coupled with those of David Brainerd and Henry Martyn, for all three had both the fire and the holiness of the seraph. See Memoir and Remains of the Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne, by Andrew A. Bonar (original edition), Dundee, 1845, frequently reprinted in Great Britain and America. WM. M. TAYLOR.

McCLINTOCK, John, D.D., LL.D., joint founder and editor of McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, b. in Philadelphia, Oct. 27, 1814; d. at Madison, N.J., March 4, 1870. He was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania 1835; received as travelling preacher in the Philadelphia Conference of the Methodist-Episcopal Church the same year; from 1836 to 1848 he was professor in Dickinson College, Carlisle, Penn. (which in 1834 had passed under the Methodist influence), first in mathematics, but after 1840 in classics. In 1846 he commenced, in conjunction with Professor G. R. Crooks, a series of elementary books upon Latin and Greek, which applied the method of imitation and repetition so successfully used in teaching modern languages. The series has been very widely used. From 1848 to 1856 Dr. McClintock was editor of the Methodist Quarterly Review. In 1857 he went to Europe as delegate to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England, and also to the Berlin meeting of the Evangelical Alliance. From 1857 to 1860 he was pastor of St. Paul's Church, New-York City; from 1860 to 1864 pastor of the American Chapel, Paris, and corresponding editor of the Methodist (established in 1852); and in Christian Advocate 1854. While in Paris, he took an earnest interest in the American civil war, and strove to circulate correct information respecting the nature and importance of the struggle. Returning to New York in 1864, he was recalled to St. Paul's; but ill health compelled his resignation after a year. In 1867 he accepted the responsible position of president of the newly organized Drew Theological Seminary at Madison, N.J. (See art.) Dr. McClintock was generally recognized as the best scholar, the best expositor, and the best exponent of his day; and as one of her foremost pulpits orators. He industriously cultivated his natural powers, and left behind him many proofs of his labor. Personally he was very attractive, a man of liberal views, and genial and amiable spirit. His publications include, besides the series already mentioned, an Analysis of Watson's Theological Institutes, New York, 1842, prefixed to the American edition of Watson since 1850; a translation, in connection with Professor C. E. Blumenhard, of Neander's Life of Christ, New York, 1847; Sketches of Eminent Methodist Ministers, New York and Cincinnati, 1852; Temporal Power of the Pope, 1855; edition of D. S. Scott's translation of Felix Bungener's History of the Council of Trent, New York, 1865; a translation of Count De Gasparin's Uprising of a Great People, London, 1861, expressly designed to help on the Union Cause in England. Since his death there have been issued a volume of his sermons, phonographically reported, entitled Living Words, New York, 1871, 2d edition, same year, and his Lectures on Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology, Cincinnati, 1873. These volumes represent only a portion of his activity. He wrote for different periodicals, and interested himself in various enterprises, and by one great work he laid the church under heavy debt. As early as 1858, in connection with Dr. Strong, he began the collection of materials for a Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, which should be much more complete than any existing. With unusual industry he labored on, assuming alone the responsibility of systematic, historical, and practical theology. It was not until 1867 that the first volume appeared (Harper & Brothers, N.Y.). He lived to superintend the publication also of the second
McCLURE, Alexander Wilson, D.D., b. in Boston, May 8, 1808; d. at Cannonsburgh, Penn., Sept. 20, 1865. He was graduated at Amherst College 1827, and at Andover Seminary 1830; and was Congregational pastor successively at Malden, Mass. (1830-41); at Augusta, Fla. (1841-44), and Malden again (1848-52). In 1852 he was installed over the First Reformed Dutch Church of Jersey City, but became corresponding secretary of the American and Foreign Christian Union 1855. He held the position until 1858, residing, from 1856 to 1858, in Rome, Italy, as chaplain of the Union. During his closing years, from 1856, he was a great sufferer. His scholarship was profound, and his writings were genial and popular. He edited The Christian Observer, 1844-47, and wrote bound in bound-periodicals. His books comprise Four Lectures on Ultra-Universitarians, Boston; Lives of the Chief Fathers of New England, 3 vols.; and particularly that painstaking and valuable historical work, — The Translators and Their Work; a Biographical Memoir of the Authors of the English Version of the Holy Bible, New York, 1853, the materials for which were “drawn from the best sources in Great Britain and America, and with the utmost care for many years, to secure accuracy and fulness.”

McCRIE, Thomas, D.D., Scottish preacher and author. He was born in November, 1772 (exact date unknown, but baptized Nov. 22); d. at Edinburgh, Aug. 5, 1835. He was educated at the school of his native town. He entered the university of Edinburgh when he was about sixteen years of age, and completed his curriculum in 1791. In the autumn of the same year he went to Brechin, where he acted as assistant in a private academy, and also opened a day-school in connection with the Anti-burgher congregation of the town. Here he resided for three years, except during the few weeks which were annually required for attendance at the theological seminary of the General Associate, or Anti-burgher denomination at Whitburn, which was then presided over by the Rev. Alexander Bruce. He was licensed to preach by the presbytery of Kelso in 1795, and ordained to the pastorate of the Potter-row Church, Edinburgh, May 26, 1796. Here he remained for ten years; when, owing to differences about the province of the civil magistrate in religious matters, a schism occurred in the Anti-burgher denomination, and McCrie, with other four ministers, separated from the General Associate Synod, by which they were afterwards deposed. They formed themselves into a new denomination, called “The Constitutional Presbyterian,” which was, at a later date, merged in the Synod of Original Seceders; and McCrie, followed by the larger part of his flock, removed to another place of worship, in which he continued to minister until his death. The controversies in which he was engaged led him to investigate the early history and constitution of the Church of Scotland; and in the years 1802-06 he contributed to The Christian Instructor a series of papers, chiefly biographical, bearing on these topics. These, however, were but unconscious preparations for the great work — the Life of John Knox, the Scottish Reformer — by which his name will be perpetuated. This work (begun in 1807, and published in 1811; enlarged edition in 1813), not only placed McCrie in the front rank of the authors of his day, but also produced a great change of popular sentiment in regard to Knox. It was distinguished by original, painstaking research, independence of judgment, judicial fairness of mind, and singular clearness of style; and its effect on the general estimate of Knox among men was not unlike that produced, in the succeeding generation in reference to Cromwell, by the publication of Carlyle’s monograph. It was received with the greatest favor by critics; its author was honored by the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh in 1813; and there is reason to believe that the impulse given by it to the study of the history of the Scottish Reformation, and the principles involved in the subsequent conflicts of the Scottish Church, did much to bring about that movement which resulted in the disruption of 1843. In 1817 McCrie reviewed the delineation of the Covenanters, by the author of Waverley, in Old Mortality, in a series of articles; and the effect of these was so great, that Scott felt it needful to reply to them under cover of an article in The Quarterly Review. McCrie continued through life to prosecute his historical studies; and the results of these were given to the world in his Life of Andrew Melville (1819, 2 vols.), History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy (1827), and his History of the Reformation in Spain together with an excellent memoir by his son, were republished in 1837, and along with them a volume of posthumous Sermons, a series of Lectures on the Book of Esther, and a collection of Miscellaneous Writings, including some valuable pamphlets, which he had given to the press. — Thomas, Jún., D.D., L.L.D., son of the biographer of John Knox; b. at Edinburgh, 1798; d. 1875. He was educated in his native city; succeeded his father in the pastorate of the Original Secession church in that city in 1860, and afterwards appointed professor of divinity by the members of his denomination. He joined the Free Church of Scotland at the union with it of the larger part of the Original Secession church in 1852, and was chosen in 1856 to the professorship of systematic theology in the English Presbyterian College at London. Besides the memoir of his father (1840), he wrote Sketches of Scottish Church History (1840), a Life of Sir Andrew Agnes, Annals of English Presbyterianism from the Earliest Period to the Present Time (1872), Story of the Scottish Church from the Reformation to the Disruption (1875), The Early Years of John Calvin (1880), and edited a new translation of The Provincial Letters of Blaise Pascal, with Historical Introduction and Notes (1849). He was also editor of The British and Foreign Evangelical Review from 1862 to 1870.

McDowell, John, D.D., b. at Bedminster, Somerset County, N.J., Sept. 10, 1790; d. in Philadelphia, Penn., Feb. 15, 1863. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey 1811; instigated pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Elizabethtown,
December, 1804; declined calls to other charges and to theological professorates, but finally became pastor of the Central Church, Philadelphia, June 3, 1832, and, from 1846 till his death, pastor of the Spring-Garden Church in the same city. “Few men have ever been connected with the American Presbyterian Church who have rendered it such manifold and varied services as Dr. John McDowell. He was a man of excellent piety.” He wrote his name indelibly upon the records of Elizabethtown. Eleven hundred and forty-four persons joined his church during the twenty-two years prior to his death, so that the number of communicants at the latter time was 1,183.

But he did not follow Calvin implicitly, or into conclusions not warranted by Scripture. His rule of truth was the plain statement of the word of God. As the church well says, “Whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith.” Holding fast this truth, whilst he maintained the doctrine of the divine sovereignty, and believed the doctrines of grace in their fulness, he stopped short of those human limitations, which, although perfectly logical, are unscriptural.

The term “evangelical,” which satisfied him, exactly describes a system of dogmatical teach
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ling which is based upon, strictly follows, and is consistent with, the evangel of our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles. Evangelical is descriptive of that system of doctrine which is defined in the Thirty-nine Articles of religion. It inspires the whole teaching of the liturgy of the church of which he was a member. Such evangelism is the pervading element in the Memorials written by Canon Carus. It is refreshing, in this age of negations, to listen to a teacher who not only knew in whom he believed, but what he believed, and who was always ready to declare it with unmistakable distinctness. The Memorials are fragrant with the "sweet spices" of the name and graces and love of the Saviour of sinners, the "Crucified." For the central thought, the sum and the substance, of Bishop McIlvaine's teaching, was "Jesus Christ and him crucified."

As an Ecclesiastic.— Whilst the bishop held strong views of the scriptural and historical authority of episcopacy, he maintained a liberal estimate of the breadth of the Church of Christ. He held that it consists of all God's faithful people. Whilst his conviction of the value of episcopal regimen was distinct and strong, he overcame the temptation to uncharitable judgments of those who differed from him. Bishop McIlvaine's views of the falsity of what is known as "Sacramentarianism" were very positive. He writes, the sacraments are "not to be seen, but to be seen through." Those words are golden. He taught that neither our Lord nor his apostles made a mystery of the sacraments, much less a mist.

As a Diplomat.— Bishop McIlvaine was a diplomat as well as a theologian and administrator. That phase of his eventful life has necessarily been less widely observed than the others, which were more in accord with his ecclesiastical mission. Yet his diplomatic mission was entirely in accord with his ministry of the gospel of peace; for it tended to prevent war between England and America at a crisis of civil strife.

Capt. Wilkes, commander of the United-States screw-of-war "San Jacinto," learning that the Confederate envoys, Messrs. Mason and Slidell, were on their way to Europe in the English mail-steamer "Trent," seized them, with their secretaries, from under the protection of the English flag. Under the circumstances President Lincoln deemed it important for the public interest, that citizens of known high standing should visit England, to counteract erroneous impressions. The high estimation in which Bishop McIlvaine was held abroad induced the President and secretary of the United States to request his good offices in England at this crisis. Two other distinguished citizens were associated with him in this mission.

Mr. Thurlow Weed, and Bishop Hughes of the Roman-Catholic Church. Of the success of this diplomacy the bishop, on returning home, records,—

"I had the comforting and gratifying assurance of many in England (including our minister, Mr. Adams) that my mission had been productive of great good, and when I reached Washington this seemed to be the opinion among the members of the government. "If I have been enabled thus to serve my beloved country in these days of her deep tribulation, I count it one of the greatest honors and privileges of my life."

As an Administrator.— He entered on the care of the diocese of Ohio in 1832. It was disordered by the sudden rupture of its relations with its first bishop. The institutions at Gambier were in peril. There were only forty parishes in the diocese (nine of them feeble), and only seventeen clergymen. The State was still "traveling was difficult, always slow, often dangerous. The parishes were scattered over every portion. There was little communication between the dispersed members of a feeble communion, all the communicants numbering not quite nine hundred; and there were some unhealed breaches of charity even among these. Seldom has a bishop entered on a more difficult task. At the end of his work, after forty years, the diocese consisted of 128 parishes, 106 clergymen, 10,000 communicants, and probably 50,000 souls; whereas only 40 parishes existed in 1832.

But no statistics can present the general agreement in doctrine, and the delightful spiritual accord, which characterized the diocese during the major part of those forty years. There were divisions and diversities, of course. Absolute agreement among all members of so large a diocese is impossible: it would imply such a stagnation as would indicate disease or death. He labored that what are known as evangelical principles should prevail, and that diversities therefrom should never exceed the limits of the standards. He labored that all parishes and all the clergy should conform to outward observances as ruled by the canons and liturgy, and neither by defect nor by excess violate external unity and order. He succeeded to a degree which might almost be claimed as complete. The purpose of administration is to maintain the privilege of all alike under the laws, and to secure to all the peaceful enjoyment of every lawful privilege. For this purpose it is necessary to maintain the integrity of the law as the safeguard for all. Such being the duty and responsibility of the episcopal office, Bishop McIlvaine's administration was a marked success.

The bishop's judgment was generally accepted as law. The wisdom and tact, the firmness and moral power, of the administrator, was manifested in preventing strife, in settling controversies before they became public, in satisfying conflicting interests before they reached the point of contention. Here the greatest skill of an executive displays itself. He has attained the summit of the moral power, of the administrator, was manifested in preventing strife, in settling controversies before they became public, in satisfying conflicting interests before they reached the point of contention. Here the greatest skill of an executive displays itself. He has attained the summit of the moral power, of the administrator, was manifested in preventing strife, in settling controversies before they became public, in satisfying conflicting interests before they reached the point of contention. Here the greatest skill of an executive displays itself. He has attained the summit of the moral power, of the administrator, was manifested in preventing strife, in settling controversies before they became public, in satisfying conflicting interests before they reached the point of contention. Here the greatest skill of an executive displays itself. He has attained the summit of the moral power, of
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The arena of public controversy. His logical acumen here exhibited itself, accompanied by such a thorough mastery of all the elements properly belonging to the topic, and such force in presenting them, that his conclusions were invariably accepted by the diocese, and generally by the church. In a discussion of the greatest moment, arising out of the publication of the Oxford Tracts, the calm decision of the church at large, after years of reflection and experience, has undoubtedly affirmed the bishop's judgment, and vindicated his foresight.

As a Preacher. — His great power in the pulpit was in the manifestation of the gospel. His main topics were redemption, the one thought, Jesus Christ and him crucified. The range which it covered was as large as every spiritual need, and every doctrine of it, the efficacy of it, the completeness of it. How he rung the changes on that chime! — ever varied, ever the same; the melodies many, the harmony one; the one thought, Jesus Christ and him crucified. His special themes were, the ruin of our nature by sin, and the atonement, — the vicarious sacrifice of Christ. His remarkably clear conceptions of these two founded his sermons, and gave a character to his preaching very like that of St. Paul. He was thoroughly imbued with the principles affirmed in the Epistles to the Romans.

In later years his sermons were largely extempore; and, both in his written and extempore discourses, he has seldom been surpassed for the steady march of logical, compact, easy, melodious, and intensely convincing eloquence.

G. T. BEDELL (Bishop of the Diocese of Ohio).

McKENDREE, William, D.D., Bishop of the Methodist-Episcopal Church; b. in King William County, Va., July 6, 1857; d. near Nashville, Tenn., March 5, 1854. He served in the Revolutionary army for several years, and as an adjutant and commissary was present at the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown, 1781. He was converted in 1787, joined the Methodists, and became an itinerant preacher in 1788; in 1796 was made presiding elder; in 1801 given general superintendence of the Western Conference; in 1806 transferred to the Cumberland District; in 1808 elected bishop. He was one of the principal founders of their denomination in the West, and "venerated as one of the most able and saintly men" in its annals. His Life was written by Bishop Paine, Nashville, 1839, 2 vols.; new edition, 1875. See also the sketch by Dr. T. O. Summers, in MacCracken's Lives and Leaders of our Church Universal, pp. 623-651.

McLEOD, Alexander, b. in the Island of Mull, Scotland, June 17, 1774; d. in New-York City, Feb. 17, 1833. He came to America in 1792; was graduated from Union College, Schenectady, 1793; from 1801 till his death was pastor of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church, New-York City. By reason of his eloquence he obtained great fame. His publications embrace Negro Slavery unjustifiable, New York, 1802, new edition, 1860; Lectures on the Principal Prophecies of the Revolution, 1814; View of the Late War, 1813; The Life and Power of True Godliness, 1816. His Memoir was written by Samuel B. Wylie, New York, 1855. — His son, Xavier Donald (b. in New York City, Nov. 17, 1821; d. near Cincinnati, July 20, 1865), was graduated at Columbia College; entered the Episcopal ministry in 1845, but while in Europe (1850-52) he became a Roman Catholic. On his return he took up a literary life, until, in 1857, he became professor of rhetoric and belles-lettres at Mount St. Mary's College near Cincinnati, and was ordained priest in the Roman Church. He wrote much in prose and poetry. Among his books may be mentioned a Life of Mary Queen of Scots, New York, 1857; and History of Decision to the Virgin Mary in North America, 1866, 5th ed., 1868. The latter work contains his Memoir, by J. B. Purcell.

McVICKAR, John, b. in New-York City, Aug. 10, 1787; d. there (in Royalmingdale) Oct. 29, 1868. He was graduated at Columbia College 1804; entered the Episcopal ministry 1811; was professor of moral philosophy, rhetoric, and belles-lettres 1817-57, and of natural and revealed religion 1857-64, and afterwards professor emeritus, and chaplain at Governor's Island. He wrote, besides other works, pamphlets, and articles, A Domestic Narrative of the Life of Samuel Bard, D.D., 1822; Memoir of Edmund Dorr Griffin, 1881; Early Years of Bishop Hobart, 1884; and Professional Years of Bishop Hobart, 1870. The Lives of Dr. McVickar by his son, W. A. McVickar, D.D., New York, 1871.

McWHORTER, Alexander, D.D., b. in Newcastle County, Del., July 15, 1734; d. in Newark, N.J., July 20, 1867. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey 1752; studied theology under William Tennent; became pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Newark, N.J., 1759. In 1764 he was sent by the synod of New York and Philadelphia to North Carolina on a mission, and in 1775 he was sent by Congress to western North Carolina to induce the Indians there to take up the Revolutionists' cause. In 1778 he became chaplain of Knox's Artillery Brigade. In 1779 he went to Charlotte, Mecklenburg County, N.C., to be pastor there, and also president of Queen's Museum College, afterwards Liberty Hall. But Cornwallis took the town. Dr. McWhorter lost his library; and in 1781 he returned to Newark, where he was re-installed. He took a prominent part in forming the constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. For thirty-five years he was a trustee of the College of New Jersey, and collected large sums for it after its buildings were burned (1802). He published several volumes of sermons.

MEADE, William, D.D., third bishop of the Protestant-Episcopal Church of Virginia; b. Nov. 11, 1789, in Clarke County, Va.; d. in Richmond, March 14, 1882. He was the son of Richard K. Meade, a favorite aide-de-camp of Gen. Washington's in the Revolutionary War. He entered Princeton College in 1806. It was during his last year in college that his religious views and experience assumed a decided character, and he formed the purpose of entering the ministry of the Episcopal Church. Out of a class of forty he was assigned, on his graduation, the valedictory. As there were no theological seminaries at that time, he prepared for the ministry under Rev. Walter Addison of Maryland, and was ordained by Bishop Madison, Feb. 24, 1811. His first charge was Christ Church, Alexandria, where Gen. Washington had frequently attended divine
service. Here, by the character of his preaching, he attracted members of Congress from Washington, only seven miles distant, among whom were John Randolph and James Milnor, afterwards rector of St. George's, New York. With John Randolph he had a correspondence on the subject of personal religion, which has been published. He was now zealously and successfully engaged in the revival of the Episcopal Church in Virginia, which had been left by the Revolution in the most discouraging state. He had much to do with the election of Richard C. Moore, D.D., of New York, as bishop. In 1829 he was elected bishop of Pennsylvania by a majority of one clerical vote, but from some technicality the election was not confirmed. In 1829 he was elected assistant bishop to Bishop Moore, with the right of succession from the death of Bishop Moore in 1841, he became bishop, and continued until his death, March 14, 1892.

He regarded with favor, and sustained with zeal, the American Bible and Tract Societies, and often and earnestly commended them to the patronage of his diocese. In the intervals from his abundant labors as bishop he was never idle. Besides many sermons, he published Lectures on the Pastoral Office; The Bible and the Classics; and Old Churches, Ministers, and Families of Virginia, a work of great research and value.

JOSEPH PACKARD.

MEALS AND BANQUETS AMONG THE HEBREWS. The principal meal seems to have been taken at night, as we conjecture from Exod. xvi. 12, xviii. 12, 13, Ruth iii. 7; and the other meal not before nine o'clock A.M. (Acts ii. 15), and on Sabbath, according to Josephus (Life, § 54), not before noon, when the synagogue service was over. It is every way probable that the Jews ate very little meat, bread and fruits constituting with them, as with the modern Orientals, the principal diet. Primitively the Jews sat (i.e., probably squatted on the ground) at meals; but contact with other nations, especially with the Babylonians, refined their idea of life; and hence Amos (eighth century B.C.), inveighing against the luxury which enervated the upper classes, speaks of those "that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches." The New Testament notices show that the custom of reclining at meals, at least where there were guests, had become national. This fact is brought out most prominently in John xiii. 23 ("There was at the table reclining in Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved"), xxi. 20 referring to the same fact (the disciple who "leaned back on his breast").

The tables were in number, arranged as three sides of a parallelogram; so that the servants could serve the guests from inside the open space. The most honorable place was the first at the right-hand table (Matt. xxiii. 6). The hands were washed before and after meals,—a custom dictated by decency; for the food was taken in the fingers. In daily life it is probable that both sexes ate together. Grace was said before and after meals (1 Sam. ix. 13; Deut. viii. 10). Our Lord was particular in following the custom (Matt. xv. 38; Luke ix. 16; John vii. 11).

Frequent mention is made in the Bible of banquets. These were held, as among us, in celebration of some special event. Richard of the "Restorer" of the Episcopal Church in Virginia, which had been left by the Revolution in the most discouraging state. He had much to do with the election of Richard C. Moore, D.D., of New York, as bishop. In 1829 he was elected bishop of Pennsylvania by a majority of one clerical vote, but from some technicality the election was not confirmed. In 1829 he was elected assistant bishop to Bishop Moore, with the right of succession from the death of Bishop Moore in 1841, he became bishop, and continued until his death, March 14, 1892.

He regarded with favor, and sustained with zeal, the American Bible and Tract Societies, and often and earnestly commended them to the patronage of his diocese. In the intervals from his abundant labors as bishop he was never idle. Besides many sermons, he published Lectures on the Pastoral Office; The Bible and the Classics; and Old Churches, Ministers, and Families of Virginia, a work of great research and value.
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JOSEPH PACKARD.
ing influence of the Spirit. The Roman-Catholic Church modifies or destroys the efficacy of these means. The priesthood whose administration is necessary to the validity of the sacraments, and by withholding the Bible from the laity; or adds to them by increasing the number of the sacraments to seven, and representing the Lord's Supper as the Mass, in which the bread and wine are transmuted into Christ's body and blood. It also differs from the Protestant Church by teaching that the efficacy of the sacraments depends upon the proper priestly administration, and not upon the faith of the participant; so that they work in opere operato. On the other hand, the Lutheran and Anglican communions have laid a greater emphasis upon the necessity of the use of the sacraments than the Reformed communions, but not upon the reading and preaching of the Word and the use of prayer, especially extemporary and family prayer. For further details see Baptism, Lord's Supper, etc., and the theologies of Hodge (ii. 466 sqq.), Van Oosterzee (li. 730 sqq.), and Donker.

MEASURES. See Weights and Measures.

MEAT, MEAT OFFERINGS. The word "meat" in the Authorized Version means food in general; and the word "offering" designates something offered to God. A "meat-offering" was an "unbloody offering," consisting of a cake made of flour and oil. The law respecting its preparation and use is found in Lev. ii., vi., xiv. 20, and the offerings on the great day of atonement (Num. xxix. 9, 10), the Sabbath offering (Lev. x. 20) and of Levites (Num. viii. 8), the cleansing of the leper (Lev. xiv. 20), and the termination of the Nazaritic vow (Num. vi. 15). See Offerings.

MECCA, the birthplace of Mohammed, and by that reason the chief of the holy cities of Islam, is situated in latitude 21° 30' north, longitude 40° 8' east, in a narrow and barren valley in the Arabian province of Hedjaz, sixty-five miles east of Jiddah, its port on the Red Sea, and about two hundred and fifty miles south of Medina. It has no manufactures and no commerce. Its forty-five thousand inhabitants depend almost entirely on the pilgrims who come to pray in its celebrated mosque (its only public building), and to kiss the black stone of the Kaabah; and the whole city seems to have been constructed for this purpose alone. All houses being simply a kind of tenement houses. In 1875 the number of pilgrims is said to have risen to about two hundred thousand; but, generally speaking, it is decreasing. (See Kaabah.) See R. E. Burton: Mecca and Medina, London, new edition, 1879-80, 2 vols.; T. F. Keane: Six Months in Mecca, London, 1881.

MECHITAR, MECHITARISTS. See Mkhitar.

MECHTHILDIS is the name of two female saints. — Mechthildis of Hackeborn, b. 1240; d. 1310; a sister to "the great Gertrude;" entered the Benedictine convent of Heilts, near Eisleben, when she was seven years old, and began to have visions after the death of her sister in 1290. Her visions were written down by two of her friends, and circulated widely under the name of Liber spiritualis gratiae. — Mechthildis of Magdeburg, b. 1214; d. 1277; belonged to a noble family, but left the paternal house when she was twenty-three years old; lived for a long time at Magdeburg, and settled finally in the convent of Heilts. Her visions, originally written down in Low German, were translated into High German (Fließende Licht d. Gethed) by Heinrich von Nordenlingen, Basel, 1344, and into Latin (Luz divinatia) by her confessor, Heinrich von Halle. See Revelatio Gertrudiana et Mechthildiana, edited by the Benedictines of Solesmes, Paris, 1877; Lubin: La Matelda de Dante, 1864; Preger: Dante al Matelda, Munich, 1873. Pregendorff.

MECKLENBURG, Ecclesiastical Statistics of. — I. Mecklenburg-Schwerin contained, according to the census of 1875, a population of 553,785 souls; of whom 548,206 were Lutherans, 2,258 Roman Catholics, 559 Jews, and 5736Friends. The Lutheran Church is a state establishment. At its head stands the chief of the state (the grand duke), who governs through his minister of education and public worship, and through an ecclesiastical council composed of two theologians and two jurists. The establishment comprises six bishoprics (the bishopswearing the title of superintendent), — Doberan, Güstrow, Malchin, Parchim, Schwerin, and Wismar, and 346 parishes, with 479 churches; one pastor in some cases celebrating service alternately in two different churches. On an average there belong 1,600 souls to each pastor, but the distribution is very unequal. The parish of Gischnow numbers only 223 souls, while that of St. Jacob in Rostock numbers 20,000 souls. The connection between the church and the school is very close. All school-inspection belongs to the superintendent and pastor, though subject to the authority of the minister of education and public worship. A rector of a public elementary school must in the cities be a candidatus theologis, and in the country a graduate from one of the two normal-schools, which are completely under the management of the church. — II. Mecklenburg-Strelitz contained, Dec. 1, 1879, 94,988 Lutherans, 265 Roman-Catholic, and 470 Jewish inhabitants. The constitution of the Lutheran Church is exactly the same in Mecklenburg-Schwerin. The church comprises only one superintendent and sixty-eight pastors, with a hundred and fifty-three churches. A. Pertz.

MEDARDUS, St., b. in 465; d. in 545; was elected bishop of his native city, Veromandum in Picardy, in 500, but removed the see to Noyon, which, as a fortified place, offered better protection against the attacks of the Barbarians. In 552 he was also elected bishop of Tournay; and for the rest of his life he administered both dioceses; very active and very successful in
spreading Christianity among the Pagans. He is commemorated by the Roman-Catholic Church on June 8. He is the patron of haymaking. His life was written in verse and in prose by Fortunatus, and in prose by Rabdodus. See Acts Censorum, Juni ii.

MEDE, Joseph, B.D., b. at Berden, in Essex, 1586; d. as a fellow of Christ College, at Cambridge, Oct. 1, 1638. He was reader of the Greek lecture on Sir Walter May's foundation, and eminent for learning and piety. He is best known by his Clavis Apocalyptica, Cambridge, 1627; English translation by R. More, The Key of the Revelation, London, 1643; new translation by B. Cooper, London, 1833. The work is highly esteemed: indeed, he was considered "as a man almost inspired for the solution of the apocalyptic mysteries," and the first to find the true way of interpretation. He advocated what is called the continuistic view of the apocalyptic prophecies; i.e., that they are predictive of progressive history, being partly fulfilled, partly unfulfilled. His Works (containing, besides the Clavis, several other apocalyptic studies, and a Life) were published, London, 1648-52, 2 vols.; 2d and best edition, 1664; 5th edition, 1686.

MEDHURST, Walter Henry, missionary, sino-mongol, linguist, and lexicographer; b. in London, 1796; d. there Jan. 24, 1857. From 1816 to 1856 he was in the Far East, doing missionary work in India, Java, and Borneo (1822-30), and China (1830-56). He mastered Javanese, Chinese, and Japanese, and a translation of the Chinese Bible into Chinese, and compiled a Chinese and English Dictionary, Batavia, 1842-43, 2 vols.; and English and Chinese Dictionary, Shanghai, 1847-48, 2 vols.; and wrote a classic upon China,— China, its State and Prospects, with Special Reference to the Christian Church, London, 1856.

MEDIA. MEDIAE (Hebrew, "םדה"; Assyrian, Madai; Persian, Mada; Medo-Elamitic, Mada; Greek, Ἔλαμ), a country and people mentioned in the Old Testament as follows, the Hebrew word being the same in almost all cases: Gen. x. 2 (Madai); Isa. xix. 17 (Medes); Jer. ii. 22 (id.); lii. 11, 28 (id.); 2 Kings xvii. 6, xviii. 11 (id.); Ez. vi. 2 (id.); Dan. v. 28 (id.); xi. [vi. 1] (Median, מַדָּא); vi. 8 [9] (Medes); 12 [13], 16 [16] (id.); vii. 20 (Medella; iia. i (Medes); xi. 1 (Mede, מַדָּא); Esth. i. 9 (Media); 14, 18 (id.); 19 (Medes): x. 2 (Media);— cf. Judith xvi. 10; 1 Macc. vi. 64, xiv. 1, 2;— Acts. ii. 9. The name is applied, as will be seen, much more often to the people than to the land inhabited by them. Its meaning is in dispute. Some identify it with the Accadian mada, Assyrian madu, "land" (Oppert, etc.); others give it an Aryan source, either deriving it from some known root, as Sanscrit madhya, "middle" (v. Bohlen, etc.), or, more wisely, refraining from any opinion as to its precise etymology (Spiegel, Lenormant, etc.).

The boundaries were somewhat different at different periods. According to our earliest information, the northern limit was at or near the Caspian (Elbur) range of mountains, just south of the Caspian Sea; on the east was Parthis; on the north-east, Scythia; on the south, Elam, on the west the Zagrus Mountains or the territory bordering on these. Later, the country stretched into Atropatene on the northwest, the term "Great Media" still having application to the narrower limits. Later still, all boundaries were lost; and the land of Media is at present divided into various provinces, and merged in the Persian Empire, forming its northwestern portion. The chief cities of ancient Media were Ecbatana (Hamadan) in the southeast (see ECRATANA), and Ragâ (Rhagae) in the north-east. The lowlands of the whole district were fertile, and Media was famous for its horses (cf. Strabo, XI. 52 ff.).

People. During the time of the political importance of Media, its population consisted of two distinct elements,—a non-Aryan (the earlier inhabitants) and an Aryan, less in numbers, but composed of the conquerors and rulers of the former. It is probably true of the "Medes" so often mentioned in honorable connection with the Persians in the Bible, in the Achiemenidan inscriptions, and by Greek writers. Herodotus (VII. 82) even tells us that the Medes (and this must refer to the ruling element of the population) called themselves Μαδαί. The same writer (I. 101) divides the Medes into six γένεσις, viz.: Aryan, Σκύθες, Αράμας, Βαβυλῶν, Μάγις. The last was probably an order or class, rather than a tribe, and to this class the priests appear to have belonged.

Languages. These were, at least, two in number. The Aryan language of the dominant race is preserved to this day in its original form, and "Medo-Elamite," "Medic," "Proto-Medic," and "Medo-Elamitic;" the last being probably the most exact designation.

Religion. In the Persian period the religion of the Medes was not essentially different from that of the Persians. Trustworthy information is greatly lacking as to earlier times; but the sun-god Mithras was held in especial honor. The moon and Venus were also worshiped; and so were fire, earth, the winds, and water (Strabo, XV. 732). The office of priest involved a knowledge of esoteric doctrines, and descended from father to son; particular functions often belonging to particular families.

History. The early history of Media is obscure. We do not know when the Aryan invasion took place, and authorities are much divided as to the date when the land became a political unit. The statement of Diodorus Siculus (II. 1), in regard to Pharnos, King of the Medes (c. B.C. 1280), is quite as untrustworthy as his mention of Ninus, king of Assyria, the conqueror of both Medes and Persians. We know nothing authentic of the empire of the Medes until the tenth century B.C. Then we have in the Assyrian records scattered notices of Media, by Shamash-Anna II. (probably; he says, not "Madi," but "Amadai:" see Schnader, Die Keilschriften und Geschichtsforschung, 1878, pp. 175 ff.), who reigned B.C. 858-829, by Shamash-Rammanu (823-810), and by Ramman-Nirari (810-781). At
length we find Tiglath Pileser II. (B.C. 745–727) conquering and annexing to the Assyrian Empire at least part of Media. Sargon (B.C. 722–705) transmitted captives to the cities of Media (cf. 2 Kings xxvii. 7). Similar reports come from Senacherib (B.C. 705–681) and Esarhaddon (681–668). Media does not appear as a single consolidated power until the reign of Assurbanipal (B.C. 668–626); and this, joined with the plural expression “all the kings of the Medes” (Jer. xxv. 25; cf. ii. 11, 28), seems to indicate that the petty chiefs of the country were not until then united under one headship. Herodotus’ statements, therefore (i. 90 ff.), in regard to King Delekes (B.C. 708–636) and the hundred and twenty-eight years of Median dominion over Upper Asia, can hardly be credited. Phraortes (B.C. 655–633), Kyaxares (633–593), and Astyages (593–550), are the only Median kings whose reign is fully established by Persian and Greek authorities. (On “Darius the Mede,” see DARIUS.)

Under Phraortes, Media became a formidable power; and his son Kyaxares, in league with Nabopolassar of Babylon, succeeded, toward the end of the seventh century B.C., in capturing Nineveh, and putting an end to the Assyrian Empire. Under Astyages, his son and successor, the kingdom of Media was not only not extended, but even declined. The king himself had neither the love nor the confidence of his people; and when, in B.C. 550, the army of Cyrus, “King of Anzan,” came face to face with that of Astyages, the soldiers of the latter betrayed their monarch, and Cyrus entered Ecbatana, and became master of the whole country. (See CYRUS.) Henceforth the history of Media is merged in that of other kingdoms,—the Persian, Syrian, and Parthian.

though most die between the third and sixth day, before appearance of boils: it has prodromal symptoms, is accompanied with fever and delirium, and very fatal (Lev. xxvi. 25; Deut. xxviii. 21, 27, 60, etc.). The “emoruds” spoken of in 1 Sam. v. 6, etc., are thought by some to be the plague, by others, the bites of a poisonous insect (Sopoluba fatalis), hemorrhoids, or dysentery.

(14) Boils (2 Kings xx. 7, etc.). (15) Sunstroke (2 Kings iv. 19, etc.). (16) Gonorrhoea (Lev. xv. 2). (17) Meteorrhagia, or uterine hemorrhage (Luk. xiv. 21; see art.). (18) Scurvy (Gen. xx. 18, etc.). (19) Aes’ foot disease, either oedema, or gout (2 Chron. xvi. 12). (20) Elephantiasis (?) (Job ii. 7). (21) Dropsy (Luke xiv. 2). (22) Cancer (2 Tim. iii. 17). (23) Worms, may have been phthiriasis (lice) (2 Macc. x. 5-8). (24) Leprosy (see art.). (25) Other varieties of skin diseases, as the itch, which rendered its victim unfit for the priesthood (Deut. xxviii. 27). (26) Apeoplexy, as in the case of Nabal (1 Sam. xviii. 37, etc.). (27) Lethargy (Gen. lii. 21; 1 Sam. xvii. 12). (28) Paralysis, paley (Matt. iv. 24; Acts iv. 21). (29) Melancholia, madness (Deut. xxxii. 28, etc.). (30) Leping (Lev. xix. 28, etc.). (31) Nervous exhaustion is supposed to have been the trouble with Timothy, causing his stomach disorder, for what food should be eaten, and the manner of fasting-saliva (Mark viii. 23), we meet with. The only thing like a prescription found in the Bible is that for the holy anointing oil, consisting of myrrh, cinnamon, sweet calamus, cassia, and olive-oil (Exod. xxx. 23-25).

II. Talmudic Medicine. — Consequent upon the successive destructions of Jerusalem, and the carrying-away of the people into captivity, the rabbis were brought in contact with the medical thought of other people: hence their ideas were modified, and we find the Talmudic medicine to be conditioned by the influence of the Greek school. The medical part of the Talmud may be called a collection of minutes of the meetings of the medical rabbis, when they discussed their art, and of their writings (see art. Talm). The rabbis, in their synagogues, and because somewhat systematized, the rabbis having learned something of anatomy and pathology, though even in these branches their knowledge was largely derived from the study of disease in the brute creation. The reading of the medical part of the Talmud may be called a collection of minutes of the meetings of the medical rabbis, when they discussed their art, and of their writings (see art. Talm). The rules of hygiene were carefully laid down, the only thing like a prescription found in the Bible is that for the holy anointing oil, consisting of myrrh, cinnamon, sweet calamus, cassia, and olive-oil (Exod. xxx. 23-25). Of anatomy they knew the essential parts, but of course had no knowledge of histology. They recognized the beginning of the spinal cord at the Foramen magnum, at the base of the skull, and its ending in the Cauda equina, near the end of the spinal column. They thought that the mesentery consisted of two coats; that the lungs were enclosed in two membranes, and the fat about the kidneys in its own skin. In the first century A.D., one rabbi dissected the body of a prostitute, and said that he found two hundred and fifty-two bones (two hundred is the correct number). As to physiology, they experimented in taking out the spleen, and said that the operation was not fatal. They distinguished between albumen and seminal fluid, saying, that, by boilering, the first coagulated, and the second liquefied.

Surgery. — They considered dislocation of the femur, contusion of the skull, perforation of the lungs, oesophagus, small intestines, stomach, and gall bladder, injuries of the spine, pia mater, and trachea, and fractures of the ribs, as fatal, unless surgical help was at hand. They thought that polyph of mouth and nose were sent as punishment for past sins. They also recognized stone in the bladder. Bleeding was done by the barbers, as it is in the East to-day.

Pathology. — Diseases were supposed to be either constitutional, acquired from injurious influences working on the body, or due to magic. Among
other diseases, they recognized jaundice as due to retained gall; dropsy, as due to retained urine, and divided it into three kinds; viz., ascites (general dropsy), ascites (abdominal dropsy), and tympanites (really a collection of gas distending the abdomen). Hydrocephalus internus was thought to be fatal; hydrocephalus externus not necessarily so. Tearing and atrophy of the kidneys, suppuration of the spine, cirrhosis of the lungs, were declared to be fatal. Their pathology was founded on observations made on animals, and the Talmud is full of long discussions over these points. As critical symptoms, they regarded sweating, sneezing, discharge from the bowels, pollutions, and dreams prophesying a happy ending to the disease.

Obstetrics. — Pregnancy was said by the Talmud to last from 270 to 273 days (now reckoned at from 280 to 380 days), and to be unrecognizable before the fourth month. It was thought that an eight-months child could not live; — a popular idea at the present time, but false. Casuarin section, turning, erosion, abortion, are operations (if of, and medicinal) that were known; the latter supposed to be caused by intercourse of a demon or animal with a woman, or a man with an animal. By the sixth week they thought that the genitals, mouth, nose, and teeth were formed; by the seventh week, the upper and lower extremities; by the third month, or third and a half, the first hair. Out of the male element the bones, sinews, brain, and white of the eye were produced; while from the female element came the skin, flesh, hair, black of the eye, etc.; but God gave the soul. Menstruation in children was known, although it is of rare occurrence.

Therapeutics. — Besides certain drugs, magic was employed. Any thing that a patient specially craved to eat he was given. Other dietetic rules were: before the fortieth year, eat more, after that, drink more; after meals, eat salt; after wine, take water; not too much working, walking, sleeping, loving, or drinking; regular stool; frequent baths, anointings, and washings. They gave opium for woe, cinchon for stomach disorders, milk drawn directly from the udder of a goat for dyspepsia, emetics for nausea, injection of turpentine for stone in the bladder, and warm foot and hand baths in the evening for eye troubles; venesection, assafetida, etc. Besides the drugs already mentioned, use was made of beer, vinegar, honey; various oils, as opobalsamum (balm of Gilad), olive, myrrh, roses, palma christi, walnut, sesame, colocynth, and fish; figs, dates, apples, pomegranates, pistachio-nuts; almonds from Egypt; wheat, barley, and other grains; garlic, leeks, and some other herbs; mustard, pepper, coriander-seeds, ginger, preparations of beet, fish, etc., steeped in wine or vinegar; whey, eggs, salt; wax and suet in plasters; gall of fish for inflamed eyes; ashes, bat's blood, etc.

Though here may be said to end the period covered by the scope of this article, it should be added, that, long after the destruction of the Hebrews as a nation, the Jewish physicians were in high repute, and became prominent as body-physicians of more than one mighty monarch.

LIT. — *Smith: Dictionary of the Bible, s.v. Disease, Medicine, Priests, Fevers, etc.; Herzog: Real-Encyklopädie, s.v. Krankheiten; Lichtemberger: Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. Médecine; B. J. Wunderbar: Biblioth.-talmudische Medicine, Riga and Leipzig, 1850-80; Bass: Geschichte der Medicin, Stuttgart, 1876; Rabbinowicz: La Médicin du Thalmud, Paris, 1880. G. T. Jackson, M.D.

Medinah, the burial-place of Mohammed, and by that reason the second of the holy cities of Islam, is situated in latitude 24° 50' north, longitude 38° 51' east, in the Arabian province of Hedjaz. It contains a large mosque with the mausoleum of Mohammed, and is annually visited by a great number of pilgrims. It has about fifteen thousand inhabitants. See Burton: Mecca and Medinah, new edition, London, 1870-80.

Medler, Nikolaus, b. at Hof, in Voigtländ, 1502; d. at Bernburg, Aug. 24, 1551. He studied at Erfurt and Wittenberg, and established a school at Eger, but came into conflict with the city authorities because he taught his pupils Luther's doctrines; was appointed preacher in his native place, but had to leave because his preaching was too sharp; lived several years in Wittenberg as chaplain to the wife of the lady L. by the sev'ls. He was made professor of theology, and preached there, and for many years he stood as the leader of that opposition which Bern offered to all attempts at reconciling the Swiss and German Reformations. But in the synod of 1537 the proceedings of Butzer were recognized, and the censure which Megander had drawn up was altered in unionistic spirit. Provoked, Megander gave up his position in Bern, and retired to Zürich, where he was made dean at the cathedral. He left commentaries to various parts of the Scriptures. See Hunschenher: Konflikte zwischen Zwingli, Luther und Calvin in Bern, Bern, 1842. Gütermeyer.

Megapolensis (the Hellenized form of Van Mekelenburg), Joannes, b. at Koedycyk, Holland, 1603; d. in New York, Jan. 24, 1670. He came to America, 1642, on the invitation, and at the expense, of the patroon of Rensselaerwyck, who employed him as a frontier missionary at a salary of eleven hundred guilders ($440). He remained with the patroon until 1649, meanwhile laboring among the Mohawk Indians, whose language he learned, and many of whom joined his church.

He was thus the first missionary among the Indians, preceding Eliot by three years. From
MEGHIDDO, a city of Manasseh, yet situated within the borders of Issachar. Before the Conquest it was a royal city of Canaan (Josh. xii. 21).

It is generally identified with the present Lejjun (called by the Romans "Legio"), on the southeast edge of the plain of Esdraelon, six miles from Carmel; but Conder suggests Mejedda, ten miles from Jenin. This places the Valley of Megiddo, memorable as the scene of the deadly wounding of Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 29; comp. 2 Chron. xxxv. 22-24), in the valley between Jesreel and Bethshean.

MEISNER, Balthasar, b. in 1587; d. Dec. 29, 1626: studied at Wittenberg, Giessen, Strassburg, and Tubingen, and was in 1613 made professor of theology at Wittenberg. His Philosophia sobria (6th ed., 1621), written with a view to the prevailing tendencies of logical studies in his time, was much read; and his Pia desideria, dictated to his hearers shortly before his death, and published anonymously at Frankfort, 1679, shows that he had a sharp eye for the deficiencies of the church.

MEKHITARISTS, The, form one of the noblest congregations of the Roman-Catholic Church, and have developed a literary activity which may fairly be compared to that of the Congregation of St. Maur. They received their name from the founder of the order, Mekhitar, b. at Sebaste, in Lesser Armenia, Feb. 7, 1676; d. in Venice, April 27, 1749. In his fourteenth year he entered the monastery of the Holy Cross near his native place, and afterwards he studied the Scriptures and the Fathers under the guidance of Edshumiazin, the residence of the Armenian patriarch, and the seat of Armenian learning. He had heard, however, of Europe and Rome, and he longed to go there. In 1695 he actually set out on the voyage. At Aleppo, where he stayed for some time, he became acquainted with the Jesuit missionary Antoine Beauvilliers. But in Cyprus he was overtaken by a violent fever, which compelled him to give up the undertaking, and return to Sebaste. In 1696 he was ordained priest; and the great object to which he had decided to devote his life — the moral and religious education of his countrymen, and the reconciliation of the Armenian and the Roman-Catholic church — he immediately began to labor for by gathering pupils, and training missionaries. In 1700 he went to Constantinople; and his learning, as well as his great gifts as a preacher, soon secured for him a considerable influence among his countrymen. But, when it was discovered that he was making propaganda for a union between the Armenian and the Roman-Catholic church, persecutions began, and he was compelled to seek refuge with the French ambassador. Morea, at that time in the possession of the republic of Venice, was pointed out to him as the place best suited for such a missionary establishment as he intended to found; and in 1706 he settled at Modon, under the protection of the republic. In 1708 the monastery, church, and school were built, and filled with Armenian youths. In 1712 the order he established was confirmed by Pope Clement XI. But shortly after Morea was conquered by the Turks, and the whole establishment had to be removed with great loss to Venice in 1715. The city council, however, presented the order with the Island of San Lazzaro; and, before Mekhitar died, not only were a monastery and a church erected there, but a school and a printing-press were in active operation, and the whole establishment was in the most flourishing condition.

Besides a number of hymns which date back to his early youth, but which are still used in the Armenian Church, Mekhitar published an Armenian grammar and dictionary, commentaries on several books of the Bible, a text-book in religious education for children, and a complete translation of the Bible. His pupils followed his example with decided success. The Mekhitarists have put themselves in possession of most civilized languages; and while, on the one side, they publish translations into Armenian of European literature, and make their countrymen acquainted with the ideas and methods of civilization on the other side, also publish critical editions of the old Armenian literature, whereby they have made known to the world many classical works which exist only in Armenian translations, such as the works of Epiphan, Synesius, the De providentia of Philo, the Chronicle of Eusebius, etc. In material respect the order has also prospered. It has received great donations; and the mother institution of San Lazzaro has been able to establish branches in every place in Europe where Armenians are settled, especially in Vienna.


MELANCHTHON, Philipp, the eminent co-laborer of Luther in the German Reformation; b. at Bretten in Baden, Feb. 16, 1497; d. in Wittenberg, April 19, 1560. His original name was Schwarzerd ("black earth"), which, after the custom of the times, and on the advice of his great-uncle Reuchlin, the famous scholar and humanist, he exchanged for its Greek equivalent, Melanchthon. After the year 1531, the Reformer wrote his name Melanthion (Corpus Reform., i. p. xxxi), with a view, probably, to facilitate the pronunciation. In 1597 he entered the Latin school at Pforzheim, the residence of his grandmother, where he came into close contact with Reuchlin. In 1509 he passed to the university of Heidelberg, where he gave himself up assiduously to private studies, and in 1511 took the bachelor's degree. Being refused the following year the degree of master, on account of his youth, and in spite of his attainments, he went to the university of Tubingen, where he devoted himself, not only to the study of philosophy and the humanistic culture (humaniora), but to law, astronomy, and medicine.

In 1514 he took the master's degree, and began the study of theology. He continued at Tubingen, put forth editions of Terence (1519) and his Greek grammar (1518), and was engaged as proofreader for a time in the printing-establishment of Anselm. He also wrote the preface of the Epistles of St. Paul (1514).
Melanchthon, at the advice of Reuchlin, refused calls to Ingolstadt and Leipzig, but accepted the invitation to the chair of Greek in the university of Wittenberg, for which Reuchlin had recommended him. Arriving in Wittenberg Aug. 25, 1518, he delivered his inaugural on the necessity of a change in the course of academic studies (De corrigendis adolescendi studiis), in which it is apparent that he hoped to effect a reformation within the Church through the instrumentality of literary culture. But the influence of Luther led him to a deeper study of the Scriptures; and the religious discussion at Leipzig in 1519 — at which he was approached by the papal legate Campegius, urging him to renounce the Reformed doctrines — was approached by the papal legate Campegius, declaring that he had not renounced true Christianity, but had only denounced the abuses of the Pope and the Church. In this same year (December, 1521) Melanchthon published, incited Eck against him. In his reply to Eck (Defensio adv. Eiccanam inculpationem), he emphasized the authority of Scripture. His theological attainments were acknowledged by the gift of the degree of bachelor of theology. The disagreement of the faculty of theology was also conferred upon him; but he refused it, urging that it ought to be sought in a reverential spirit, and conferred with great care (Corpus Reform., iv. p. 811). In 1520 he was married to Catharine Krapp, a daughter of the master of Wittenberg, and himself incited the reformation, under the title, Loci communes rerum theologicarum, seu Hypotyposes theologicae. His next years were occupied largely with the German translation of the Bible (in which he was associated with Luther), and in the publication of commentaries. In 1524 he took a journey to Southern Germany in the interests of his health, and was approached by the papal legate Campegius, urging him to renounce the Reformed doctrines. Melanchthon refused, and wrote (Briefe, iv. 110), "Saturn well feels that your apology, Softstepper, dissimulates the article about purgatory, the worship of the saints, and especially about the Pope, the Antichrist" (Satan bene sensi apoloyiam vestram, Leisetreterin dissimulare articulam de purgatorio, etc.). Melanchthon subsequently wrote the Apology of the Augsburg Confession [also one of the symbols of the Lutheran Church], in which, provoked by the Roman-Catholic theologians, he is sharper than in the Augsburg Confession, and gives an admirable portrayal of the scriptural evidence for the evangelical doctrines. For several years after the Diet of August, Melanchthon performed his academic duties in comparative retirement. The most important theological work of this period was his Commentary on Romans (in 1534), to France, etc. In 1527 he was appointed at Cassel, 1534, to discuss the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He departed, in consequence of this discussion and previous studies, farther and farther from the views of Luther, and distinctly calls himself, at Cassel, a representative of other views (Corpus Reform., ii. p. 862). At a later period, Luther suspected him of leanings to the Zwinglian theory, but added that he would, in spite of this, "share his heart with Melanchthon." He was accused (1558) by Cordatus, preacher in Niemack, of affirming good works to be an indispensable condition of justification; and in 1558, in the second great edition of his Loci, he had departed farther from the Augustinian views, and emphasized his so-called Synergism. But, in a letter to Luther and his other colleagues, he says, "I never have wished to teach, nor have I taught, any thing about this controversy (good works) than that which you in common teach" (Corpus Reform., iii. 150). These discussions and differences embittered his stay in Wittenberg during the years 1538 to 1588;
so that he compares himself to Prometheus bound to Caucasus (Corpus Reform., iii. p. 806). About this time occurred the notorious case of the double marriage of Philip of Hesse. Melanchthon, as well as Luther (see Luther), regarded this an exceptional case, was present at the marriage, but urged Philip to keep the matter a secret. When it was made public, he and Melanchthon heard it, he was so overcome with regret, and pangs of conscience, that he sickened unto death, and was only delivered by the heroic courage of Luther in prayer, and the influence of his powerful will.

In October, 1546, he was present at the religious conference in Worms, and determined to be less sparing of the Papists than he had been in 1530 at Augsburg. The conference was afterwards adjourned to Regensburg (1541), and was followed by the Regensburg Interim. In 1548 he came into conflict with Luther on the definition in the statement prepared by Bucer and himself for the Reformation party in Cologne. Luther spoke out his feelings of disapprobation from the pulpit, and even went so far as to say that Melanchthon ought to be banished from Wittenberg, and led him to pray to be delivered from the rabies theologorum. The renewal of this discussion was occasioned by the triumph of the Calvinistic doctrine in the Reformed churches. He did not fully sympathize with Calvin, but had a view of his own, even before Calvin had any influence upon him. The personal presence of Christ, and the impartation of himself in the Lord's Supper, were matters of supreme importance with him; but he is not clear upon the point as to what relation the body and bread (physica conjunctio corporis et panis), and quotes approvingly the words of Macarius, that they who partake of the bread "eat spiritually the flesh of the Lord" (συνεφασμένος τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ), and quotes approvingly the words of Macarius, that they who partake of the bread. Melanchthon, as well as Luther, regarded this as mediated by a carnal impartation by Christ of himself. But, in considering his views of the Lord's Supper, we must not forget his bias for union, and how far he was willing to go in the modification of his views in order to promote it.

A few days before his death he wrote down his reasons for not fearing death. On the left hand of that paper were the words, "Thou shalt be delivered from sins, and be freed from the acri- mony and fury of theologians;" on the right, "Thou shalt go to the light, see God, look upon his Son, learn those wonderful mysteries which thou hast not been able to understand in this life," etc. He contracted a severe cold on a journey to Leipzig, which brought on an intermittent fever. His last hours were spent in prayer, and listening to passages of Scripture, especially Ps. xxiv.-xxvi., Isa. lxxi., John i., xvi., and Rom. v. Especially significant did the words seem to him, "His own received him, to them gave he power to become sons of God" (John i. 11, 12). When Peucer asked him whether there was any thing else he wanted, he replied, "Nothing but heaven." His body was laid at the side of Luther's, in the Schlosskirche in Wittenberg.

In estimating Melanchthon's influence we naturally think, first of all, of his share in developing the interests of the Protestant Church. As the colleague of Luther, he was especially called to confirm and carry on the work of the Reformation.
MELANCTHON.

upon the basis which Luther had laid. Providence joined these two men, so opposite in their natures, together in one great work, because they complemented each other. It required the heroism and creative power of a Luther to break with the ruling church. Melanchthon himself was led by the "inward impulse," the spirit of the Reformation and theology. He shrank from public activity, and would have preferred to confine himself to an academic and literary career. Without Luther, as Nitzsche has said, he would have "become and remained a second Erasmus;" although his deeper religious nature would have given him a more vital interest in the Reformation. He is continually longing for the retirement of a literary life, exclaiming, as early as 1529, "Oh, happy they who abstain from public affairs!" (Corp. Reform., i. 106). But it was essential that he should aid in the public work of the Reformation, and bring into use these very literary talents. If Luther scattered the sparks among the masses, it remained for Melanchthon by his logical and systematic writings, comparing the Protestant faith with the Catholic, to scatter the sparks among the cultured and learned, for the cause of the Reformation. Melanchthon's moderation and conservativetendency were, in general, as necessary, in their place, to the success of the German Reformation, as were Luther's heroism of mind and bold and military nature. Only Luther could have written the Ninety-Five Theses, the book addressed to the nobles of the German nation, etc., and have made the bold confession before the emperor at Worms; but Melanchthon had to write the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and the Loci Communes. These two men fully understood their own capabilities and the talents of each other. In 1520 Melanchthon writes (Corp. Reform., i. 160), "I will rather die than be torn from Luther." Luther he compares to Elijah (Corp. Reform., i. 448), and calls him "the man full of the Holy Ghost" (Corp. Reform., i. 282). In spite of the coldness which grew up between them in the last years of Luther's life, Melanchthon exclaims at Luther's death, "The man is the horseman and chariot of Israel who ruled the Church in this last age of the world" (Corp. Reform., vi. 59). On the other hand, Luther wrote of Melanchthon, in the Preface to Melanchthon's Commentary on the Colossians (1529), "I was bound to fight with rabbles and devils, for which reason my books are very belligerent. I am the rough pioneer, who must break road; but Master Philip comes along softly and gently, sows and waters heartily, since God has richly endowed him with gifts." A year before his death, Luther, in the Preface to his own works, praises Melanchthon's Loci above them, and calls him an instrument of God who had accomplished the very best in the department of theology, to the great rage of the Devil (Henkel: D. Verhältniss Luthers u. Melanchthons, 1880). In the last years of his life, although Luther was opposed to Melanchthon's views on the Lord's Supper and other questions, he controlled his feelings, and never said anything harsh against him. In their relations it cannot be denied that Luther was the more magnanimous, never once uttering a suspicion against Melanchthon's personal character; while Melanchthon did express now and then a want of confidence in Luther's. The latter, however, is to be explained by the fact that Melanchthon was the weaker nature, and at times felt the dominating personality of Luther to press like a yoke.

It is Melanchthon's moderation, conscientious prudence, and love of peace, which merit our respect for him as a Reformer. Nothing is easier than to be dazzled by the lightning and thunder of Luther's strong mind and personality. Melanchthon's moderation and caution were often, during his lifetime and after his death, explained as fear, and want of courage and character. But, if there is much to make such a view plausible, we must remember that he was always thinking more of the welfare of the Church than of his own. Nor did he lack in personal fortitude; and it is related how, a few years before his death, he dashed into a crowd of noisy students with a drawn dagger, in order to restore peace. In fact, it required no little courage to practise a cool moderation when all was in haste, especially in view of the calumnies of the Catholic party. But courage was only princes, but Melanchthon moderation and caution were often, during his lifetime and after his death, explained as fear, and want of courage and character. The distinction between Luther and Melanchthon in this regard is well brought out in Luther's letters to the latter (June, 1530): "To your great anxiety, by which you are made weak, I am a cordial foe; for the cause is not ours. It is your philosophy, and not your theology, which tortures you so,—as though you could accomplish anything by your useless anxieties. . . . So far as the public cause is concerned, I am well content and satisfied; for I know that it is right and true, and, what is more, it is the cause of Christ and God himself. For that reason, I am a bare spectator. If we fall, Christ will likewise fall; and, if I fall, I would rather fall with Christ than stand with the emperor."

Nothing is more prominent in Melanchthon's temper than its ironic tone. He was mild by nature, and shunned contentions and divisions. His was the churchly disposition; and he retained a profound and pious respect for the Church, and found it much more painful to think than irrecusable separation from it than Luther did. He laid emphasis upon the authority of the church Fathers, especially Augustine. He stood nearer the Catholic Church than Luther, because he laid more stress upon external discipline and ceremonies than Luther. His love of peace, and aversion to eclesiastical separation, led him to undertake conciliatory measures, which sometimes gave to his contemporaries the occasion for the charge of vacillation. It is in this very fact that the unionistic tendencies of our day in the churches of Germany love to strike their root. Kahnis, in his Gedächtnissrede (1880), has said, "The spirit of mediation in the Protestant Church is the inheritance which we are to preserve as coming from Melanchthon."

The literary talents and learning of Melanchthon were very great. His works betray an excellent gift of observation, a healthy though not always profound judgment, fine aesthetic tastes, and a happy memory. To these gifts he added an assiduous eagerness to get knowledge, and facility in the use of his tongue. His style was marked by clearness, vivacity, and a simple
In the department of ethics the influence of Melanchthon was greater and more lasting than in that of systematic theology. His three principal works in this line were, *Prolegomena to Cicero's De Officiis*, 1525; *Enarrationes librorum Ethicum Aristotelis*, 1529, etc.; and *Ethica doctrinae elementi*, 1550. In the last work he insists that ethics are to be "treated in the Church as well as by philosophy."

As an exegete he does not occupy the same prominent position as Luther. He assisted Luther to some extent in translating the Bible, and both the Books of the Maccabees in Luther's Bible and the Books of the Maccabees from the Greek are ascribed to him. His principal commentaries are, *Genesis, Proverbs, Daniel, The Psalms*, and especially those on the New Testament,— *Romans* (edited in 1522 against his will by Luther, then, in revised editions, 1532, 1540, 1550), *Colossians* (1527, revised editions, 1529, 1538, 1550), *Annotations in Evangelium Johannis* (1528). He lays down the principle, that every faithful theologian and interpreter of the Scriptures must be first a grammatical scholar, then a dialectician, and third a witness.

He insisted upon the literal sense in contrast to the four senses of the scholastics. His commentaries, however, are not grammatical, but full of theological and practical matter, confirming the doctrines of the Reformation, and edifying believers.

Melanchthon also exerted a wide influence in the department of *homiletics*, and has been regarded as the author, in the Protestant Church, of the methodical style of preaching which follows a subject. He himself keeps entirely aloof from all mere dogmatizing or rhetoric in the *Annotations in Evangelium Johannis* (1528), and his German sermons prepared for George of Anhalt. He never preached from the pulpit, [never having been ordained]; and his Latin sermons (*postilla*) were prepared for the Hungarian students at Wittenberg, who did not understand German. [By his *De Rhetorica* (1519) and *De Officiis Concionatoris* (1385), he exerted a profound influence upon the writers on rhetoric who followed him. See art. *Homiletics.*]

In the departments of philology and pedagogy Melanchthon's influence was also very great. He has been called *Preceptor Germaniae*. He laid great stress upon classical studies, and, by urging the study of the classic languages and models, became the founder of the learned schools of Germany. He advocated the close and necessary conjunction of the school and the church; the school being a nursery, or forecourt, of the church.

He was, in fact, the most active representative of the union of the evangelical church and the new culture. [He put forth editions of many classic authors, and published Greek and Latin grammars, which held their places in German schools for two centuries.]

Portraits still exist of Melanchthon,— by Holbein at Hanover, which is said to be the best ([Woltmann : Holbein, i.359], by Dürer (made in 1526, representing him with a large head and high forehead), and others. He was small and meagre in body, but had a bright and sparkling eye, which kept its color till the day of his death. He was never in perfectly sound health, and managed to perform as much work as he did only
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by reason of scrupulous care in his habits. His
domestic life was happy. He called his home "a
little church of God" (ecclesia Dei), and always
found there peace, and showed a tender solicitude
for his wife and children [two of whom survived
him—a daughter and a son], and not infrequent-
ly was he found rocking the cradle with one hand,
and holding a book in the other. In his public
career he sought not honor or fame, but earnestly
endeavored to serve the church and the cause of
truth. Humility was one of the signal features
of his character. In him we have no great, im-
pressive personality, winning his way by massive
strength of resolution and energy, but a noble
personality which we cannot study without loving
and respecting.

The opinions of Melanchthon's character and
work have undergone radical changes since his
death. One would deem it incredible, if it were
not well authenticated, that, in the beginning of
the seventeenth century, Leonard Hutter, in a
public discussion at Wittenberg at which Mel-
anchthon's authority was appealed to, tore down
a picture of the Reformer, which was hanging on
the wall, and in the sight of the audience trampled
it under foot. For more than a hundred years
after that, few voices spoke a word in his favor.

In 1760 the anniversary of Melanchthon's death was for the
first time celebrated, and from that time a differ-
ent view began to gain currency. In 1800 the
300th anniversary of Melanchthon's death was ob-
served with much enthusiasm all over Germany;
and, in spite of his weaknesses, he will continue
to be honored for his positive and not inconsid-
erable contributions to the Reformation.

Lit.—Melanchthon's Works were issued at
Bassel, 1541, 2 vols.; Wittenberg, 1562–64, 4 vols.
His Letters were edited by Manlius, Basel, 1565;
Peucker, 1565 (continued by Pezel, 1590); Saub-
bert, 1840, etc. The first complete edition of
his works by Bretschneider and Binseil, Halle, 1834–50, in the Corpus Reformatorum, vols.
1.–xxviii. Additional letters were edited by Bin-
seil: P. Melanch. Epigr., Halle, 1874; Biographies
by Lippmann: d. Glaubenlehre, 1866; Hirth:
Brand: Oratio in obitum Mel., Tübingen, 1590;
Adam: Vitae Theologorum, 1620; Ströbel: Me-
lanchthoniana, 1771; [F. A. Cox, 1815, 1817];
Küthe, 1830; Mathies, Altenburg, 1841; [Ledd-
errose, Heidelberg, 1847, Eng. trans. by Rosel,
Philadelphia, 1855, Planck: Procerum Germani-
ae, 1860]; C. Schmidt, Elberfeld, 1861; and of
a more popular character, by Hepp, Marburg,
1860; Meurer, Leipzig, 1890, 2d ed., 1899. On
Melanchthon's Theology, see Delbrück: Mel.
d. Glaubenlehre, 1826; Gale: Charakteristik Mel.
al. Theologen, Halle, 1810; Hepp: Dogmatik d.
Gotha, 1857; Flitt: Mel. Loci in ihrer Urgestalt,
Erlangen, 1804, 1805, 1808, Apology, 1873;
Herrlinger: Die Theol. Melanchthona, Gotha,
1872, 2d ed., 1876; C. Matthaei: Melanchthoniana, Zetsib, 1885. See also Binseil: Bibliotheca Melanchthon, Halle,
1868. [See arts. Augsburg Confession, Luther,
Marburg, etc.] Landereck. (Herrlinger.)

MELCHIADES, or MELIADES, Pope (July 2,
310–Jan. 10 or 11, 314), was an African by birth,
and buried in the baptistery of Calliaut. The
title of toleration by Galerius, the occupation of
Rome by Constantine, and the edict of toleration
by Constantine and Licinius, fall in his time. A
letter from Constantine to him, written in Gaul
in 313, is found in Eusebius: Hist. Eccl. x. 15, 18.
The decrees ascribed to him by the Liber Pontiff.
and Gratian are spurious.

MELCHITES, in contradistinction to Monophy-
sites, denoted the orthodox Christians living in
those provinces of the Roman Empire which
were conquered by the Arabs. The name, derived
from Ἰβ ("king"), referred to their allegiance
and respect for the Pope, if not to the empire. Its
name was treated with much more severity by the Arabs
than were the Monophysites.

MELCHIZEDEK, the priest of the Most High
God, and king of righteousness, is mentioned in
Gen. xiv. 17–20, Ps. ex. 4, Heb. vii. 1—6. He
met Abraham after his victory over the kings, and
offered him bread and wine, and blessed him.
Receiving a tithe of the spoil from Abraham, he
returned again into retirement, a true representa-
tive of the higher world of peace. We shall
consider here his city, his God, and his priest-
hood.

The Salem of which Melchizedek was king
(Gen. xiv. 18) has been identified with a city
called Salem, or Salumias, which Jerome states
was close by Scythopolis. He further states that
Melchizedek's palace was shown there (Ep. ad
Evagri.). Whity, Reland, Rosenmüller, Bleek,
Alford, Ewald, and others have adopted this view,
and refer to Salim (John iii. 29). It is better
to identify it with Jerusalem. In Ps. lxxxi., where
the word occurs again as the designation of a
place, it stands, to the empire. Its meaning
peaceful, made it an appropriate name for the
city. The analogy between the names Melchize-
dek and Adonizek, the king of Jebus (the old
name of Jerusalem) in the time of Joshua (Josh.
x. 1), also favors this view. Abraham would
naturally have taken the road by the city in
returning to Hebron. The Targums, Josephus,
Jerome, at first (Quast. in Gen.), and most of
modern critics, adopt this view.

The God whom Melchizedek worshiped bore
the name of El (the original divinity of the Pho-
nicians, Babylonians, and other Shemitic peoples)
and Eljon (Most High). He is the "possessor of
heaven and earth." These designations indicate
that Melchizedek was a monotheist, and wor-
shipped essentially the same God as Abraham,
who recognized him as a priest, and applied to
Jehovah the same appellation, Most High (Gen.
xiv. 22).

Melchizedek was a priest not merely by virtue of
his being the head of a family, but as being a
prince; all princes, according to the ancient
Phoenician custom, exercising the functions of the
priesthood. In him as its representative, the
older and purer Canaanitish religion offered the
hand to the representative of the new Hebrew
religion, and acknowledged his own and his peo-
ple's salvation by Abraham from perils they
could not resist themselves. This foreigner, Mel-
chizedek, subsequently became the ideal priest
in the eyes of Israel (Ps. ex. 4); and the Epistle
to the Hebrews finds in Christ his true antitype.
Origen and Didymus regarded Melchizedek as
an angel, because the Hebrews represent him
without pedigree. Hierakas regarded him as an
incarnation of the Holy Spirit, and the sect of
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The Melchizedekites as the incarnation of a power superior to Christ (App. ad Tert. de prescrip., c. 53; Epiph., Her., 35). Another opinion held by the Targums, the most of the rabbins, Jerome, Luther, Melanchthon, Hugh Broughton, Selden, Lightfoot, Jackson, is that he was Shem, who seems, according to the chronology, to have survived Abraham's entrance into Canaan a hundred and twenty-five years. Others have advocated the view that he was Ham, or Japheth, or even Enoch. (Comp. Deving: Observat. ii. p. 71 sqq.) Our best point of departure for ascertaining the ethnological power is the name of Adonizek. The latter was a Jebusite (Josch. x. 5, 6), and we may conclude that the former was so likewise. [See H. Broughton: Treatise of Melchizedek, 1831; Gaillard: Melchisedecus Christus, etc., 1838; Borgius: Hist. Crit. Melchisedecet, 1708; Jackson: On the Creed (book IX. § 2, ch. vi.-xi.); and the Commentaries on Gen. xiv. 18-20, and Hebrews vii.] F. W. Schultz.

MELENDEIUS, Rupertus, is the name of the author of the Paterensis voca, pro pace Ecclesia, and which has been preserved by Epiphanius, who appealed to it in 375 declared Paulinus to be the rightful bishop of Antioch. Another, which appeared in Germany about 1630. Of his personal life nothing is known: it is even probable that the name is fictitious. The book, which, though written from an orthodox Lutheran stand-point, maintains that practical piety is more important than purity of doctrine, contains the famous sentence, in necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, "in necessary things unity, in unnecessary things liberty, in both things charity." This sentence has had a great effect in soothing controversy. It is a watchword for the pacemakers. But whether Melendy originated it, as Lücke maintains, is doubtful. At all events, it is found in Gregor Frank's Consideratio theologica, dated 1829; and Baxter, in 1679, quotes it as the words of the "pacificator," which would seem to point to an older and better known author than Melendy or Frank. When Lücke wrote his book, only the reprint of Melendy by J. G. Pfeiffer, in his Variorum auctorum miscellanea theologica (Leipzig, 1738), was known; but since, at least two copies have come to light, one of which is noticed by Lücke in Studien zur Kritikten, 1831. See F. Lücke: Uber das Alter der Verfassung, die ur sprungliche Form u. den Urausspruch des kirchlichen Friedensspruches "In necessariis," etc., Göttingen, 1850.

C. BERTRAD.

MELETIAN SCHISM. See next two articles.

MELETIUS OF ANTIOak and the Meletian Schism in Syria. When, in 360, Bishop Eudoxius of Antioch removed to Constantinople, as the successor of the deposed Macedonius, Meletius (who had previously been bishop of Sebasti in Armenia, but who had left his see in retirement at Hieroas in Syria) was elected bishop of Antioch on the supposition that he belonged to the Arian party. This proved a mistake, however. A sermon which he delivered shortly after his election, and which has been preserved by Epiphanius (Her. 73, 29), revealed to the congregation, that, though he was not an adherent of Athanasius in the strict sense of the word, he was decidedly antagonistic to Arianism. The discovery caused great commotion. Meletius was banished by the emperor; but Eudoxius, a full-blooded Arian, was appointed bishop. Nevertheless, a large portion of the congregation, holding the same views as Meletius, remained true to him; and thus the church of Antioch became split into three parties,—the Eustathians, who, under the leadership of the descon Paulinus, lived in a quiet and retir ed manner, accused of Sabellianism by the two other parties, but recognized by Athanasius as the true church; the Arians, who enjoyed the support of the court; and the Meletians, who formed a rapidly growing middle party between those two extremes. A synod of Alexandria, presided over by Athanasius, undertook in 382 to bring order into the disturbed affairs of the church of Anti oeh, or at least to unite all the anti-Arians into one camp. But, before the emissaries of the synod reached Antioch, Lucifer of Calaris had consecrated Paulinus bishop; and, as he was recognized by Athanasius and by Rome, the schism became fully established. Under Julian, Meletius returned to his see; and the great personal reputation he enjoyed, as well as his intimate connection with Basil and the two Gregories, gave to his party a paramount importance. A recon cilation did not take place, however. The Meletians were steadily approaching the orthodox. At a synod of Antioch in 383, presided over by Meletius himself, they formally adopted the Nicene Creed; and the explanations with which they accompanied it seemed to be simple precautions against Sabellianism. They became still more pliant when the persecutions of Valens struck them alone, and left the Eustathians untouched as an obscure sect. Meletius went in exile a second time. But the stubbornness and arrogance of Pope Damasus frustrated all negotiations. But, a synod of Rome in 375 declared Paulinus to be the rightful bishop of Antioch; and another, in 377, even declared Meletius a heretic. After the death of Valens, however, Meletius once more came into possession of his see (378); and it was significant with respect to the position he occupied, that the imperial edict of 380, enforcing the Nicene Creed as the one alone valid and alone tolerated, did not in any way interfere with him: on the contrary, he was recognized as bishop of Antioch by the imperial officer Saporius. A kind of reconciliation was also brought about. Meletius and Paulinus agreed that he who lived longest should be sole bishop, that he who died first should have no successor. But, unfortunately, the agreement was not kept. Meletius died the following year, 381, in Con stantinople, where he represented the church of Antioch at the council; and the Syrian bishops immediately appointed the presbyter Flavian his successor. In 388 Paulinus died; but Evagrius succeeded him, and the schism continued. Finally Chryostom succeeded in 394, in reconciling Flavian with Alexandria and Rome; and in 415 the successor of Flavian, Bishop Alexander, led the Eustathians back into the bosom of the church.

Lit. — Besides the scattered notes by Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Philostorgius, Jerome, and Rufinus, see Gregory of Nyssa: Orat. funer. in Meletian; Chrysostom: Orat. in Mel.; the Letters of Basil; and the numerous acts of synods in Mansi: Con. Coll., iii.

W. MÖLLER.

MELETIUS OF LYCOPOLIS and the Meletian Schism in Egypt. During the persecution of Diocletian it came to an open breach between
Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, and Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis, a city in the province of Thebais. They held different views with respect to the re-admission of the lapsi. According to the penitential writing of Peter, which the Greek Church has incorporated with the Epitola Canonico, and which is found in Routh, Relique Sacr., iv. 23, he recommended mildness and forbearance; while Meletius protested that no lapsi could be re-admitted until after full penance; that an ecclesiastic who had fallen should be degraded, etc. To this difference of views may be added a feeling of jealousy; the Bishop of Alexandria having at that period begun to exercise a kind of authority over the rest of the Egyptian Church, which was vehemently opposed by the other Egyptian bishops, especially by Meletius. The dissen-

sion broke out while the two bishops were still in prison; and when Meletius, after his release, undertook to ordain presbyters and deacons outside of his own diocese, the Synod whose bishop Meletius was in prison, and everywhere tried to enforce his views with respect to the lapsi, Peter felt utterly provoked, cancelled all his ordinations, and even deposed him from his see. The Coun-

cil of Aquileia, in 1717, condemned the bishop of Alexandria. He regretted the mildness. His ordinations were recognized, and he himself was continued in office, though under certain restrictions. After this, every thing went on smoothly and quietly until Athanasius became bishop of Alexandria. He regretted the mildness which the Council of Nicæa had shown, and employed much harsher measures, the conse-

quence of which was, that the Meletians formally broke off from the church, and formed an independ-ent community of their own. In the follow-

ing contest between Athanasius on the one side, and the Eusebians and Arians on the other, the latter were always supported by the Meletians; and it took a whole century before the schism was thoroughly healed.
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Coll., ii.; Sc. Maffei: Osservazioni letter., Vero-
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MELITA was the site of the shipwreck of the vessel which was conveying St. Paul as a prisoner to Rome (Acts xxvii.—xxviii. 10). Two islands have had advocates as the ancient spot. — Meleda in the Adriatic; and Malta, sixty miles south of Sicily, in the Mediterranean. It is now generally as-

sumed that the latter was the Melita on which Paul was cast. This is made almost certain by the description the Acts gives of the seas which washed up on the island, the harborage of a grain-ship, and the direction Paul took, by way of Putecol, or leaving the island, to get to Rome. The subject is thoroughly and interestingly treated by Capt. Smith, in Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, and Dean Howson, in Smith's Bible Dictionary, "Life of St. Paul," and the International Revision Commentary on the Acts, New York, 1882.

Malta had a brilliant period as the headquarters of the Knights of St. John, and now belongs to the British crown.

MELITO OF SARDES (Sardis), the only bishop of that place mentioned in the literary monuments of the first three centuries, flourished in the middle of the second century, and acquired great fame by his activity in the church and in literature. Of his numerous works, only fragmentary writing of Peter, which the Greek Church has incorporated with the Epitola Canonico, and which is found in Routh, Relique Sacr., iv. 23, he is ascribed to him another apology, of which a Syrian translation was dis-

covered by Tattam in a monastery in the Nitrian desert, and edited by Cureton, in Specil. Syr., and by Pitra-Renan, in Specil. Soseense; but its auth-

ors is very doubtful. In the introduction to his commentaries he has given the first Chris-

tian list of the canon of the Old Testament: he excludes the Books of Esther and Nehemiah, and the Apocrypha. The curious notice by Origen, that he ascribed corporality to God, and found the likeness of God in the human body, is, on account of its brevity, very difficult to explain. Perhaps he, like Tertullian, considered corporality and substantiality as identical ideas,— a view which might arise very naturally as an opposition to the spiritualistic vagueness of the Gnostics. Many works have been falsely ascribed to him, as, for instance, the Clavis Melitonis, edited by Cardinal Pitra, in the Specil. Soseense, ii. and iii. It probably belongs to the latter part of the eleventh century. A sect of Melitomans is probably a later fiction. [For an excellent study of Melito and his writings, see Harnack: Texte u. Unter-

suchungen zur Geschichte der Althchrist. Lit., Bd i.
(Leipzig, 1882), pp. 240—278.]

MELVILLE, Henry, b. at Pendennis Castle, Corn-

wall, Eng., Sept. 14, 1800; d. in London, Feb. 9, 1871. He was graduated at St. Peter's College, Cambridge, 1821, where he was fellow and tutor; took holy orders; was minister of Camden Chapel, Camberwell, London, 1829—43; chaplain to the Tower of London, 1846; principal of the East India College, at Halsebury, 1843—60; and for nearly ten years held the Golden Lectureship, St. Margaret's Lothbury. In 1853 he was appointed one of her Majesty's chaplains; in 1856 a canon of St. Paul's; in 1868 rector of Barnes, and rural dean. He enjoyed a high reputation for pulpit oratory. His style was florid, and his delivery impassioned. Very many of his lectures and ser-

mons have been published; e.g., Golden Lectures, from 1850 to 1866, 7 vols.; Sermons delivered in the Cathedral of St. Paul, London (1856—59), 1890; Selections from the Sermons preached during the Latter Years of his Life, 1872, 2 vols. His Lectures on Practical Subjects was reprinted in Philadel-

phia, 1884; and his Sermons was edited by Bishop Melivaine, New York, 1870, 2 vols.

MELVILLE, Andrew, b. at Baldovy, near Mon-

trose, Aug. 1, 1545; d. at Sedan in 1622. He was a "sickly, tender boy." After preliminary train-

ing in Latin, Greek, and French, at Montrose, he entered St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, in 1569; and when he left St. Andrews for the Univer-
Melville was born in 1555, the son of a gentleman of Aberdeen. He was educated at Aberdeen Academy, and then proceeded to the University of St. Andrews, where he was installed as principal of St. Mary's College. His learning and zeal won him the position of minister of the church. Despite the confession of 1581, the privy council revived the regime of episcopacy, and the religion of the church was threatened. Melville was excommunicated, and was ordered to leave Edinburgh, and their power and authority were restored among the ministers of the church. Five years later, the episcopal office was formally abolished by the assembly, and Melville was made moderator of the assembly in June 1587, and was one of its commissioners to the Parliament which annexed the temporal lands of bishoprics, abbacies, and priories to the crown, thus paving the way for the entire abolition of episcopacy. At the coronation of the queen, in May 1590, he recited a Latin ode praising the sovereignty of the crown, thus laying the way for the establishment of the church of Scotland. Having consented to be deprived of Melville, that the church of Scotland might be enriched. Having returned to Scotland, in July 1574, he accepted the principalship of Glasgow University. He began his work in it in November, and by his incredible labors and enthusiasm drew students from all quarters; so that the class-rooms, which for some years before had been literally empty, were soon filled to overflowing.

Before Melville's return to Scotland, "Tulchan" episcopacy had been erected; and when John Dury protested in the General Assembly, in August 1575, against the lawfulness of the bishop's office, Melville showed that prelacy was unscriptural, and should be abolished, and that the church should be restored to its former state. In 1598, Melville was transferred to the University of St. Andrews, where he was installed as principal of St. Mary's College, which, by act of Parliament, had been appropriated to the study of law. He returned to Scotland in 1574, and was one of the principal commissioners of assembly in June 1587, and was one of its commissioners to the Parliament which annexed the temporal lands of bishoprics, abbacies, and priorities to the crown.

In 1580, Melville was transferred to the University of St. Andrews, where he was installed as principal of St. Mary's College, which, by act of Parliament, had been appropriated to the study of law. He returned to Scotland in 1574, and was one of the principal commissioners of assembly in June 1587, and was one of its commissioners to the Parliament which annexed the temporal lands of bishoprics, abbacies, and priorities to the crown, thus paving the way for the entire abolition of episcopacy. At the coronation of the queen, in May 1590, he recited a Latin ode praising the sovereignty of the crown, thus laying the way for the establishment of the church of Scotland. Having consented to be deprived of Melville, that the church of Scotland might be enriched. Having returned to Scotland, in July 1574, he accepted the principalship of Glasgow University. He began his work in it in November, and by his incredible labors and enthusiasm drew students from all quarters; so that the class-rooms, which for some years before had been literally empty, were soon filled to overflowing.

Before Melville's return to Scotland, "Tulchan" episcopacy had been erected; and when John Dury protested in the General Assembly, in August 1575, against the lawfulness of the bishop's office, Melville showed that prelacy was unscriptural, and should be abolished, and that the church should be restored to its former state. In 1598, Melville was transferred to the University of St. Andrews, where he was installed as principal of St. Mary's College, which, by act of Parliament, had been appropriated to the study of law. He returned to Scotland in 1574, and was one of the principal commissioners of assembly in June 1587, and was one of its commissioners to the Parliament which annexed the temporal lands of bishoprics, abbacies, and priorities to the crown, thus paving the way for the entire abolition of episcopacy. At the coronation of the queen, in May 1590, he recited a Latin ode praising the sovereignty of the crown, thus laying the way for the establishment of the church of Scotland. Having consented to be deprived of Melville, that the church of Scotland might be enriched. Having returned to Scotland, in July 1574, he accepted the principalship of Glasgow University. He began his work in it in November, and by his incredible labors and enthusiasm drew students from all quarters; so that the class-rooms, which for some years before had been literally empty, were soon filled to overflowing.

Before Melville's return to Scotland, "Tulchan" episcopacy had been erected; and when John Dury protested in the General Assembly, in August 1575, against the lawfulness of the bishop's office, Melville showed that prelacy was unscriptural, and should be abolished, and that the church should be restored to its former state. In 1598, Melville was transferred to the University of St. Andrews, where he was installed as principal of St. Mary's College, which, by act of Parliament, had been appropriated to the study of law. He returned to Scotland in 1574, and was one of the principal commissioners of assembly in June 1587, and was one of its commissioners to the Parliament which annexed the temporal lands of bishoprics, abbacies, and priorities to the crown, thus paving the way for the entire abolition of episcopacy. At the coronation of the queen, in May 1590, he recited a Latin ode praising the sovereignty of the crown, thus laying the way for the establishment of the church of Scotland. Having consented to be deprived of Melville, that the church of Scotland might be enriched. Having returned to Scotland, in July 1574, he accepted the principalship of Glasgow University. He began his work in it in November, and by his incredible labors and enthusiasm drew students from all quarters; so that the class-rooms, which for some years before had been literally empty, were soon filled to overflowing.
church affairs was "the needle which drew in the episcopal thread." In 1567 Melville was deprived of the rectorship of St. Andrew's University, after holding it seven years. To get rid of his opposition in the church courts, and to have a place in the Privy Council and Parliament to judge in their own affairs. To this the assembly by a small majority agreed. The king would not permit Melville to sit in the assembly of 1606, and, by acceding to many cavets, he induced the members to comply with his plan. When the Scotch Parliament restored the bishops to their ancient privileges, in 1606, Melville, who was sent by St. Andrew's presbytery, protested. As the bishops had as yet no spiritual power, Melville and other seven ministers were summoned to London, nominally to confer with the king on church affairs, really to deprive their brethren of their aid and council in opposing the changes contemplated. The English nobles were astonished at Melville's talents and courage. On a highly ritualistic service which he had been made to witness in the Chapel Royal, he wrote a Latin epigram, which one of the court spies, set to watch him, conveyed to the king. For this Melville was tried by the English Privy Council on the 30th of November, and, though he had given out no copy, was found guilty of treasonable opinions. In April he was sent to the Tower, where for ten months he was treated with great severity. Pen, ink, and paper were taken from him; and none saw him save the person who brought his food. But his spirit was free and unbroken, and on every wall of his cell was written verses beautifully engraved with the tongue of his shoe-buckle. By means of packed assemblies and bribery, prelacy was established in Scotland when he and other faithful men were far away. Though the Protostants of Rochele were eager to have Melville as professor of divinity, James would not consent; but, after four years' captivity, he, at the request of Du Plessis-Mornay, allowed him to go to Sedan to share with Tilenus the professorship of divinity. There his last years were spent, the bitterness of his exile being alleviated by the kindness of some Scottish professors and students. Among these last were John Dury (afterwards famous for his efforts for union among Protestants), and perhaps Alexander Colvilie, destined so long to carry on his work in St. Mary's College. The contest in which he took such a prominent part, not only affected the government of the church, but also the cause of civil and religious liberty. "Scotland," says his nephew James, "never received a greater benefit at the hands of God than this man." It is said Dr. McCarie, "the love of pure religion, rational liberty, and polite letters, forms the basis of national virtue and happiness, I know no individual, after her Reformer, from whom Scotland has received greater benefits, and to whom she owes a deeper debt of gratitude and respect, than Andrew Melville. He was full of spirit, vigorous and old-fashioned, quick-tempered but kindly, of great and varied learning, but more of a scholar than a popular orator. His chief work was in the universities and church courts, rather than in the pulpit; and that, perhaps, was the reason why, with all his influence among the brethren, he never gained such sway over the nobles and people as Knox and Henderson attained. The hard measure meted out to him by King James was one of the greatest blows on his reign.

Lit.—Life by McGare, in 2 vols. 8vo, Edinburgh, 1819; 2d ed., 1824. Melville's writings mainly consist of Latin poems, which were published without his knowledge. See list in Dr. McCarie. In 1849 the Woodrow Society published his Latin Commentary on the Romans; but several of his works, among them a metrical paraphrase of the Epistle to the Hebrews, are yet in manuscript.

D. HAY FLEMING (of St. Andrews).

MEMPHIS. See Noph.

MEN OF UNDERSTANDING (Hominis Intellectus), a sect, which, about 1411, sprang up in Flanders, and was most numerous around Brussels. Its founders were Giles the Singer (cantor) and a Carmelite monk, William of Hildeaheim (Hildeisnem). The former was illiterate, and, carried away by his fanaticism, proclaimed himself a savior of men, as Christ was. In general, the sect was related to the earlier Brethren of the Free Spirit (see art.). It maintained that the Church "was under the rule of the Holy Spirit; that these latter days were a time of higher illumination than any which had preceded, so that the Scriptures were practically superseded; that the only resurrection of the body which would ever take place had taken place already in that of Christ; that the spirit is not defiled by bodily sin; that the punishments of hell are not eternal; and that even the evil angels would be eventually saved."—Dict. Soc. sci. 2d ed., 1836, p. 896.

MENA/EA, or MENAION, corresponds, in the Greek Church, to the breviary of the Roman Church, containing for each feast and holiday of the year the appointed prayers and hymns, together with short lives of saints and martyrs. There are large editions,—a volume for every month, and smaller ones (two volumes) for each half-year. Manuscript copies are very frequent: of the printed editions the most magnificent is that of Venice, 1623-45.

MENAHEM (comforter), king of Israel for ten years, 771-760 b.c. usual chronology, or 769-759 according to Ewald (2 Kings xiv. 14-30). He came to the throne by his murder of Shallum, who was king for only one month. Under Menahem, Israel's affairs became desperate, as Hosea (in chap. iv.-xiv.), Isaiah (ix. 10, xi. 1-10) abundantly prove. It was then that the first invasion of Assyrians took place. Pul (Tiglath-pileser) the invader was, however, bought off by 1,000 talents of silver (about $1,643,000). With this biblical statement tallies the Assyrian inscriptions which speak of Menahem (or, as they call him, Minhimmi Samirinri) as tributary to Tiglath-pileser. Menahem's reign opened with an act of awful cruelty,—the massacre of the
Tiphritans, because they did not at once yield to his usurped authority, — ran its course of imbecility and idolatry, but ended peacefully; and Petakiah, his son reigned in his stead.

**MENANDER.**

One of the oldest Gnostics, was, according to Justin (Apolog., i. 26), born at Capparisata, a village in Samaria, and taught in Antioch, according to Euting (Co lex Nasar al us, liber Adami appellatus, 5 vols., Londoni Gothorum, 1815-17) and by Petermann (Theaaurus sive Liber magnus, 2 vols., Berlin, 1867).

The next work of importance is the Sidra d'Yahad ("Book of John"), also called d'rdke d'malfk ("Lectures of the Kings"), of which only fragments were published by Loranab, in Museum für bibliiscbe und orientaliscbe Literatur (Marburg, 1867, pp. 6-71).

(3) The Qolasta, a collection of hymns and doctrinal pieces concerning baptism and the "ascension" of the soul after death: hence it is also called Sidra di nismata ("Book of Souls"), in a hundred and three sections, published by Euting, Stuttgart, 1867. Besides, it also contains a liturgy and prayers to be used at sacrifices and marriages.

(4) Diakon, a kind of ritual, unpublished.

(5) After Menander, on astrology. Aside from these, they have formulas for all kinds of sorcery, and amulets for sickness and other misfortunes which evil spirits may bring. These charms are worn on the breast.

**Religious System.** — At the beginning of all things they place the Pirâ rabbâ ("the great glory," or "splendor"), sometimes D'malke, i.e., "image," mentioned as female potency. Mâna rabbâ called forth the "first life," and then went into the most absolute retirement, visible only to the purest emanations and the most pious among the Mendaeans, who, after their death, are permitted, to contemplate the Almighty. As the revealed, active, and governing deity, stands the Chayê Kadmaye ("the first life"): hence, it is to be adored alone, because Mânâ rabbâ is above all adoration. The "first life" is to be invoked first at prayers, and with his name every book begins. Like the Mânâ rabbâ, the "first life" dwells in the pure, brilliant ether, which is inhabited by nameless Uther, or "splendors." God is therefore called "father of all Uther" (i. ii.), who is surrounded by angels and the "first life" of the Mendaeans. The "second life" attempted to usurp the place of the "first life," and was on that account exiled from the pure ether into the world of light, being separated from it by the Hephtkey mayê, i.e., "water-canals." But the "spirit of life" remains with the "first life," or rather the Mânâ rabbâ, whose "beloved son" is styled also "good shepherd," "high priest," "word of life." He revealed himself, however, to humanity in his three sons, who are also called his brothers, — Hibîl, Sîtil, and Anûs (Abel, Seth, and Enoch). In another place it is said that Hibîl alone is his son, Sîtil his grandson, and Anûs his great-grandson. Hibîl, the most important among them, is almost equally venerated with the Manâ de-Chayê, receives the same names, and is often confounded with him. If Manâ is the Christ, Hibîl is the Jesus Christ, of the Mendaeans. Among the Uther ("angels") who emanated from the "second life," is the Hayye t'litdye ("the third life"), the first and most prominent of the Uther, often called Abûtar, i.e., "father of the Uther," or "the Ancient," or "the watchman." He sits at the limit of the world of light, where the door leads to the middle and lower regions, and, in a scale which he holds in his hand, he weights the deeds of the departed as they appear before him to be admitted.

Under him there was at the bottom an immense void, and at the bottom of it the troubled, black water, magye s'âwbâ. As he looked down, and saw his image reflected in it, arose P'tâhil, who is also called Gabriel, the son of Abatur, who retains in part the nature of the dark water from which he proceeded. He receives from his father the mission to build the earth and to create man. This he does, according to some, alone; according to others, with the aid of demons. When he created Adam and Eve, he found himself unable to give them an upright posture, be-
cause the spirit was not in him. Hibil, Sitil, and Anūs then interfered, and obtained from Mānā rabbā the spirit, and infused it into man, that he might not worship P'tahī as his creator. Hibil Zīdī then instructs Adam and Eve concerning the "great king," Adunay, and which the Mendaeans call Urashlam, i.e., the "great mountain of flesh," and "first-born of darkness." In the entrances to hell there is yet dirty, slimy water: in the real hell there is none; and Kīn's kingdom consists only of ashes, dust, and vacancy. Hibil Zīdī, or Mānā d'hayyē, sustained by the power of Mānā rabbā, descended into it, unravelled the mysteries of the lower regions, took all power from their kings, and closed the door of the different worlds. By subterfuge he brought out Rūchā, daughter of Kīn, the queen of darkness, and prevented her return to the nether world.

Rūchā is the mother of Ur, i.e., fire, or destroyer, the worst of all devils. When, in his zeal, Ur sought to storm the world of lights, Hibil Zīdī threw him into the black waters, bound, and surrounded with seven iron and seven golden walls. While P'tahī was occupied in the creation of the world and of man, Rūchā bore first seven, then twelve, and again five, sons to Ur. These twenty-four sons were by P'tahī transplanted into the heavens. The first seven are the seven planets, one for each of the seven heavens; the twelve became the signs of the zodiac; the remaining five have not yet been interpreted. The sun, as the greatest of the planets, stands in the central or fourth heaven. The planets are intended to be serviceable to man, but only seek to injure him, and are the sources of all evil and wrong upon earth. The seven planets have their Mutārfūdāhī, or stations, where they return always, after accomplishing their course in the heavens. They, like the earth, and another world situated in its neighborhood, to the north, rest on anvils which Hibil Zīdī placed on the belly of Ur. The heavens of the Mendaeans consider as built of the purest, clearest water, but so solid that even diamond will not cut it. On this water the planets and other stars are sailing: they are of themselves dark, being evil demons, but are illuminated by brilliant lights carried by the angels. The seven heavens as far as the polar star, around which, as the central sun, all the other stars are revolving. Towards it, as to their Kūlā, the Mendaeans turn their face at prayer. The earth they regard as a circle, inclining somewhat to the south, and surrounded on the three sides by the sea. On the north is a great mountain of turquoises, whose base is red as the sky to appear blue. On the other side of that mountain is the world of the blessed, a kind of lower paradise, where the Egyptians reside who did not perish at the Red Sea. They are regarded as the ancestors of the Mendaeans, since Pharaoh had been high priest and king of the Mendaeans. Both worlds are surrounded by the Yammā rabbā d'īsī', i.e., the outer sea.

Man consists of three parts,—the body, or payrā; the animal soul, or rūchā; and the heavenly soul, or n's'emala.

They consider the earth as four hundred and eighty thousand years old, divided into seven epochs, each of which is governed by a planet. According to the Siddā rabbā, the human race has been three times destroyed by water, fire, sword, pestilence; only one coupleremaining alive after each time. At the time of Noah (Nū), the world was four hundred and sixty-six thousand years old. After him rose many false prophets. The first prophet was Abrahām, who came six thousand years after Noah, when the sun came to reign over the world. Then came Mishū (Moses) in his time the Egyptians had the true religion. After him came Shimūm (Solomon) bar Dawūth, whom the demons yielded obedience. The third false prophet is Yāsū Mu'shāhī, a sorcerer. Forty-two years before him lived, under the king Pontius Pilate, the only true prophet, Yahēyā, or Yāhūnā bar Z'tyārē, whose mother was Enisēbāi (Elizabeth); Yahēyā, being deceived by the Messiah, baptized him. He is the incarnation of Hibil Zīdī, who already preached repentance in the time of Nū. With the Messiah and John the Baptist lived Anūs Ubrā, a younger brother of Hibil Zīva, who had descended from heaven, was baptized by Yahēyā, wrought miracles, healed the sick, raised the dead, and was the cause of the crucifixion of the false Messiah. He then proclaimed the true religion; and, before his return to the world of lights, he sent three hundred and sixty prophets into the world to proclaim his teaching. Jerusalem, which was once built at the command of Adūnay, and which the Mendaeans call Urashlam, i.e., the devil Ur has completed, was destroyed by Anūs, while the Jews were dispersed into all the world, having killed John the Baptist. The last of the false prophets was M'hamad, or Atmah bar Bītā. There will be none after him. After four thousand or five thousand years, mankind will again be destroyed by a terrific storm; but the earth will be again repopulated by a man and a woman from the upper world, whose descendants shall dwell on earth for fifty thousand years in piety and virtue. Then will Ur destroy the earth and the other medium worlds; and, being burst in pieces, will fall down into the abyss of darkness, to be annihilated there with all worlds and powers of darkness. Then the universe will become a realm of light, enduring forever.

Ethics.—Ethical sentences from the Siddā of Yāshā are as follows to see through the Hierarchy. — There are three different degrees in the priesthood among the Mendaeans: (1)
MENDEAEANS.

S'kand̈ā, or deacon, to which office he is ordained at the age of nineteen; having served for one year as deacon, he becomes (2) Tarmida, or priest, presbyter, by the ordination performed through a bishop, with the assistance of two priests. The highest degree is that of (3) Ganiord̈, i.e., "treasurer," corresponding to our "bishop." Besides these three degrees, there is yet another ecclesiastical dignity similar to that of patriarch or pope, that of the Rish amma, who is both the civil and ecclesiastical authority. Women are also allowed to become members of the clergy; they must be virgins at their entrance into the diocesanate. In order to be raised to the dignity of Tarmida, they must at once marry a priest of that order, or of a higher. In no case the woman can have a higher title than her husband. The official dress of the priests is pure white. During divine service they wear on the right fore-arm the ttigu, or crown. On the little finger of the right hand the priests wear a gilt, and the bishops a golden, seal-ring, bearing the inscription,茎m jantar zam, i.e., the name of Yâvar Z̈īd; in the left hand they carry an olive-branch. They must always be barefooted in exercising their functions.

Rites.—The most important of all religious ceremonies is the masbatha, or baptism, by which they receive children into the communion of priests and their assistants; the laymen remain on the outside. The churches are so small that only a few persons can stand in them. They are built in the vicinity of a flowing water, to be used as a means of baptism. When a church is dedicated, the priests offer up a dove.

Sacred Seasons.—Besides Sunday, they celebrate, (1) The Naurūz rabba, or New-Year's Day, at the beginning of the winter; (2) Dehūd A'sīnā, or Ascension Day, in commemoration of the return of Ḥiḥīl Z̈īd into his realm of light; (3) Marwānā, in honor of the Egyptians who perished in the Red Sea; (4) Pānīsha, i.e., the five days of baptism, during which time all Mendaeans, male and female, must bathe themselves three times every day in the river, and must wear purely white dresses; (5) Dehūd d'batamān̈ā, in honor of one of the three hundred and sixty Uhrās; and (6) Kanāhē zalāh, or the last day of the year. Besides, they have some m'kubtāl, or fast-days.

Calendar.—The Mendean year is a solar year of three hundred and sixty-five days, divided into twelve months of thirty days each.

Polygamy is advised in the Great Book, but at present most of them have only two wives.

Number.—In the seventeenth century the Mendaeans still numbered about twenty thousand families: at present their number is very small. They are located on the Euphrates and Tigris, south of Bagdad, and in various cities of Chuzistan, where they carry on the trades of jewelers, blacksmiths, carpenters, etc. They do not outwardly distinguish themselves from the Mohammedans among whom they live.

The Sacred Language of the Mendaeans is an Aramaic dialect very much akin to the language of the Babylonian Talmud.

MENDICANT ORDERS, or BEGGING FRIARS, is the general designation of those monastic orders, which, at least for a time, took their vow of poverty in earnest, and actually led the life of beggars for which the name of frars was given to them, and on which the alms they received. They were four,—the Franciscans, Dominicans, Carmelites, and Augustinian Hermits; but the history of these four orders and their branches shows how soon their poverty became a mere deception, and their beggary a base means of amassing wealth.

MENDICANT ORDERS.


K. KEESLER.

MÉNDELSSOHN, Moses, b. at Dessau, Sept. 6, 1729; d. Jan. 4, 1786; descended from a poor Jewish family, and studied the Bible, the Talmud, Maimonides, and afterwards modern languages and literatures, under great privations. In 1750 he became tutor in the family of a rich Jewish manufacturer in Berlin, and in 1754 bookkeeper in the firm. From about the same time date his intimate acquaintance with Lessing, Nicolai, Abbt, etc., and the beginning of his long and varied literary activity. His Phadon, oder iüber die Unsterblichkeit der Seele (1767), and Morgenstunden (1787), lectures on the existence of God and immortality, procured for him a great name as a philosopher, and were translated into several foreign languages. But his ideas as well as his method are now utterly antiquated. More interest have his controversies with Lavater, who wanted to convert him to Christianity, but completely failed, and with Jacobi, who had accused Lessing of Spinozism. Of lasting merit were his efforts for the elevation, mental and moral, of his co-religionists in Germany, and especially in Berlin. The most complete edition of his works is that by his grandson, Leipzig, 1849–45, 7 vols. His life was written by Samuel, London, 1822, and by Kayserling, Berlin, 1862; and his German writings upon philosophy, aesthetics, and apologetics, were edited by Brusch, Leipzig, 1880, 2 vols.
MENNO SIMONS, b. at Witmarsum, a village in Friesland, 1492; d. at Olschef in Holstein, Jan. 13, 1559. The dates often met with in German works on the subject (1505-81), and those often met with in Dutch works (1496-1561), are mistakes due to the anonymous bungler, who in 1619 published the Uitgang en beekering van Menno Simons. In 1518 or 1519 Menno was ordained priest, and priest, appointed vicar or sub-pastor at Pingzum, near Witmarsum. He entertained, at even at that time, grave doubts with respect to the dogma of transubstantiation; but for a time he tried to drive them away as temptations of the devil. He finally sought refuge with the Bible, which he had hitherto shunned as a dangerous seducer; and the effect of his study was, that he very soon acquired the fame of being an evangelical preacher. In 1531 he was removed as pastor to Witmarsum. In that year the burning at the stake of Sicke Freerks, for holding Anabaptist views, made a great sensation, and led Menno into investigations which resulted in the firm conviction that neither the New Testament nor the writings of Luther, Butzer, and Bullinger, gave sufficient evidence of the validity of infant baptism. Many were led by his preaching to leave the Roman-Catholic Church; he himself, however, still remained in his office as priest; and when, in 1534, Jan Matthijszen's book, Van der wreke, was spread over all Friesland, Menno wrote against it,—Benuja uit de H. Schriften dat J. C. is de rede beloofde David, etc. Nevertheless, in 1535 a swarm of fanatic Anabaptists forcibly took possession of the monastery Blemkamp, and it came to a bloody encounter with the Frisian governor, in which most of the enthusiasts, and among them Menno's own brother, were killed. Jan. 12, 1536, Menno resigned his office, left the Roman-Catholic Church, and began to preach secretly to the brethren who gathered around him, though not so secretly that the Inquisition did not notice it.
demanded divorce if one of the married couple did not belong to the brethren. Again: the Obbenites held that no higher kingdom than that of earth was to be expected on earth than that which already existed under the form of persecution and suffering to all the faithful; while the Melchiorites hoped that an entirely new state of affairs would soon be established by a new descent of the Holy Ghost, accompanied by new prodigies and miracles; and those from Münster and Batenburg even went so far as to declare that this new state of affairs must be and should be introduced by force of arms. David Joris understood how to avail himself of the discord: in December he had his first visions. The Obbenites tried to resist the general fermentation, and sent six or eight representatives to Menno to induce him to assume the office of "elder" among them. After much hesitation he consented; and he became a blessing to the brethren. Pious and conscientious himself, he demanded the strictest morals in the congregations; and with powerful hand he kept down any outbreak of enthusiasm or fanaticism. From 1537 to 1541 he resided in Groningen; but, when a price was put on his head, he removed first to Amsterdam, then to various places in North Holland, and finally settled at Emde in East Friesland, in 1543, whither he had been invited by John a Lasco in order to hold a public disputation with him on the various Anabaptist issues.

Menno was not an original genius. His doctrinal system was completely borrowed from the brethren. But he was eminently clear (the charge of obscurity is entirely due to the circumstance that he wrote many of his tracts in "Oostersch," a Low-German dialect, from which they afterwards were translated into Dutch in a very bungling way), and his ideas always clothed themselves in a simple and impressive form. Nor was he a great and imposing character. He was often hesitating, not so much from weakness, though, as from humility. But, when the decision was taken, he was firm and persevering. By his frequent and searching visitations he exercised great influence upon his Followers. He also moved in 1545, as Charles the Fifth peremptorily demanded the Anabaptists expelled from Friesland. He found a temporary refuge at Cologne, but settled finally, in 1546, at Oldesloe. There he gathered a number of brethren, and established a printing-press; but most of his time he spent in travelling from one congregation to another, making visitations. By his literary activity he also exercised great influence. Besides a number of devotional tracts and apologetic and polemical treatises, he published the Fundamentboek, 1539 (in which he expounded his views of grace, conversion, faith, baptism, etc., and warned against the "pervasive sects," the "Davidjorists," and other upstart Anabaptists) and the Klare beantwoording over eene Schrifl van Gellius Faber, 1556, an apology of his whole doctrinal system. The first collected edition of his works appeared in 1592, and the latest and best, 1681. A more complete edition, under the title of Sommarie, appeared in 1601 in two volumes, one still more complete, under the title Opera Menno Simons, also called the Groot Sommarie, in folio, in 1646, and the latest and best, 1851. But there lacks a satisfactory edition.

The best information on his life is found in his own notes accompanying his apology against Gellius Faber; in The Confessions of Obbe Philip; in NIK. M. CRAMER (in Dutch, 1837), C. HARDER (1846), H. C. ROOSEN (in German, 1849), and N. BROWNE (in English, Philadelphia, 1853). Cramer's is by far the best one.

DE HOOP SCHEFFER.

MENNONITES is the name of those evangelical Christians, who with respect to constitution, discipline, baptism, oath, military service, etc., agree with Menno Simons, after whom they are named. In the Netherlands they are now called "Doopsgezinde." But the views the Mennonites hold originated in Switzerland. At present they have congregations in Germany, France, Switzerland, Russia, and North America.

In 1525 Grebel and Mann, who were members of Zwingli's congregation, but felt dissatisfied with what they considered his lack of consistency, formed an independent congregation in Zürich, in which baptism was administered only after confession. See E. EGLI: Die Züricher Wider- dinger, 1873. Though they designated infant baptism as a most horrible invention of the Devil and the Pope, they generally laid less stress on doctrines than on practice. They banished from their worship all features not found in the apostolical church; they rejected a paid clergy, tithes, the holding of civil offices, the use of the sword, the oath, etc.; they wanted to re-introduce into the community the apostolical ban, community of property, etc. It is possible that they inherited several of those views from earlier medieval sects, as, for instance, the Waldenses (see J. MEHRING: Der heiligen Tauf historie, 1847); but there is no proof. Very soon, fanaticism developed among them; and the wild extravagances of Thomas Münzer and Carlstadt gave the civil authorities a welcome occasion to employ harsh measures against the peaceful and harmless. Persecution was instituted, and continued throughout the whole sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth it reached its culmination. In 1635 the magistrate of Zürich undertook to compel the Mennonites by force to enter the Reformed Church. They were thrown into prison, and their property was confiscated. Schaffhausen, Bern, and Basel joined hands with the church and great cruelties were perpetrated. Bern sold a number of its Mennonites as slaves to the king of Sardinia, who used them on his galleys. In the course of about seventy years, all Mennonites were expelled from Zürich, Schaffhausen, and St. Gall. In Basel, Bern, and Neuchâtel they lived on in concealment until the persecution stopped (about 1710). During the persecution, however, a split took place among them; and they were divided into two fractions,— Obere- and Untere-Mennonites. The former followed the elder, Jakob Amman, who demanded a most rigorous exercise of the ban in 1567. The latter followed the elder, Hans Reist, who held milder views with respect to the ban, and considered the buttons and the beard as adiaphora.
The German Mennonites live in Alsace (especially in the Vosges) — thirteen congregations in the Bavarian Palatinate; eleven in Baden; in Württemberg, Bavaria, Hesse, Nassau; in Neuwied, Crefeld, Cleve, Goch, and Emmerich in the valley of the Lower Rhine; three congregations in East Friesland; seventeen in Lithuania; six in Poland (then in Galicia); in Hamburg, Danzig, Elbing, and Königsberg. See Alfr. Michiels: Les anabaptistes dans les Vosges; Hunzinger: Religiöse, Kirchen-, und Schulwesen der Mennoniten in Baden, 1830; Grünkeisen: Mennoniten in Württemberg, 1847; Winter: Geschichte der bairischen Widerläufer, 1849; Wolny: Die Widerläufer in Mähren, 1850. — The French Mennonites have congregations in Nancy, Toul, and Franche-Comté. — The Russian Mennonites, numbering about 20,000 souls, and settled in about 50 colonies in the circles of Chortitz, Molotschna, Mariapoli, and Samara, are all of German descent. On the invitation of Catherine the Great they emigrated to Russia, mostly from Lithuania, and founded a number of flourishing agricultural colonies, especially in the Crimea. But an edict of June 4, 1817, bereft them of their exemption from military service, giving them, however, a term of ten years to take up arms, and after that time, where they could take up arms, and after that time, they were expelled. Wherever they had decreased to 30,000. At present there are about 20,000 souls, of whom 150,000 are settled in the United States, and 25,000 in Canada. Driven away by the persecutions in Switzerland and the devastation of the Palatinate, and allured by the promise of perfect religious freedom which William Penn held out to them, the Mennonites very early began to emigrate to America. They founded their first settlement at Germantown, near Philadelphia, in 1683. In America they retained their independence of all the churches, and called themselves simply Doopsgezinden. After the cessation of persecution, in 1681, they were not only tolerated, but even protected by the State; and in 1672 they were formally recognized. They generally chose their preachers among their learned men — physicians and lawyers; but in 1735 they founded at Amsterdam a theological seminary, which in 1811 was considered the highest in Europe, and is now in a flourishing condition. About 1760, their number was 160,000; but at the beginning of the present century it had decreased to 30,000. At present there are 127 congregations, consisting of 47,000 members, and settled principally in the provinces of North Holland and Friesland. See Tunker. Lit. — H. Steins: Historia Mennonitarum, 1729; Starck: Geschichte der Taufe und Taufgesinnten, 1759; Bloupot ten Cate: Geschiedenis d. Doopsgezinden, 1838-47, 5 vols. DE HOOP SCHUFFEN.

MENOLOGION, in the Greek Church, corresponds to the Calendarium and Martyrologium of the Latin Church, and contains a complete list of all the festivals celebrated throughout the year in honor of the saints and martyrs, together with short notices of the life and death of the person celebrated, etc. See the art. Menaion, and Alattius: De libris Oecumencis, 58-66. The most interesting specimens of this kind are the Menologium Basilianum (Urbini, 1727), and Calendarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae (Rome, 1788, 2 vols.). GASS.

MENOT, Michel, d. 1518; a French monk of the order of the Cordeliers; lived during the reigns of Louis XI, Charles VIII, Louis XII, and Francis I.; taught theology in one of the establishments of his order in Paris, and acquired a kind of celebrity as a preacher, his sermons offering the most extreme instances of the style called "Macaronic;" Latin and French, serious thoughts, and open indecencies, etc., being mixed with each
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MENSES PAPALES (papal months) denotes the right of the Pope to dispose of those benefices which become vacant during certain months. The term, however, is not synonymous with alter-nativa mensium. The latter expression refers simply to an exception from the common rule; the eight papal months being reduced to six in favor of those patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops who reside in their dioceses. The months thus reserved for the Pope are always the uneven,—January, March, etc.—whence the expression “uneven months” in the sense of “papal months.”

This peculiar right of the Pope arose from a custom, prevalent already in the twelfth century, according to which the Pope recommended a certain clerk to a certain office. If the papal letter of recommendation (preces) was left unheeded, it was followed by a mandatum de providendo, and this again by littera monitioria, preceptoria and excusoria, until the vacancy was filled in accordance with the wishes of the Pope. However, the Pope began to issue mandata de providendo, not only for vacant benefices, but also for benefices which were not vacant; and great confusion and corruption were the natural results of such a practice. The Councils of Constance and Basel tried in vain to restore order; but, by the concordat of Vienna (1448), an arrangement was made by which the months were divided, and the uneven reserved for the Pope. At present, the right, though not altogether extinguished, exists only in certain countries and under certain modifications.

MENTZER, Balthasar, b. at Allendorf in Hesse, Feb. 27, 1565; d. at Marburg, Jan. 6, 1627. He was appointed professor of theology at Marburg in 1596, but removed to Giessen in 1605, as he was vehemently opposed to the landgrave’s plan of establishing the Reformed Church in Hesse.

After the closing, however, of the university of Giessen, in 1825, he returned to Marburg. He was an ardent champion of Lutheran orthodoxy, and sustained numerous controversies in its behalf with the Roman Catholics and the Reformed. His Operæ Theolocica Latina were collected in two volumes (Francfort, 1669) by his son, Balthasar

MENTZER (b. at Giessen, May 14, 1614; d. at Darmstadt, July 28, 1769), who, like the father, was a stanch Lutheran, and professor of theology at Marburg.

MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY, a school of philosophy and theology which took its rise, about the year 1836, in Marshall College and in the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church, at that time located at Mercersburg, Pennsylvania. This title was derived from the name of the village, and first applied by opponents as indicating a novel and somewhat doubtful system of speculation in American Protestantism. It grew out of the contact between the modern evangelical theology of Germany and Anglo-American church life, and quickened the German Reformed Church to new activity. That church was just then awaking from a state of comparative stagnation, and the change of language from German to the English language. In this unavoidable process of transition, she was in danger of losing her historical identity, and dissolving into other denominations. The Mercersburg system saved her historical church life, but transformed and adapted it to the condition and vocation of a new country. It produced considerable fermentation and controversy, which affected also the Lutheran and other neighboring churches, but is now a matter of history, though its fruits remain. The movement has three phases. The first was philosophical (from 1836 to 1843): the second was theological, and turned chiefly on the church question (1843-58): the third was liturgical (from 1858 to 1866). The liturgical movement began at the synod of Norristown, in 1847; but the liturgy was not published till 1868.

With Rauch, the Rev. Dr. John W. Nevin, called from the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Allegheny, to the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, became associated in the spring of 1840. Somewhat prepared by his own independent studies for a transition into the bosom of a German church, he soon learned to appreciate the genius and the genetic method of Rauch. His new vocation led him to study more fully the Heidelberg Catechism, and the history of the Continental Reformation, and modern German philosophy and theology. Rauch died in April, 1841. Nevin became the second president of Marshall College. Two years later the Reformed Church called Dr. Philip Schaff, by birth a Swiss, from the University of Berlin, where he had just begun to lecture, to the chair of church history and exegesis in Mercersburg. Arriving in the summer of 1844, young and enthusiastic, he entered with freedom into the theological life then pulsating in the Mercersburg institutions, and gave fresh impulse to its growth by the publication from that time on of the Principle of Protestantism (1845). Rauch, Nevin, and Schaff were alike conversant with
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philosophy and theology; but Rauch excelled chiefly in the former; and Nevin in the latter; while Schaff was by predilection a church historian, filled with love for the past, and hope for the future,—an advocate of progressive development. Complementing each other reciprocally, these three scholars developed the ideas of Mercersburg theology in different ways. Dr. Nevin discussed the questions concerning the church and the sacraments. Turning to Cyprian and the Nicene age, he represented the contrast between the church idea then extant and the sect system of our century, but aimed chiefly to show that the Oxford Tractarian theory of repristination was historically untenable, and would lead logically to the whole system of the Papacy, which in some respects was an improvement on Nicene and ante-Nicene Christianity. On the nature of the sacraments he reproduced the anti-Zwinglian and anti-Lutheran conception of John Calvin, which he held to be the modern necessity of his principle of Protestantism, vindicated the doctrines of the Reformation on the basis of historical development, in decided opposition to Romanism and Puseyism on the one hand, and also to rationalism and sectarianism on the other. Their attitude towards opinions then current provoked the charge of Romanizing tendencies against the Mercersburg school; yet, at the very time, Nevin was dealing heavy blows against Rome in his articles on Brownson's Quarterly Review; and Schaff, in his treatise, What is Church History? justified and defended the epoch of the Reformation as the legitimate result of the preceding ages, and the main current of modern Christianity. The Mercersburg school was also charged with transcendentalism and mysticism, but all these charges have gradually subsided. Among the expounders and defenders of the school must be mentioned Drs. Wolf (d. 1872), Harbaugh (d. 1867), Hibbey, Gerhart, Apple, Gast, and many other graduates of the college and seminary of Mercersburg. The chief opponents within the German Reformed Church were Dr. Berg, then in Philadelphia, and afterwards Dr. Bomberger, who headed the anti-liturgical movement since 1855. A regular heresy trial was held at the synod of York in 1845, and again at two subsequent synods; but in each case the Mercersburg professors were acquitted by an almost unanimous vote. We shall state in brief compass, not in the historical, but in logical order, the points of doctrine which were at issue in these controversies.

1. Mercersburg theology taught that the divine-human person of Jesus Christ is the primordial truth of Christianity, both of revelation and redemption. From the Christ-idea, as the fundamental principle, are to be developed all scriptural doctrines. Issue was taken with the high Calvinistic principle of a twofold unconditional predestination, as well as with the contrary Arminian principle of freewill, and no less decisively, also, with the Roman system, which starts from the idea of the Church as a visible and centralized organization. Neither the sovereign will of God, nor the natural freedom of man, nor an infallible church or pope, can, according to Scripture, be the starting-point in theological science. Mercersburg was the first theological school in America which propounded and vindicated what has since been called the "Christocentric" idea of Christianity.

2. The doctrine concerning the nature of the Church. Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God, is the second Adam, the head of a regenerate human race. Born in him and of him, by the Holy Spirit, believers are his members. He, glorified in heaven, and they, though still in the flesh on earth, together constitute one mystical body, a spiritual organism. This is the Christian Church, holy, catholic, and apostolic. Of supernatural origin, invested with divine authority, possessing spiritual powers adequate to the fulfillment of her mission, instinct with heavenly life, and destined to overcome her enemies, she is the communion in which men may obtain salvation and eternal life. The Church, extending through all ages, and destined to embrace all nations, is ever identical with herself, having one Lord, one faith, one baptism; yet as she has grown, in her Protestantism; yet as she has grown, in her Protestantism, in decided opposition to Romanism, and vindicating the validity of the reformation, and vindicating the validity of the anti-hierarchical organizations of the Protestant churches.

This idea was at war with the prevalent notion that the Church is a voluntary society of Christian individuals, organized for their common spiritual good, and with the opinion that the orthodox confessions of the Reformation are as fully adapted to the needs of the Church in the nineteenth century, as they were in the sixteenth or seventeenth century. Since the controversy closed, a great change has been wrought in the attitude of evangelical denominations. The uncharitable judgments on the Roman Church are moderated; and the tendency to union is spreading in proportion as the various branches of the Church by better knowledge of the history of the past become acquainted, and learn to appreciate each other.

3. An elevated conception of the Church involved a corresponding estimate of the spiritual dignity of the ministry. Christ perpetuates his mediatorial office by an order of chosen men, who, by the laying-on of hands, are duly invested with divine authority to speak in his name, to dispense the sacraments, and to bear rule as undershepherds over the flock. At the same time, Mercersburg always taught the general priesthood of the
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MERCY.

The whole movement was christological, and in close sympathy with the positive evangelical theology of Protestant Germany, though necessarily modified by American surroundings and wants. In 1858 Marshall College was removed to Lancaster, Penn., and united with Franklin College. The theological seminary followed in 1871. The appellative Mercersburg, therefore, no longer signifies any local relation. The name has been employed in this article to denote that christological type of thought which originated and was developed at Mercersburg. At the present time, the peculiar characteristics of the Mercersburg school are no longer equally distinctive, because similar christological tendencies have since sprung up, and taken root in other denominations; hence former issues have been superseded. Instead of antagonism at nearly all points, there is now some degree of living sympathy between the different branches of American Protestantism and schools of evangelical theology. Within the German Reformed Church itself the two parties which for years were divided on doctrine and worship have been brought into closer sympathy, and in 1880 appointed a peace-commission, which has since been engaged in preparing a new English liturgy and hymn-book.


MERCY, God's love displayed towards the sinner as subject to sorrow, misery, and death, as grace is God's love displayed to the sinner as a transgressor of the law, and guilty. This is a theological distinction, and is not made in the New Testament in the use of the terms "grace" and "mercy." See GRACE, LOVE.

MERCY, Sisters of, or ORDER OF OUR
Lady of Mercy, a religious order founded in Dublin by Miss Catherine McAuley (see art.), Dec. 13, 1831. The first was founded by the archbishop of Dublin, Jan. 23, 1834; but subsequently the rule of St. Augustine, with some necessary modifications, was chosen, approved by Gregory XVI. in 1835, and formally confirmed by him in 1840. The order has spread very rapidly, and is now found in all parts of the British domains and of the United States. The first house upon the American Continent was opened at St. John’s, Newfoundland, 1842, and, in the United States, at Pittsburg, Penn., 1843. The Sisters of Mercy devote themselves to the suffering and the tempted among women. They are divided into choir-sisters and lay-sisters. The latter are occupied with the duties in the house; the former, with those connected with their more active work. The former also elect the superior for the order in each diocese, for there is no general superior over the entire order. Those who would enter either class undergo a postulancy of six months, assume the white veil, and then, after a novitiate of two years, are received. The irrevocable vows are of poverty, chastity, obedience, and service to the poor, sick, and ignorant. The habit of the order is a black robe with long loose sleeves, a white coif, and a white or black veil. In the streets a bonnet of black crepe is worn, instead of the coif and veil. See Ceremonial for Reception and Profession of the Sisters of Mercy, Baltimore, and Leaves from the Annals of the Sisters of Mercy, New York, 1851 sqq. 3 vols.

Mercy-seat, the golden lid of the ark. See Ark of the Covenant.

Meribah (quarrel), the name of two places (Exod. xvii. 7; Num. xx. 13), upon the wandering of the Israelites, where Moses, on command of God, drew water out of a rock. (1) Meribah, with the alternative name Massah (temptation), was in Rephidim, the last station before the Sinai Desert. The monks of St. Catherine put it in the Wady Leja, at the base of Sinai, on the other side from the convent; but the location is improbable. Against it is the monastic and Bedouin eagerness to put as many holy places as possible together, the improbability that Rephidim was at the base of Sinai, and yet not in the Wilder ness of Sinai, and the perennial supply of water at Sinai. Wilson and Warren place it in Wady Feiran, near Mount Serbal; Holland, in the pass at Watiyeh, at the eastern end of Wady es-Sheikh. (2) Meribah, near Kadesh, in the Wilderness of Zin. From Ezekiel’s mention of it (xlvii. 10), it has been conjectured that the water still flowed in his day. See Kadesh. It was at this Meribah that Moses disobeyed God by striking the rock, instead of speaking to it, and received the heart-breaking intimation, that, in consequence, he would not be allowed to lead the Israelites into the promised land, as he had expected (Num. xx. 12).

W. PRESSIEL.

Meritum de condigno, de congruo. This distinction in the conception of the merit of good works, as first made by Thomas Aquinas (P. ii. 1, Qu. 114, arts 4 and 5), is, in his system, a compromise between the stronger Augustinian leaning, which personally ruled and distinguished him, and the Pelagian inclination in the Catholic Church towards emphasizing good works. He taught, (1) that no one but Christ can gain grace for any one else by the “merit of condignity,” i.e., real merit; (2) that no one can gain such grace by the “merit of congruity,” since God meets the wish of man for the salvation of others. Duns Scotus goes even farther in this Pelagian direction, and asserts that man can prepare himself to receive this grace. But Protestants reject altogether this teaching, on the ground that it tends to lessen the mediatorial character of Christ, and leads tender consciences to doubt of all their works, and to seek ever for more. [See K. R. HAGENBACH: History of Christian Doctrine, ii. 308-311; HODGE: Systematic Theology, iii. 231-245.]

Temple, the Ark of. See Ark of the Covenant.

Merle d’Aubigné, Jean Henri, b. at Eaux-vives on Lake Leman, Switzerland, Aug. 16, 1794; d. at Geneva, Oct. 21, 1872. He studied theology at the university of Geneva; but the deepest and most decisive religious impressions he received from Robert Haldane and the religious revival which he produced in Geneva in the second decade of the present century. It was not without some hesitation that he subscribed to the famous edict of May 3, 1817, issued by the Venerable Association of Pastors, a thoroughly rationalistic body, and forbidding the preachers to discuss any debatable doctrine in the pulpit, such as hereditary sin, predestination and grace, etc. But some explanations induced him to take a lighter view of the edict; and July 3, 1817, he was ordained. It was at that time his idea to devote himself to literature in general, and he was much occupied with translations of Ariosto and Schiller; but his visit to Eisenach in October, 1817, during the celebration of the third centennial festival in commemoration of the Reformation, made it one of the great objects of his life to write the history of the religious reforms of the sixteenth century. After a short stay in Berlin, where he acquired the friendship of Neander, he was appointed pastor of the Reformed congregation in Hamburg, 1818, and court-preacher in Brussels, 1824. In both places he exercised great influence; but in Hamburg he experienced some difficulties from the side of the consistory, and from Brussels he was driven away by the revolution of 1830. Meanwhile the Evangelical Society had been formed in Geneva; and, in order to provide the church of Geneva with evangelical pastors, the society had founded an independent theological school. From that school Merle accepted a call as professor of church history; and in that position he remained for the rest of his life, preaching alternately with Gaussen and Gall, and in the Chapelle de l’Oratoire. The formation, however, of the Evangelical Society, and the foundation of the new theological school, could not help arousing the jealousy of the state church; and the Venerable Association of Pastors forbade Merle the pulpit. One of Merle’s most cherished ideas was the union of all true Christians, and consequently he actually dreaded a separation from the state establishment. But, on the other hand, he could not allow any external authority to interfere with his office as a preacher of the gospel; and in 1835 an independent congregation was formed at the Oratoire, which, by joining the Bourg, de Faur in 1849, became the foundation of the Eglise Evangélique in Geneva. In the same
year he published the first volume of his great work, *Histoire de la Réformation*, of which the thirteenth and last volume appeared after his death. The work consists of two divisions,— the Reformation at the time of Luther (English translation, many editions), and the Reformation at the time of Calvin (English translation, 1869-79, 8 vols.); the two great characters forming the respective centres of the two groups of Reformers. Its success was marvellous, especially in the English-speaking countries Great Britain and America, but also in France and Germany. It was translated both into English and German, and edition followed upon edition. Among his other works are *Le Protecteur*, 1848, an apology of Oliver Cromwell; *Trois Siècles de l'Ultime*, predicted capture of that city. Bel is here men obscured, so that the epithets and dignity of Bel speech, sermons, etc. [See Remusat: *Mélanges de Littérature et Philosophie*; and Robert Baird: *D'Aubigné and his Writings*, New York, 1846.]

**MERODACH.** (Heb., מֶרְוָדָךְ; Babyl., Marduk, Maruduk; origin and meaning of name uncertain), a famous Babylonian deity, son of Ea, god of the planet Jupiter; a valiant warrior, agent, and god; during the later Babylonian Empire, the special guardian of Babylon itself; is named (Jer. 1.2) as overthrown at "the destruction with Merodach: but the latter was himself called "Bilu, Bel ("lord"); and it is on other grounds times between him and the mighty god Bel (see 

Jabin." (2) As "king of the land of Kaldi," the kings who paid tributeto Tiglath Pileser III. (3) As "a lake in Northern Palestine, the site of Joshua's crushing defeat of Jabin's confederacy (Josh. xi. 19, 21, 22, 7), identified with Lake Samachonites of Josephus, and Lake Huleh of the Arabs, eleven miles north of the Lake of Galilee. It is triangular in shape, six miles long by two miles and a half wide, but only eleven feet deep.

**MERSWIN,** Rulman. See *Rulman Merswin*. 


Now, if, according to the last contract-tablet mentioned above, a King Mardukabaddina reigned for twenty years, then the identity of the persons thus named by Sargon and by Sennacherib, of the *Maprodecesus* of Piolemny, the Merodach-Baladan of the Bible, and the Marudachus Baldanes of Alexander Polyhistor, is highly probable. He would not interrupt his reckoning because during some of these years (after his twelfth,— years during which no contract-tablets bearing his name have been discovered) he failed actually to hold the throne. It is more doubtful whether the king named by Tiglath Pileser II. is the same person, though this is quite possible. But if "Baladan," the name of the father of Merodach-Baladan according to 2 Kings xx. 12 and Isa. xxi. 1, is abbreviated, as is not unlikely, for Merodach-Baladan (father and son having the same name), then the contemporary of Tiglath Pileser may have been the father.

Most difficult of all is to fix the time of the embassy to Hezekiah. In all probability, the object of it was really to pave the way for an alliance; and it occurred, most likely, at a time when Merodach-Baladan was in special straits, or saw a good opportunity for striking a blow against Assyria. It is impossible at present to decide, however, whether it was in the time of Sargon or of Sennacherib, and, if the latter, whether before or after Sennacherib's campaign in Judæa.

See Sargon, Sennacherib. 

**MERON,** Waters of (waters of the high place), a lake in Northern Palestine, the site of Joshua's crushing defeat of Jabin's confederacy (Josh. xi. 5, 7), identified with Lake Samachonites of Josephus, and Lake Huleh of the Arabs, eleven miles north of the Lake of Galilee. It is triangular in shape, six miles long by two miles and a half wide, but only eleven feet deep.
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MESOPOTAMIA (Μεσοπόταμια, i.e., ἴδια μέσα τῶν ποταμῶν τοῦ τε Εὐφράτου καὶ τοῦ Τίγρου — Αρτιαν. Alex., 7, 7, cf. Tacit. Annal., 6, 37) is the name given to the land situated between the Tigris and the Euphrates. The region covered by this name was included in the territory of the ancient Aramaeans. Abraham entered Canaan, and the name Aram is found in connection with the land mentioned in Genesis xxvii. 5; xxviii. 1 ff.; xxxv. 20, xlvi. 15. 

Among the chief cities of Mesopotamia were Haran (Carra), Edessa, Nisibis, and Tal-Barsip (later Kar-Salmanassar), capital of the important principality of Bit-Adini (Judg xxxi. 5). 

Mesopotamia was not a political unit, and its history is involved in that of the great peoples which bordered upon it. Among the chief cities of Mesopotamia were Haran (Carra), Edessa, Nisibis, and Tal-Barsip (Har-Erru, the capital of the important principality of Bit-Adini). The name of this city is often mentioned in connection with the land of Mesopotamia. It was ruled by a series of chieftains and kings, among whom were Abraham and his descendents. 

During the time of the Babylonian Empire, Mesopotamia was a province of the kingdom of Babylonia. It was conquered by the Persians in the 6th century B.C., and was later divided among the Parthians and the Sassanians. The region was eventually conquered by the Arabs in A.D. 637-641. 

MESROB, or MASHTOZ, b. in the middle of the fourth century, at the village of Hazez in the Armenian province of Taron; d. at Wabarshapat, Feb. 19, 441. He was educated by the catholicos, Nerses the Great, and instructed in the Eastern Church, which was later called the Armenian Church. 

After the death of Nerses, he came to the court of King Vramshapuh, where he was disturbed and dissatisfied with his life as a monk. He then began his great missionary and literary labors in Armenia. The Bible was translated into Armenian, and the Armenian language was written in a new alphabet. Mesrob was later recognized as a saint in the Eastern Church. 

MESSENIANS. — I. Messenians were a Greek city-state in southern Greece, located between the Peloponnesus and the southern coast of the Greek mainland. Their capital was Messene. 

Their history is closely connected with the history of the Peloponnesus, and they were often at war with their neighbors. They were ruled by a council of elders, and their religion was based on the worship of the god Zeus. 

In the 5th century B.C., Messenians rebelled against Sparta, their powerful neighbor. They were later defeated by Sparta, and their territory was annexed to the Sparta. However, Messenians continued to resist Sparta, and they formed a league of cities known as the Messenian League. 

Their independence was recognized by the Spartan king Cleomenes I, who granted them a charter of freedom in 371 B.C. However, the league was eventually dissolved due to internal strife, and the territory was again annexed to Sparta. 

MESSENIANS. — II. Messenians were also a people in ancient Greece, located in the region of Messenia, which is now in the western Peloponnesus. Their territory was bordered to the north by Arcadia, to the east by Lacadia, and to the south by Spartia. 

Their history is closely connected with the history of the Peloponnesus, and they were often at war with their powerful neighbor, Sparta. They were ruled by a council of elders, and their religion was based on the worship of the god Zeus. 

In the 5th century B.C., Messenians rebelled against Sparta, their powerful neighbor. They were later defeated by Sparta, and their territory was annexed to the Sparta. However, Messenians continued to resist Sparta, and they formed a league of cities known as the Messenian League. 

Their independence was recognized by the Spartan king Cleomenes I, who granted them a charter of freedom in 371 B.C. However, the league was eventually dissolved due to internal strife, and the territory was again annexed to Sparta. 

MEXAPIPIIS. — MESSAPII, Messapia, was a province of Italy, located in the southern part of the country. It was occupied by the Romans in the 2nd century B.C., and was later annexed to the Roman Empire in 43 B.C. 

The province was divided into two parts, the Messapic and the Messenian, which were located on opposite sides of the Apennine mountains. TheMessapichills were inhabited by the ancient Messapii, while the Messenian plains were inhabited by the Messenians. 

The Messapii were a semi-barbaric people, and they were ruled by a council of elders. They were later incorporated into the Roman Empire, and their territory was annexed to the province of Campania. 

MESSENIANS. — MESSAPII, Messapia, was a province of Italy, located in the southern part of the country. It was occupied by the Romans in the 2nd century B.C., and was later annexed to the Roman Empire in 43 B.C. 

The province was divided into two parts, the Messapic and the Messenian, which were located on opposite sides of the Apennine mountains. TheMessapichills were inhabited by the ancient Messapii, while the Messenian plains were inhabited by the Messenians. 

The Messapii were a semi-barbaric people, and they were ruled by a council of elders. They were later incorporated into the Roman Empire, and their territory was annexed to the province of Campania. 

MESSAPII, Messapia, was a province of Italy, located in the southern part of the country. It was occupied by the Romans in the 2nd century B.C., and was later annexed to the Roman Empire in 43 B.C. 

The province was divided into two parts, the Messapic and the Messenian, which were located on opposite sides of the Apennine mountains. TheMessapichills were inhabited by the ancient Messapii, while the Messenian plains were inhabited by the Messenians. 

The Messapii were a semi-barbaric people, and they were ruled by a council of elders. They were later incorporated into the Roman Empire, and their territory was annexed to the province of Campania. 

These parts were ruled by a council of elders. They were later incorporated into the Roman Empire, and their territory was annexed to the province of Campania.
1. Prophecies in the Old Testament. — The first promise of salvation is put in closest connection with the Fall (Gen. iii. 15). The older theologians wrongly interpreted the “seed of the woman” to mean an individual; and the Roman Catholics, on the other hand, looked for an exegesis which the Jesuits zealously espoused. The passage predicts the conflict of the human race with the kingdom of evil, and the final triumph over it; so that it is indeed the “first Gospel” (ἐπίστασις εἰς τὸ παρακάτω), as the older theologians designated it. Of very great interest is the further teaching of the passage, that as evil is the consequence of sin, so salvation will be a consequence only of the destruction of sin. In other words, the conflict here indicated is a moral conflict. Gen. iv. 1 does not refer to the God-man, as Luther indicates in his translation; but the name “Noah,” which Lamech gave his son (Gen. v. 29), proves that the antediluvian world was looking forward to a deliverer from the curse of sin. After the Flood, those divine acts of election occur by which the way for the fulfilment of salvation was being prepared. The God of revelation was the God of Shem (Gen. ix. 26), and the promise that in Abraham (Gen. xi. 3, xviii. 18, etc.) all nations were to be blessed was to find its fulfilment in the kingdom of Christ. Important is the thought that the chosen tribe is to rule all nations (xxviii. 29), and this tribe was to be Judah (xlix. 10). No matter how the word “Shiloh” is interpreted (“Christ the Prince of peace,” or, “a place of peace”), it is replete with the promise of the future.

A third period of Messianic prophecy begins with the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. Baal's prophecy of the star of Jacob (Num. xxiv. 17 sqq.), referred by the ancient Jews to the Messiania, evidently points to a glorious rule and ruler issuing from Israel. The passage in Deuteronomy (xviii. 15–19) does not refer, as it used to be explained, to a single individual prophet, Christ, but to the office of the prophet, no less the Messiah, — Acts vii. 37. The point of departure for the more definite concentration of the Messianic expectation on a person is 2 Sam. vii., where Jehovah promises to establish David's dynasty forever, and to make his seed his son. This son was not the whole house of David, but one of David's descendants (1 Chron. xi. 11). By this passage (2 Sam. vii.) two things were fixed, — that the Messiah was to be a king, and a son of David. David's house can be humbled, but not permanently (1 Kings xi. 39). In David's last song (2 Sam. xxiii.) predicates are affirmed of David's royal line in general, not of his own person, but to the ideal kingdom he represented (compare Ps. xxi. 5, 7, lxi. 7). In Ps. li., xlv., lxii., cx., a royal personage is de-
picted, to whom neither David nor Solomon corresponded, but only He of whom they were types. There are two schools of interpretation with regard to these psalms. The one, represented by Calvin, holds that, in the first instance, they refer to a king of Israel, but that the ideal predicates affirmed of him refer to the Christ. The other school holds that the Psalmist had before him the ideal theocratic king, and so spoke directly of Christ. This last view cannot be set aside by the objection that the Psalmist could not sing of a future king; for he does sing of a future glory of the holy city (Ps. lxxxi.), and the future advent of Jehovah to establish his kingdom (Ps. xcvi.-xcviii.). This view seems to be decidedly the more natural in Ps. ii., lxiii., cx. These psalms depict the Messiah as a victorious prince, ruling over the world, and relieving the suffering (Ps. lxiii.). This king is also a priest (Ps. cx. 4), a designation it was impossible to give to David or Solomon; and the assurance that his priesthood was to be after the order of Melchizedek shows that it was to be something outside of, and superior to, the Mosaic order.

Turning to the prophetical books, we find in the oldest of them no distinct reference to the person of the Messiah. But the elaborate descriptions of his person and rule which Isaiah and Micah give do not make the impression that the idea was a novel one; and the view that the Messianic expectation goes back no farther than the eighth century B.C. has no warrant. It should not occasion any surprise that the prophets, at the time of the deterioration of the Davidic dynasty, should have pointed more distinctly to the future; for this was the very function of the prophets,—to testify to the indestructible truth of the divine promise. Pursuing first the line of the predictions concerning Christ's person, we discover that he is to be endowed with a superhuman dignity. He is of divine origin (Mic. v. 2), and endowed with divine power (Mic. v. 4). To this passage in Micah corresponds Isa. iv. 2, if this is to be referred to the Messiah, as the Targum assumes. Isa. vii. 14 refers to the birth of “Immanuel,” and the usual opinion that this refers to the Messiah from its connection with ix. 5 sqq., where the divine nature of the Messiah is affirmed. In xi. 1 sq. the divine in him seems to be described as only the result of the Divine Spirit's resting upon him. In Jer. xxiii., xxxiii. 14-20, we have other prophecies of the Messiah; but, in the first, the expression “the Lord our righteousness” (xxiii. 6) does not necessarily contain the affirmation of the divinity of the Messiah; for it does not say he is divine, but is “called” so. In Jer. xxx. 21, however, the Messiah is described as a ruler, and in a peculiar relation to Jehovah, such as no man can hold to him. In Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12, the expression “Branch” is used as a proper name of the Messiah. In Mal. iii. 1 we have a prophecy of a “messenger,” whom the Lord would send to prepare the way for the “messenger of the covenant,” or angel of Messuagement. This angel who does not the messenger is Jehovah. The angel of the covenant may be the angel of the wilderness, but it is more plausible to refer it to the Messiah. Finally, in Daniel, we come to the close of the Messianic prediction of the Old Testament. In vii. 13 sq. the vision of the four beasts is concluded with a vision of the “Son of man coming with the clouds to the Ancient of days.” According to some interpreters, the Son of man referred to the theocratic people, as the four beasts referred to world-kings; but this is very improbable: and, as far back as we can trace the exegetical tradition, it was referred to the Messiah. So here, likewise, the Messiah is described as a divine as well as a human being; for only God can use the clouds as his chariot (Ps. civ. 3). If we follow the usual interpretation, the Messiah is not again referred to in the heavenly creatures of Daniel; but who is he whose voice is heard on the bank of the Ulai (viii. 15-17), who appears in majesty at the Tigris (x. 5 sqq.), and swears by him that liveth forever (xii. 6 sqq.)? That is the best view which sees here the angel of Jehovah (Michaelis, etc.). If this be so, his identity with the Son of man of vii. 13 (not with Daniel, as Hengstenberg urged) is easily made out. It is to be noticed that the Apocalypse (i. 13-15) gets its description of the appearance of the glorified Christ from Dan. x. 5 sqq.

The union of this Son of man coming from the clouds with the member of the house of David is not described in the Old Testament (we prophecy only in part,—1 Cor. xiii. 9). All the elements, however, are furnished in the prophecy of the Old Testament. It remained for Christ to unite them in his person,—the object and the fulfilment of these two lines of prophecies.

2. The Office and Work of the Messiah. The first characteristic of the Old Testament prophecies is, that the Messiah was to be a king, and the Messianic kingdom was to rise from a humble beginning to a glorious consummation (Isa. xi. 1; Mic. v. 2). Like the first David, he was to come forth as a stem out of Jesse, and be born in Bethlehem. The same truth is taught by the allegory of the cedar of Lebanon (Ezek. xvii. 22 sqq.), which grows from a little twig that the Lord planted, and under the shadow of whose branches all the birds of heaven congregate. This allegory refers, not to Zerubbabel, but to the Messianic kingdom. The Messiah sits on a great throne, but in humble circumstances (Zech. ix. 9 sq.). His royal power was to extend over all nations (Isa. xi. 10 sqq.).

The second characteristic of the Messiah of the Old Testament is that he suffers, and by his suffering and death atones for the sins of the people. The destruction of sin he will accomplish by the exercise of righteous judgment (Isa. xi. 9) and the spread of the knowledge of Jehovah through the land. At the side of passages of this kind are others, in which prophecy points to a servant of Jehovah who suffers in the people's stead, to an act of atonement upon which the dawn of the period of salvation depends. The Messiah is to be a priest. The sufferings of the Messiah bring about a recognition of the God who saves among those who therefore have not known him.

This idea is brought out very distinctly in Ps. xxii., which is Lorri, in which no circumstance is found to correspond to it (not even 1 Sam. xxiii. 25 sq.), nor to Jeremiah, who would hardly have associated the establishment of the kingdom of God among the heathen with his deliverance. The meal of thanksgiving and sac-
The sacrifice (Ps. xxii. 26) is identical with the prophesied meal of the Messianic period (Isa. xxv. 6 sq.), which God prepares on Zion. The most pious of the gentiles is the suffering one in the psalm, Israel (Kimchi), as verses 22, 23, show. This Messianic suffering is regarded as vicarious. The whole Old Testament is full of the thought that God stays judgment upon a guilty race on account of a just and righteous substitute. The most pious of the patriarchs of Israel are sinful themselves, for this reason cannot roll away the curse from the people (Isa. xiii. 27, etc.), and do well if they save themselves (Ezek. xiv. 14 sq.). The people needs a more perfect mediator. This is the servant of Jehovah. The fundamental conception of the servant of God in Isa. xi. sqq., it is true, is the people of Israel (xli. 8 sq., xlv. 1 sq.; comp. Jer. xxx. 10), in which the prophets are included. It is not the prophetic order by itself, for the prophets were not a corporation; and the description of blind and dumb dogs (iv. 10) is not applicable to them. But when this servant of Jehovah is described as the light of the Gentiles (xlii. 1-7), the one who shall lead the people back to the Holy Land (xlii. 1-6, etc.), it is not to be denied that the description refers to an ideal person, and not to the servants of God (Israel) as an aggregate. This must be affirmed very positively with regard to lii. 13- liii. 12. The people itself has the consciousness of guilt (lix. 16, xlv. 5), and cannot atone for its sins (lix. 16). The prophecy points to one who suffers not for his own sins, but gives up his life as a substitute, as a ransom (Cp.), for the sins of others. He is rejected of men, but honored of God, and by him lifted out of the grave into glory. This servant of God is the son of David, as is plain from iv. 3 sqq., which refer back to the promise of David. In Zechariah it is plainly taught that the Messiah is to be priest, making atonement for his people (lii.), and is crowned with the double crown, uniting the royal and priestly functions (vi. 9-15). He is to suffer death; and, when he is pierced, it is as though Jehovah himself were pierced (xii. 10-13).

3. The Apocrypha. — The question whether the Messianic hope and the earliest monotheistic character of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament has been recently discussed with a good deal of heat, but without overthrowing the old position, that only faint indications of the Messianic hope are found in them. Turning first to the apocryphal Chochmah literature, we find that Ecclesiasticus speaks of the promises delivered to the patriarchs (xlv. 21 sqq.), David's glorious throne (xlvii. 11), and the coming of Elias (xlvii. 10), but nowhere even hints at the Messiah, the destroyer of sin, the consummator of the Davidic royalty. The Book of Wisdom is based on the Old Testament the idea of a day of judgment, and when the divine kingdom shall be restored (iii. 7 sqq., v.); but there is not a vestige of a reference to the future King and Saviour of David's lineage. One passage (ii. 12-20) was referred by the ancient church to the death of Christ, but the connection forbids this. What is true of the former two books is true of all the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. The Book of Baruch, which the writer attempted to set in the key of the old prophets, speaks of the glory of Jerusalem and the return of the people (iv. 21 sqq.), but has no word about the Messiah. The same is the case with Tobit, which refers to terrors of the Gentiles (xiii. 8-18, xiv. 5-7), but not to the Messiah. The First Book of Maccabees breathes, more than any of the other Apocrypha, the theocratic spirit of the Old Testament; but here, too, there is no trace of a Messianic expectation. The Messianic hope had not died out among the pious of the people back to the Holy Land (xlii. sqq.), but has no word about the Messiah. The same is true of all the Apocrypha, which probably understood Gen. xii. 10 in a Messianic sense, and Num. xxiv. 7, 17, when he whose kingdom is greater than that of Agag cannot be any one else than the Messiah. The same may be said of Isa. ix. 5, where they seem to have identified the Messiah with the appearance of the Lord's presence. The earliest Targums prove the same thing as the LXX. (see above). The Messianic hope was also fostered in those narrow and pious circles (Essenic circles, Hilgenfeld) from which the Jewish apocalyptic literature sprang after the Maccabean period. To this literature we now turn.

4. The Hebrew Apocalyptic Literature. — The Book of Enoch, whose composition is put by the latest authorities in the year 110 B.C., substitutes for the seventy weeks of Daniel seventy periods in which heathen rulers shall govern. At the end of these two books, the heathen nations shall be subdued, the new Jerusalem be established, and the Messiah reign (xxvii. 39 sqq.). The Messiah is represented under the figure of a white bullock,
The name of the Messiah occurs most frequently in chaps. xxxvi.-lxxi (which Hilgenfeld declares to have been written after Christ's birth), and was given before the world's creation (xviiil. 9). When he appears (xvi. 4 sqq.), he will cast out all the rest of the elders who cast the lot upon the Messiah, and the people; but even his enemies shall bow before him (li. 3-5, xii. 9). If this section was written before Christ, then we have it, as Hilgenfeld has said, "the highest doctrine of the Messiah known to us in the Hebrew literature before Christ." It also speaks of the Messiah as being at once the Lord from heaven and the son of a woman (xii. 5), but does not teach an incarnation. The step is so great from the Messianic passages in the Old Testament to the Christological section in Enoch included between xxxvii and lxxi as to force me to the conclusion of Hilgenfeld, that it is of post-Christian origin.

The expectation of the Messiah culminated in the Herodian period. This result was caused by the restlessness of the people under the domination of Idumean and Roman rulers; and the people looked forward with great longing to the coming of the Son of David, which from henceforth is a title of the Messiah in the New Testament (Matt. ix. 27, etc.) and the Targums. The best authority on the subject, as it was held at this time, is the New Testament; after it, Josephus, who however, is very cautious in his utterances. The New Testament represents one of the essential features of the time to be the waiting for the Messiah (Luke i. 38, ii. 25), who should deliver Israel from its enemies, and redeem it from its sins (Luke i. 74-77). He was to establish righteousness, but only through suffering and conflict rise to his glory (Luke ii. 34; John i. 29). Very different was the Messianic hope of the Pharisees. They expected the kingdom of God to come with outward circumstance (Luke xvii. 20), and to be a political power. Their ideas were visibly embodied in Judas the Galillean, and the faction of the Zealots.

The vital power of these Messianic expectations is attested by the frequent outbreaks of the Jews against the Romans. Josephus (B. J., VI 5, 4) explains this inhuman hostility by a prophecy in their sacred books, of double meaning, according to which one should attain to dominion over the world from Judea. He found the fulfilment in the Roman emperor Vespasian. The passage to which he referred was, in all probability, Dan. ix. 24-27.

The destruction of Jerusalem was by no means the grave of the Messianic hopes: on the contrary, from that event dates the reception of this belief as a Jewish article of faith; and Bar Chochba was able once more to gather the people about him, under the delusion that he was the Messiah, and to lead them into a death-struggle. Rabbi Akiba acknowledged his Messianic claims; but Hillel II., in the time of Constantine the Great (Gesch. d. Juden., iv. 386), said, "There is no Messiah for Israel; for Israel had its Messiah long ago, in the days of Hezekiah." To which Rabbi Joseph replied, "May God forgive Hillel!" It was firmly believed that the Messiah would come in which Suetonius (Vespas. 4) refers to as an old and firm opinion.

The Fourth Book of Ezra is the last of the Hebrew apocalyptic writings. The most recent criticism again refers its origin to a date before Christ, although we still prefer to place it about 100 A.D. The teachings concerning the Messiah include much that is peculiar to the Talmud. It represents the fourth world-power as the Roman Empire. The Messiah will come to bring the eagle (the Roman Empire) to judgment, and to cast it into the fire (xi. 37 sqq., and, on the other hand, to bless the people of God until the day of the last judgment (xii. 33). In chap. xiii., the advent and work of the Messiah are more fully described. His face is as a consuming fire. The nations will give up their wars when he speaks. His reign, however, is limited to four hundred years, when he and all men living shall die, but, after seven days, rise again. The Highest will then reveal himself, and establish righteousness.

6. Rabbinical Views. — Jewish theology distinguished two periods (ones), by which they did not mean this world and the world to come, but two periods in this world's history. The second period follows upon the resurrection. Some taught that the Messianic period began before, some after, that event. The former was the prevailing view; and R. Eliezer says, that, in the days of the Messiah, wars will continue. The duration of the Messianic kingdom is variously defined. The principal reference is Bab. Sanh., 97 sqq. After limiting the duration of the world to six thousand years, to be followed by a universal sabbath lasting a thousand (Rab Kethina) or two thousand (Abaji) years, during which the world will lie desolate, it says, "It is a tradition..."
of the school of Elias, that the world will last six thousand years, two thousand of which are deo-
lation (Thohu), two thousand law (Thora), two thousand the Messianic period; but, on account
of our sins, a part of the latter is run out." In
another place, leaning upon Bythin sources, it
says, that, after 4,291 years should have elapsed
from the creation of the world, the war between
Gog and Magog would begin; and then the Mes-
siah would come, and, at the end of seven thou-
sand years, God would create a new world.

The Messiah was to appear suddenly (Bab. 
Sanh., 97: "Three things come unexpectedly,—
the Messiah, that which is found, and a scor-
pion"), but whether in Nisan (the month of the
deliverance from Egypt) or Tisri (Ps. lixxxi. 14),
was a matter of dispute. Signs would precede
his coming. R. Jochanan says (Bab. Sanh., 98),
"The Son of David will not come, except in that
generation when all are either undeserving of
punishment (Isa. lix. 21), or all are guilty (Isa.
lix. 16)." R. Acha asserts, that, if Israel was in
a state of penitence only for a single day, the Son
of David would not come until Maimonides (Mai.
xiv. 6) explained the prophecy of one coming in the
spirit and power of Elijah. Many represented that the Messiah's
first act would be the breaking of the foreign
yoke; and some rabbins held that he would arouse
the righteous dead, but in regard to the resur-
rection of the dead there was a great divergence
of views amongst the Jewish theologians.

A great interest centres in the question, whether
the Jewish teachers taught an atonement for sin
through the sufferings and death of the Messiah.
(See Wünsche: D. Leiden d. Messias, 1867.)

There is no doubt that the old Jews referred
the Messianic passages in Zechariah and Isa. liii.
to the Messiah; and Trypho (Justin, c. 89) says,
"It is evident that our Scriptures announced that
Christ will suffer;" but the idea of atoning suf-
ferrings is not to be found in the Talmud associ-
ated with him. Its method of salvation is ex-
pressed in these words (Berachoth, 5) : "Their
sins are all forgiven who study the Law, do acts
of mercy, and bury their children." The Christ
of the atonement was an offence to the Jews.
The Targum of Jonathan, in its paraphrase of
Isa. liii. 5, says, "By his teaching peace will be
multiplied upon us; and, if we hearken to his
words, our sins shall be forgiven." The teaching
spoken of must refer to a revision of the Mosaic
law, which was deemed of permanent validity,
stretching even to the future world (Pesikta s.).

In regard to the fate of the Gentile nations, some
taught full citizenship would be offered to them;
others, that not even the privileges of the prose-
lyte would be granted.

Lit. — Knobel: D. Prophetismus d. Hebräer.,
Breslau, 1857; Hofmann: Weissagung u. Erfül-
lung und Schriftbeweis, Nördling, 1864; Stähelin:
D. messian. Weissagungen d. A. T., Berlin, 1847;
Hengstenberg: Christologia d.(coord. Old Testament,
Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1853-58; Neumann:
Gesch. d. messian. Weissag. im A. T., Bleicherode,
1865; Tholuck: D. Propheten u. ihre Weissag.,
Gottha, 1861, 2d ed., 1867; Oehler: Theology of
the Old Testament, Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1874;
Costella: Istene lemessiaici, Ebri, 1874; Riehm:
D. messian. Weissag., Gottha, 1875; Delitzsch:
Messianic Prophecies (edited by Curt-
tiss), Edinburgh, 1880; Hitzig: Vorlesungen über
d. bibl. Theol. u. messian. Weissagungen (edited by
Kneucker), Karlsruhe, 1880; von Orrelli: D.
attest. Weissagungen von d. Vollendung d. Re-
gates, Wien, 1882. — For the views of the later
Jews, at the time of Christ and since, on Messianic
prophecy. See Buxtorf: Lexicon Chald. Talmud.
et Rabbin., Basel, 1639 (pp. 1268-1273, where the
passages are given which the Targums explained
of the Messiah); Schöttgen: Hora Hebra. et
Talmud., 2 vols., Dresden et Lips., 1840; Thol-
dt: Christologia Judæorum, Erlangen, 1811;
Colani: Jésus Christ et les croyances messianiques
de son temps, Strassburg, 1864; Vernes: Hist.
des idées messian. depuis Alexandre jusqu'à l'empo-
reur Hadrien, Paris, 1874; Drummond: The Jewish
Messiah (from the Maccabees to the conclu-
sion of the Talmud), 1877; Ferdi. Weber: System d'.
altsynagogalen pallast. Theol. (edited by Delitzsch


MESTREZAT. Jean, b. at Geneva in 1592; d. in Paris, May 2, 1657; studied at Saumur, and was pastor of Charenton. He was a learned theologian, an excellent preacher, and one of the main supports of the French Reformed Church in the beginning of the seventeenth century. He disputed in the synods, in its disputations with the Jesuits, and in its negotiations with the court. He published several collections of sermons, of which the most remarkable is the Exposition de l'épitre aux Hébreux, Geneva, 1855, 3 vols. Of his numerous polemical writings, his treatise De la Communion à J. C. au Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, Sedan, 1624, was translated into German 1824, English 1831, and Italian 1838. See André: Essai sur les œuvres de J. M. Strassburg, 1847.

O. Schmidt.

METALS IN THE BIBLE. The use of bronze and iron was so old among the Hebrews, that they, like other ancient peoples, dated it back to the very beginning of history. (Compare Gen. iv. 22.) Abraham was rich in gold and silver, and the treasures of David and Solomon were famous (1 Chron. xxii. 14, xxiv. 4; 1 Kings ix. 26, x. 27; 2 Chron. viii. 18). Palestine itself, however, is not rich in metal-bearing strata, but the neighboring countries are; and, since the author of the Book of Job shows a considerable knowledge of mining, he may very well have acquired it from personal experience. According to Strabo, gold and silver were dug in the land of the Nabateans, and according to Edrisi, at Gebel es-Sera in the Seir Mountains, and along the boundary-line between Egypt and Nubia; but the principal places from which it was derived were Ophir (1 Kings ix. 26, 27, x. 11, 12, 22, 24; 2 Chron. xiv. 17, 18, 19, 20; 1 Kings x. 15; 2 Chron. ix. 14). Gold generally occurs more or less mixed with silver, and silver more or less mixed with some baser metal; but the Hebrews understood the various processes of purification; and gold from Ophir was especially valued on account of its purity (Job xxviii. 16; Ps. xiv. 9; Isa. xiii. 12). Before the exile, neither gold nor silver was coined into money, though both were used in the payment of tributes (2 Kings xii. 18, xiv. 14; xvii. 14, xxi. 33) and of taxes (Exod. xxi. 2, xxxv. 5; 1 Kings x. 16; 2 Chron. ix. 14). Gold and silver were mostly used for ornaments, such as bracelets (Gen. xxiv. 22), chains (Gen. xli. 42), tables (Exod. xxxv. 22), and necklaces (Exod. xxxvi. 22), or for embroidery (Exod. xxxix. 3; 2 Sam. i. 24) and decoration. Especially was silver lavishly used in the outfit of the temple, for the sockets of the candlesticks (Exod. xxxvi. 19, xxxvi. 24), for the hooks of the pillars (Exod. xxxviii. 10, 19), for the bowls and chargers (Num. viii. 18), the trumpets (Num. x. 2), the candlesticks, and tables (1 Chron. xxviii. 15, etc.). Copper was very commonly used. It could easily be smelted and fused; and those processes naturally suggested its being mixed with other metals, especially so as to produce bronze. Iron was more difficult to handle. It could be purified by smelting away all foreign elements, but it could not be smelted or fused itself. The smith, however, understood to forge it into axes, swords, etc. (1 Sam. xvii. 7; 2 Sam. xxiii. etc.). The "north ern iron" (Jer. xv. 12) seems to correspond to what we call steel. Zinc and lead were also known, and applied in various ways in practical life.

FR. W. Schultz.

METAPHRASTES, Simeon, a Byzantine writer, who has acquired a name in medieval literature by a compilation and partial remodelling (metaphrasis, whence his name) of a great number of lives of saints and martyrs. Of his personal life nothing is known with certainty. Leo Allatius, and, after him, Cave and Fabricius, place him in the first half of the tenth century, in the reigns of Leo the philosopher and his son Constantine; while Oudin, and, after him, Hamberger and others, place him in the middle of the twelfth century, in the reign of John Comnenus. The work itself, such as it exists in numerous manuscripts in the libraries of Vienna, Paris, Moscow, and London, and such as it has been partially incorporated with the Acta Sanctorum, is a bewildering maze of old and new, genuine and spurious; a hundred and twenty-two lives being considered genuine, and four hundred and forty-four spurious. Other works ascribed to him are Epitola IX, Carmine Sermones, etc. The Simeonis Chronicon is of doubtful authorship.

G.A.S.

METH, Ezechiel, and STIEFEL, Essias, were the leaders of a sect of mystical enthusiasts, which, in the first half of the seventeenth century, caused considerable trouble to the authorities in Thrinacia. Stiefel, a wine-dealer at C., was the originator of the whole movement; but Meth, his nephew, seems to have been its principal leader.
METHODISM.

power. Many of their relatives and acquaintance joined them, and neither admonitions nor punishments had any effect. The Countess Juliane of Gleichen separated from her husband, convinced that she was going to bring forth the Messiah. But, when Stiefel died (Aug. 12, 1627), Meth felt sorely disappointed, as he believed him indispensable. After his death, Stiefel was converted to Christianity, and the sect which he founded died out.

The movement afterwards known as "Methodism" had begun to develop its prodigious power. Like a mighty storm, the new preaching shook the hearts of the hearers, and threw new converts into the dust; so that, with great agitation and much crying, they entreated for mercy. The representatives of the movement were, on the other hand, treated to ridicule, scorn, and active persecution. But the movement spread in spite of resistance. Nothing was at first farther from the thought of John Wesley than to act independently of the English Church. He himself was a High-Churchman; but the Calvinistic view of religion was not acceptable to his young converts. Wesley, overcoming his first feelings of revolt, followed his example at Bristol; and, when the public places were denied him, he established the first Methodist chapel at that place, May 12, 1738. Great throngs now gathered to hear these two preachers, in Moorfields, Kensington Common, Mayfair, Blackheath, and other places. Nothing of the kind had been seen since the Reformation,—no, not even then. They and others knew, as Isaac Taylor has said, "how to hold the ear of men with an absolute mastery." Their sermons were interrupted by disturbing noises and personal violence; but their courage increased, and John Wesley could exclaim, "To save souls is my vocation, the world is my parish." In 1740 (July 23) he organized, with twenty-six male and forty-eight female members, the United Society in the Foundry, London. The year following (1741) Cennick, who had charge of the study of the Scriptures and religious conversation, of their number the most prominent were: John Wesley (1703-91) and his brother Charles (1708-88), and, several years later, George Whitefield (1714-70). In sport they were called "Sacramentarians," the "Pious Club," and also, on account of their regular habits of study and mode of life, "Methodists." — a name which they themselves afterwards adopted, defining a "Methodist" as one who lived after the method laid down in the Bible. It was from this club of Methodists that the religious regeneration of England proceeded. The first period of the history of Methodism synchronizes with the history of the latter's career: the second dates from his death.

1. HISTORY OF METHODISM TILL THE DEATH OF JOHN WESLEY, 1791.- The club at Oxford, which spent several evenings in the week in the study of the Scriptures, first began to show its works in the visitation of the poor, sick, and imprisoned. After six years (1738), the Wesleys departed to Georgia, in answer to calls,—the one to be pastor of the colony, the other to be missionary to the Indians. On board ship they came in contact with twenty-six Moravians, and much to their spiritual profit. John Wesley once said, "I went to America to convert others, and was not converted myself." They both had returned, by 1738, to England. Soon afterwards John Wesley and Whitefield began preaching in London churches, and by their fervid eloquence excited a deep sensation.

As the numbers of the congregations increased, the organization of the Methodist movement, or the "societies" as they were called, occupied Wesley's attention. With no other resort within reach, he somewhat reluctantly selected the most competent of the converts as lay-preachers. Maxwell had preached without his knowledge, but with great acceptance; and he made the first lay-preacher (or helper), but not till his scruples had been removed by the strong words of his mother: "Take care what you do with respect to that young man, for he is as surely called of God to preach as you are." In 1742 the number had already risen to 20. These men were without much education, but became eloquent by reason of a living faith, and, as local and itinerant
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preachers, accomplished an immense amount of good, suffering often imprisonment and other personal indignities in the work. Education was not a condition of a license to preach; but, by the rules of 1746, simply a gift of preaching and personal faith were required. They were licensed at first as "preachers on trial," for one year. By a rule passed in 1763 they were not allowed to remain longer than two years (afterwards extended to three years) in the same place.

The life of Methodism was settled by the admission of lay-preachers. The next thing in the way of perfecting the organization was the inauguration of an Annual Conference, the first session being held June 25-29, 1744, in the Foundry, London. Four lay-preachers were admitted. In the first instance it was designed by Wesley to be simply a meeting with his friends. But it came to be more of an authoritative body, with the power of discussing questions of doctrine, and formulating rules. The minutes of the early conferences were first published in 1763.

The first Methodist organizations were called "societies," and the first " Rules," so called, were drawn up by Wesley for the guidance of the members, forbade blasphemy, Sabbath desecration, dishonesty, usury, etc., and enjoined works of charity, and the use of the private and public means of grace. The societies were divided into classes, and here we come in contact with a peculiarly Methodist institution, and one of its sources of power. The idea struck John Wesley in Bristol, when, in order to raise money to pay the debt of the chapel, he divided the members into classes of twelve, and appointed one of them to collect from the other eleven a penny a week. Henceforth, all the societies were divided into classes, with a class-leader, who gathered the classes together once a week, presided over their meeting, and conversed with them on their spiritual estate. The separate societies were united in circuits; and in 1748 there were nine of these, with about seventy-two societies. The circuits were occupied by itinerant and local preachers, over whom one of their number presided as the overseer, with the title at first of assistant, and later of superintendent. (The Wesleyans in America call them "bishops.") Each society had a corpse of officers called "stewards," who met twice a week, and cared for its temporal concerns and diaconal work. This was the excellent outward organization of the Methodist body. But that which gave it power was the fresh blood of the gospel, which coursed through its veins. All the lay-talent was employed, the gifts of preaching were put into requisition, prayer-meetings (1762) gave an opportunity for all to exercise their powers, and, with the love-feasts, an opportunity for mutual encouragement and edification.

It is impossible here to follow the work of Wesley and his coadjutors in detail. They passed into districts where the people were most destitute, from a religious point of view. Methodism spread into Scotland, where Whitefield preached in 1741, and Wesley in 1751; and four circuits — Edinburgh, Dundee, Aberdeen, and Glasgow — were constituted. It was planted in Ireland in 1741, and both the Wesleys were soon after on the ground. At the end of thirty years, there were in Great Britain 50 circuits, 100 itinerant preach-
These were some of the practical results of the self-sacrificing zeal and indomitable purpose of Wesley and the early Methodists.

Wesley's *theology* had a predominantly practical trend. He himself was no creative mind in this department, much less did he ever think of founding a new system of theology. He stood almost wholly upon the platform of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. His system is called Arminian; but it must not be forgotten that he did not reject, as did the followers of Arminius, the doctrines of original sin and the Trinity. He taught very definitely the fall of man, the necessity of all the ministers of the district, which purely moral perfection, in which love has cosmically the Large Minutes, which are a summary of the Minutes from 1744 to 1789.

But his moral nature rose in revolt against the doctrines of absolute election, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of saints. He taught a conditional election and the possibility of falling away from grace. Two points upon which he laid great stress were regeneration and sanctification (perfection). By the former he meant a sudden conversion; the individual being able, like Wesley himself, to put his finger on the place that would be the power of a new life. This doctrine, which was almost a novel one at that time to the Church of England, has had a great power, especially among the masses; but it has also given rise to the abuse of laying an undue stress upon the affections. The doctrine of sanctification, or Christian perfection, Wesley also developed, appealing to passages like Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Matt. v. 48; John xvii. 19, 23; Eph. v. 25-27; 1 Thess. v. 23; 1 John v. 19. Perfection is attainable on the general ground that God would not demand any thing which could not be reached. An absolute and sinless perfection he did not teach, and repeatedly explains that it does not consist of freedom from ignorance, and error in things which are not essential to salvation, or of freedom from physical weaknesses, but of supreme love to God, and an equal love to our neighbor. In other words, the perfection of Wesley is relative, a purely moral perfection in which he consumed sin. In regard to this, as to other gifts of grace, he taught that it could be lost. The doctrinal authorities in the Wesleyan Methodist Church are the Works of John Wesley and Fletcher, and the Minutes of the Conferences, especially the Minutes of the Conferences, which are a summary of the Minutes from 1744 to 1789.

**II. HISTORY OF METHODISM FROM 1791 TO THE PRESENT TIME.** — Wesley foresaw dissensions in the church after his death, and left behind him a document for the Conference, urging the members to covenant not to assume authority the one over the other, or to be partial in the distribution of the funds. But differences of opinion at once revealed themselves. One party was in favor of the “old plan”; that is, the continuation of the union with the Church of England. Another party were strongly in favor of separation. There was also a decided difference of opinion in regard to lay-representation in the Conference, which Wesley had opposed. Alexander Kilham led the party favoring separation; and he was supported by numerous memorials to the Conference, but defeated by a large majority in the body. The Conference united the circuits into districts, and formed the so-called “district committee,” consisting of all the ministers of the district, which was to have authority to locate (subject to the confirmation of the Conference) and suspend ministers, etc. The year following (1783), it accorded to the societies the right of administering the sacraments, and ordained that no steward should be removed from office before his guilt was proved in the presence of the other stewards and the class-leaders. But, these concessions failing to satisfy all, a Plan of Pacification was passed in 1785, which went farther in the direction of separation from the Church of England, vested the power of locating ministers in the hand of the Conference (subject to the will of the stewards), in general accorded more power to the lay-element, and confirmed the law limiting the representation in the Conference to a hundred.

Kilham, discontented with the continued refusal of the Conference to admit laymen as representatives, sought to arouse opposition to that body. The Conference, in its turn, suspended Kilham, and endeavored to quiet the agitation by according more power to the lay-element in the so-called “Regulations of Leeds” (1787). Still dissatisfied, Kilham and the Wesleyan preachers broke off from the parent society, and on Aug. 9, 1797, founded in Leeds *The Methodist New Connection*, with which 5,000 seceders at once united. This body adopts the Wesleyan teaching and polity in every respect except in its treatment of the laymen, to whom it accords an equal representation with the clergy. In 1818 it had 26,564 communicants, with 176 ministers.

*The Primitive Methodist Connection* has grown much more rapidly. It grew out of the endeavor of Bourne and Clowes to introduce camp-meetings into England. Excluded by Conference, they established a new body in 1810, which preserved substantially the Wesleyan teachings, except in the matter of lay-representation. They admit delegates in the proportion of two laymen to one clergyman, and are distinguished for their original Methodist simplicity in the pulpit and private life.

The body carries on missionary work in Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. In 1881 it had 158,312 members and 1,149 preachers.

In 1815 there was another separation, of the so-called *Bible Christians*, or *Bryantites*, of whom William O'Bryan was the founder. It grew out of a feeling of discontent with the remuneration of the itinerant preachers. In 1881 they had 21,209 members. In 1816, 9,000 of the Methodists of Ireland formed a new organization, under the name of the *Primitive Wesleyan Methodists*. The leader of the movement was Adam Averill, who revolted against the departure from Wesley's original plan in allowing the societies to hold their services at the same time with those of the Anglican Church. In 1877 the body was again united with the Wesleyan Methodists.

The secessions were not yet at an end. Every new question admitting of a difference of opinion seemed to carry in it the seeds of separation and division. In 1828 the *Independent Wesleyans* and the *Wesleyan Protestant Methodists* went out from the main body; the original occasion being a dispute over the introduction of an organ into a chapel at Leeds against the wishes of the class-leaders. Not of the secessions attained much importance. Of more significance was the Warren movement of 1834, occasioned...
by the project of the Conference to establish a theological seminary, against which Dr. Samuel Warren protested. It was ultimately excluded from the Conference, and, with 20,000 others, constituted the Wesleyan Methodist Association (see below).

The church continued to have peace for ten years, when (in 1844) it was again interrupted by the so-called Fly Sheets, which were published by the Wesleyan Times, and The Wesleyan Banner. At the time of Wesley's death, there were already 5,848 communicants connected with the Wesleyan Methodist Association (see below).

The party represented by the Fly Sheets now emboldened, established two organs, The Wesleyan Times and The Wesleyan Banner. The agitation spread; and Dunn, the editor of the latter, Griffith, a co-editor of the former, and Everett, the author of the Fly Sheets, were excluded from Conference, while others were reprimanded. The excluded preachers were regarded as martyrs. Meetings were held, and finally, on March 12, 1850, in London, a convention of Wesleyan delegates. This meeting, while confessing its sympathy with the teachings of Wesleyanism, demanded lay-representation and other concessions. A petition, signed by 50,000 Methodists, was presented to the Conference, which, however, refused to accept it. The excitement in Methodist circles was intense, and in a single year (1850-51) the body lost 56,000 communicants. In 1850 the British Conference in England alone had 358,277 communicants, and in 1855 only 280,858. It continued, however, year after year, to refuse any concessions; and the agitators, finding their efforts hopeless, ceased agitating. Of the 100,000 who had left the main body, 19,000 in 1857 united with the Primitive Methodist Association and the Wesleyan Methodist Association (see below) to form the association of the United Methodist Free Churches. They hold an Annual Assembly composed of ministerial and lay delegates, each five hundred church-members being entitled to one delegate. In 1861 they numbered 72,339 members. The other reformers went to other denominations, except the few who organized the Wesleyan Reform Union, which in 1880 numbered 7,860 members.

It took a number of years for the wound which the Wesleyan Church had suffered to be healed. The increase in the number of communicants from 1855 to 1882 has been from 280,858 to 509,387 members (54,489 on trial), 2,124 ministers (298 on trial), and 341 supernumeraries. After its victory it was wise enough to give the lay membership a larger representation on the committees, and in 1877 to constitute a Representative Conference, composed of laity and clergymen in equal proportion. It does not take the place of the Conference of a hundred, but is auxiliary to it.

During this second period of its history, Methodism has not outgrown its original zeal and energy, but has shown itself more expansive, combining with the simplicity of early years a more perfected organization and broader culture. Its churches are no longer all chapels, but vie with those of other denominations in elegance of architecture, and luxury of furniture; its members also have wealth; its preachers lay more stress upon education, until now they have seminaries at Richmond, Dublin, and other places. The Primitive Methodists have also established a school of theology in Sunderland; and the Methodist New Connection, at Ranmoor, Sheffield.

From the very start, the Methodist body has been most active in carrying on missionary labors. At the time of Wesley's death, there were already 5,848 communicants connected with its foreign stations. Dr. Coke was the first superintendent of Methodist missions; and his indefatigable zeal secured the funds, and established 13 missions in many parts of the world. The Fiji and other Islands of the Southern Pacific were Christianized exclusively by their zeal. The West Indies were another of the main stations of early Methodist missions; and in 1880 they had there 46,032 communicants among the negroes. In 1875 it began its mission at Sierra Leone, proverbial, as a convict colony, for its moral degradation, which now has 18,647 communicants. It has since established missions in India, China, and other foreign lands, as well as in Germany, Italy, France, and other countries of Europe. In 1878 the Methodist Church in Canada and British America numbered 124,000 communicants. The Australian Conference, founded in 1877, has now 70,000 members.

In surveying the history of Methodism from its beginning, we are struck with the aggressive feature of this movement. Wesley felt that the masses were neglected, and he went out to meet them with the gospel in his hand. In Great Britain, Methodism found its first great field among the destitute and neglected, the poor and forsaken: on the New Continent, it has always been first on the frontiers. It is true that the Anglican Church now vies with the Methodists in working among the lower classes, and that it has emphasized aggressive church activity. This activity it was the further merit of Wesley to emphasize as the privilege and duty of all Christians. The laity were not to be merely receptive, but active. One of the great sources of power in Methodism has been the extent of lay-activity. Lay-preaching, the conduct of the classes, the prayer-meeting,— these all have drawn them forth.

In this connection we may refer to the philanthropy of Methodism. Before Elizabeth Fry had entered the prisons, and long before the institution of the Ragged-schools, the Methodists were laboring among the destitute, visiting jails, distributing tracts, and establishing free Sunday schools; and among the first to condemn slavery was the founder of Methodism.

Repeated attempts have been made to win the Methodist Church back to the communion from which it came. All such efforts have heretofore
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proved in vain, and the prospect is that they will
in the future. (See Rigg: The Churchmanship of
John Wesley.) It has won for itself, in spite of
scorn and persecutions, a place of power in the
State and Church of Great Britain. It has its
representatives in Parliament, and no statesman
can afford to trifle with it any longer. It roused
the Anglican Church itself to activity and renewed
faith a hundred years ago, and has not only a his-
tory behind it, but a work before it. The fulfil-
ment of its great aim depends upon its continued
emphasis upon the practical temper of its founder.
It was this which has given it the sway over a
constituency of 15,000,000 in all parts of the world.

[On Wednesday, Sept. 7, 1881, there assembled
in City Road Chapel, London, the first Ecumeni-
cal Methodist Conference, consisting of 400 dele-
gates. The suggestion came from the General
Conference of the Methodist-Episcopal Church
of the United States in 1876; but the place of
meeting was appropriately "the principal centre
of John Wesley's labors, and close to which he
had finished his course." The conference repre-
sented 28 different branches of the Methodist
family of churches, with an aggregate of 89,292
local preachers and 5,000,000 church-members.
The first session of the conference was presided
over by the Rev. Dr. George Osborn, president of
the British Wesleyan Conference; and the opening
sermon was by Bishop Simpson of the Methodist-
Episcopal Church of America. On the evening
of the day before, a public reception, at the Man-
sion House, was given to the delegates by the Rt.
Hon. William McArthur, mayor of London, who
is a Wesleyan. The conference was in every way
a success. It closed upon Tuesday, Sept. 20.
The second conference is to be held in the United
States, in Louisville, Ky., 1887. See Proceedings
of the Ecumenical Methodist Conference, held in
City Road Chapel, London, September, 1881.
Introduction by Rev. William Arthur, M.A., Cincinnati
and New York, 1882. (Statistical tables on p. 61.)

Lit.-The Works of John and Charles Wesley, Whitefield, Coke, etc., for which
see those arts. Abel Stevens: History of Meth-
odism (the best), New York and London, 1858-61;
5 vols. (new ed., 1878); George Smith: History of
Taylor: Wesley and Methodism, London, 1851;
[Alder: Wesleyan Missions, Lond., 1842; Strick-
land: Genius and Mission of Methodism, N.Y.,
1851; George Smith: The Polity of Wesleyan
Methodism, London, 1852; J. Porter: A Com-
prehensive History of Methodism, Cincinnati, 1876;
H. W. Williams: The Constitution and Polity of
Wesleyan Methodism, London, 1881; W. H. Dan-
iel: Short History of the People called Methodists
(from Wesley to September, 1881), Lond., 1882;
held in London, 1882]. Dr. Scholl (London).

METHODISM IN AMERICA. I. EARLY HIS-
TORY. — The great religious movement inau-
grated by the Wesleys and their co-laborers could
not long be confined to Great Britain. It was
natural that the British Colonies should likewise
be recipients of some brands from the great con-
flagration in the mother-country. America was
no exception. Among those on the European
side of the Atlantic who were most benefited by
the Wesleyan revival were the Irish Palatines of
Court Mattress, Killilheen, and Ballilgarrane. In
1760 a party of these German refugees left their
Irish home to seek their fortune in America, and
arrived in New York, Aug. 10. The emigrants
were included in their number Philip Embury, a class
leader and local preacher, and Barbara Heck, wife
of Paul Heck. Embury seems to have lost a part
of his zeal on coming to America; and it was not
until 1768, that, upon the earnest entreaty of Bar-
bara Heck, he began to preach in his own house
to such as could be induced to go there for reli-
gious service. In February of the following year,
Capt. Thomas Webb of the British army appeared
among the worshippers at Embury's house, and
presented his credentials as a local preacher; and
from that time forward he became an active agent
in the establishment of American Methodism.
Embury's house soon became too small for the
rapidly increasing audience, and a more com-
monious room in the neighborhood was obtained.
Through the preaching of Embury and Webb,
vast numbers were attracted to the services, re-
quiring still larger accommodations. A rigging-
loft on William the Methodist was hired in 1757; but this would not accommo-
date one-half of the people who desired to attend.
Barbara Heck, with womanly foresight and spirit-
ual zeal, secured the erection of the first Method-
ist chapel in America. A site on John Street
was purchased in 1770, and a building was con-
structed of stone, faced with blue plaster. Capt.
Webb was very active in the spread of Methodism.
He founded societies in various parts of the coun-
try, notably in Philadelphia, where he formed a
class of seven members in 1767 or 1768, and aided
in the purchase of the first Methodist church of
that city (St. George's) in 1770. Interest in the
new movement increased with such rapidity, that
it was impossible to supply the demand for preach-
ing. Appeals were sent to England for help; and
in response to the call, on the 8th of August, 1769,
from the Conference, then in session at Leeds,
Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor were sent
over. In 1771 Francis Asbury and Richard Wright
were sent to assist in the farther spread of Meth-
odism in this country. In the following year
they were joined by Thomas Rankin and George
Shadford.

The first Methodist Conference held in America
convened in St. George's Church, Philadelphia, on
Wednesday, July 14, 1773, and closed on Friday,
the 16th. Its members were Thomas Rankin,
Richard Boardman, Joseph Pilmoor, Francis As-
bury, Richard Wright, George Shadford, Thomas
Webb, John King, Abraham Whitworth, and
Joseph Yearboy,—ten in all. The aggregate
membership of the classes reported was 1,160,
although there were many adherents beside. At
this session the Wesleyan discipline was made
binding on all the preachers and adherents of
American Methodism. The second Conference
occurred in May of the following year, when the
returns indicated 10 circuits, 17 preachers, and
2,073 members. At the Conference of 1775 the
returns showed a membership of 3,148. The
ship to the itinerants and to the entire body of
the classes had increased to 11,817 in 1780.
In 1776 there was a membership of 4,921, and an itinerant roll of 25; in 1777, 6,968 members and 98 itinerants. The year which followed this conference was one of close contact and dependence on American liberty and the cause of Methodism. British arms were successful. The itinerants were persecuted, and in some instances compelled to seek safety in seclusion; and Methodism, instead of pursuing its onward way with its accustomed vigor, declined considerably. The sixteenth Annual Conference convened at Leesburg, Va., May 19, 1778, when the returns indicated 6,095 members and 30 ministers,—a loss of 575 members and 8 preachers. New York and Philadelphia were in the hands of the British, and many other parts of the land were under the menace of the enemy's guns. But Methodism emerged from the Revolution strong and vigorous, with no purpose to relinquish the field for any opposition. During the summer of 1783, a few months after the close of the war, Asbury wrote,—

"We have about 14,000 members, between 70 and 80 travelling preachers, between 90 and 40 circuits . . . . I admire the simplicity of our preachers. I do not think there has appeared another such a company of young devoted men. The gospel has taken a universal spread. . . . O America, America! It certainly will be the glory of the world for religion."

II. METHODIST-EPISCOPAL CHURCH. — The authority of England over America was now at an end; and the relation of the "societies" to the English Church could not be maintained, as in the mother-country. Something must be done to provide for the sacraments among this vast body of believers. In 1784 Mr. Wesley determined to ordain, in accordance with the usages of the Established Church, as elders or presbyters, Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey, and to set apart Thomas Coke, a patroon of the Church of England, as a bishop, under the modest title of "superintendent." The ordination took place at Bristol, on the first and second days of September, 1784. The three arrived in New York Nov. 3, and began preaching, and administering the sacrament.

On Friday, Dec. 24, 1784, the preachers assembled in Baltimore, in what has since been known as the "Christmas Conference." Dr. Coke presided, and, on taking the chair, presented a letter from Mr. Wesley, recommending the organization of a church, with Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as superintendents. Asbury would not accept the responsible station, unless also elected by a vote of his brethren of the Conference. Coke and Asbury were unanimously elected superintendents. On Saturday, the second day of the session, Asbury was ordained a deacon by Coke, Vasey, and Whatcoat; on Sunday he was ordained an elder; and on Monday he was consecrated superintendent. The following is from Whatcoat's account of the Conference:

"On the 24th we rode to Baltimore. At ten o'clock we began our conference, in which we agreed to form a Methodist-Episcopal Church, in which the Liturgy (as presented by the Rev. John Wesley) should be read, and the sacraments administered by a superintendent, elders, and deacons, who shall be ordained by a presbytery, using the Episcopal form, as prescribed in the Rev. Mr. Wesley's Prayer-Book. Persons to be ordained are to be nominated by the superintendents, elected, installed, and ordained by the imposition of the hands of the superintendant and elders. The superintendent has a negative voice."

The Conference lasted ten days, and resulted in the organization of a church which is to-day by far the largest body of Methodists on the face of the earth. The doctrinal basis of the organization was an abridgment of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church, consisting of Mr. Wesley's Twenty-four Articles, together with another, "Of the Rule of Faith," and "Of the Union of Americans," making twenty-five; and these constitute, in the main, the doctrinal basis of all American Methodist bodies. (See Arminianism.) The Christmas Conference above mentioned differed from the ordinary annual meeting of the preachers, in that it was not confined to a particular district, but included the entire country. The conferences now provided for in the church were three,—the quarterly, or conference of the officers of each circuit or station; the annual, or conference of the preachers of a particular section of the country; and the general, or conference of all the preachers of the entire church. The growth of the church was so rapid as to make it necessary in a short time to limit the General Conference by making it a delegated body. This was provided for at the Conference of 1808; and, as the General Conference had convened once in four years since 1792, the first delegated General Conference met May 1, 1812, with one delegate to every five members of the annual conferences. The ratio has been changed several times with the growth of the church. In 1816 it was one to seven; in 1836, one to twenty-one; in 1856, one to twenty-seven; in 1872, one to forty-five, when lay delegates were admitted, two from each annual conference. Every preacher, from the bishops to the humblest circuit-rider, is required to "itinerate." The preachers are not permitted to have charge of the same circuit or station more than three years in succession, nor more than three years in six. The presiding elders, who have supervisory oversight of the districts or sub-divisions of the annual conferences, are not permitted to remain in charge of the same district for more than four years in succession. The bishops arrange their own appointments to the presidency of the conferences at their semi-annual meetings.

The Methodist-Episcopal Church has various benevolent institutions in vigorous working-order. The Missionary Society has been in operation since 1819. There are missions, under the direction of this society, in Africa, India, China, Japan, Korea, Germany, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Bulgaria, Italy, South America, and Mexico, of the foreign fields; and, in the home fields, among the American Indians, the Germans, the Scandinavians, the Chinese, in the Territories and frontier settlements, and in various other localities known as "English-speaking" missions. In the foreign fields there are 1,100 American missionaries, with about 70 assistants; about 200 native ordained preachers, with as many more who are not ordained; about 300 local preachers; 400 native teachers; about 37,000 members and 65,000 Sunday-school scholars; 517 day schools, with 16,000 scholars; 2,500 laity members; in the home fields, among the American Indians, the Germans, the Scandinavians, the Chinese, in the Territories and frontier settlements, and in various other localities known as "English-speaking" missions. In the foreign fields there are 1,100 American missionaries, with about 70 assistants; about 200 native ordained preachers, with as many more who are not ordained; about 300 local preachers; 400 native teachers; about 37,000 members and 65,000 Sunday-school scholars; 517 day schools, with 16,000 scholars; 2,500 laity members;
Missionary Society are nearly a million dollars annually. The Church Extension Society was incorporated in 1865, and is now erecting churches, in localities where the people are not able to build for themselves, at the rate of more than one for every day in the year. The Freedman’s Aid Society has been in operation since 1866, and has done much to educate and Christianize the freedmen of the South. The following figures are taken from the report of the Society for 1886:—

Number of institutions is 41; number of teachers employed, 169; number of pupils taught in the year 1885-86 in the institutions of the Society, 6,055; funds received and expended during the fiscal year, $174,210.68; total disbursements by the Society since its organization in 1866, $1,568,558.29.

There are also a Sunday-school Union, a Tract Society, a Woman’s Foreign Missionary Society, and a Woman’s Home Missionary Society.

The Methodist-Episcopal Church has two great publishing-houses, known as “Book Concerns,” located at New York and Cincinnati respectively, where the books, tracts, and most of the periodicals of the church, are published. Weekly papers under the patronage and control of the church are published at New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis, San Francisco, New Orleans, Syracuse, and Pittsburgh. There are also numerous other periodicals in English and German, including Sunday-school supplies and a Quarterly Review.

III. METHODIST-EPISTOLAR CHURCH SOUTH.

The question of slavery had been agitated in the Methodist “societies” in America, and in the conferences, previous to the formation of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, and still continued as a disturbing element after the organization. At the General Conference of 1844, however, the agitation reached a crisis, which resulted in the disruption of the church. The Rev. Francis A. Harding, of the Baltimore Conference, had been suspended from the ministry for refusing to emancipate slaves belonging to his wife; and he appealed from this decision to the General Conference. Bishop James O. Andrew was also found to be in possession of slaves through marriage and otherwise, and this state of affairs, and a growing conviction on the part of a majority of the church that slavery and Christianity are inconsistent, brought the Conference to decisive action. After a long and able discussion of the question, the following action was taken by a vote of 111 in the affirmative, and 99 in the negative:—

“Whereas the Discipline of the Church forbids the doing any thing calculated to destroy our itinerant and general superintendency; and whereas Bishop Andrew has become connected with slavery, by marriage and otherwise, and this fact having drawn after it circumstances, which, in the estimation of the General Conference, will greatly embarrass the extension of our superintendency, if not, in some places, entirely prevent it: therefore,

Resolved, That it is the sense of this General Conference that he desist from the exercise of this office so long as this impediment remains.”

The Southern delegates were greatly displeased with this action; and, after several unsuccessful attempts at a modification of the attitude of the Conference, they adopted the following declaration:—

“The delegates of the conferences in the slave-holding States take leave to inform the General Conference of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, that the continued agitation on the subject of slavery and abolition, in a portion of the church, the frequent action on that subject in the General Conference, and especially the extra-judicial proceedings against Bishop Andrew, which resulted, on Saturday last, in the virtual suspension of him from his office as superintendent, must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of the General Conference over these conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slaveholding States.”

It now became plain that the Southern delegates would be satisfied with nothing less than a discontinuance of all further agitation of the slavery question, and the Northern delegates would insist upon administering discipline to all ministers in the Church who should buy, sell, or hold slaves. A committee of nine, composed of Northern and Southern delegates, was appointed, to prepare a Plan of Separation, which they submitted to the Conference, and which was adopted by a nearly unanimous vote. The “Plan” provided for the voluntary withdrawal of the annual conferences of the slaveholding States, the permission to ministers and members to adhere to the body of their choice, — the Methodist-Episcopal Church, or the Church South,— an equitable distribution of the church property, and a formal agreement not to interfere with the work of each other. The Southern delegates issued an address to their constituents, detailing the facts, and calling for a convention, composed of delegates from the annual conferences in the ratio of one to eleven, to meet in Louisville, Ky., May 1, 1845. This convention organized the Methodist-Episcopal Church South, invited Bishops Soule and Andrew to become itinerant general superintendents, and appointed its first General Conference to be held in Petersburg, Va., in May, 1846. At that session the church had 19 annual conferences, 1,519 travelling preachers, 2,833 local preachers, and 327,284 lay-members. The church made rapid progress until the late civil war, in which it suffered greatly, in common with all the Southern interests. Since the war, it has again started on a new era of prosperity. It has a “book-concern” at Nashville; and editors are employed, and various books and periodicals are published. There are numerous foreign missions; various benevolent organizations are maintained; and colleges, universities, and other schools, are supported and controlled within the denomination.

IV. METHODIST-PROTESTANT CHURCH.

The original constitution of the Methodist-Episcopal Church vested the legislative power entirely in the travelling ministry. This was satisfactory for a brief time only. Local preachers of influence, and prominent laymen, soon began to desire some voice in the general government of the church. The power of the episcopacy was also a source of discontent to many. The question of electing presiding elders was discussed at the General Conference of 1820, and caused considerable excitement. William S. Stockton, a prominent layman of that church, then began the publication of The Wesleyan Repository at Tren-
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In 1828 the Methodist-Protestant Church was divided by the slavery question into two bodies, the conferences of the North-western States seceding and forming the Methodist Church; and those of the Southern States continuing as the Methodist-Protestant Church. These were re-united in 1877 under the original name. There are two "book-concerns" belonging to this church,—one at Baltimore, the other at Pittsburg,—several colleges and academies, and a number of other institutions. The preachers are stationed by the Annual Conference.

In 1858 the Methodist-Protestant Church was organized. The doctrines are the same as those of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, and its government is similar, although their general principles of union and representation are different.

VI. FREE METHODIST CHURCH. — This is the youngest of the Methodist bodies, having been organized by a convention at Pekin, N.Y., Aug. 23, 1890. The object of the new church was to return to the original Methodists' simplicity, and adhere more closely to the doctrines and usages of Wesley. Its doctrines are the same as those of the Methodist-Episcopal Church (of which its founders were original members), with the addition of two articles,—one on entire sanctification, and the other on future reward and punishment. Its government is a slight modification of that of the parent church. General superintendents are elected for four years; laymen are admitted on equal terms with ministers to all conferences, and are received on probation except those connected with the old Methodists' faith in Christ; and all who unite with the church are required to lay aside all superfluous ornaments in dress. They have two educational institutions, a monthly magazine, and a weekly church paper.

VII. COLORED METHODISTS IN THE UNITED STATES. — Of these there are several distinct bodies in addition to the colored Methodists in Canada, subsequently noticed. There are also colored members and preachers scattered throughout most of the other Methodist bodies; and some of the conferences of the Methodist-Episcopal Church in the Southern States are almost exclusively colored.

1. African Methodist-Episcopal Church. — Methodism was early employed as an agency in the conversion of the negroes in America, both slaves and free. Vast numbers united with the Methodist societies, and many of these continue as members of the Methodist-Episcopal Church. A number, however, believing that their spiritual interests would be advanced by a separate organization, assembled in convention in Philadelphia, April 1816, and organized the African Methodist-Episcopal Church. Richard Allen was elected the first bishop, and Morris Brown the second, in 1828. There are now nine bishops. The doctrines are the same as those of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, and the government is very similar. They have several educational institutions, especially Wilberforce University, Xenia, O.; and seminaries at Baltimore, Columbus (O.), Allegheny, and Pittsburg. There are two religious papers,—the Christian Recorder and the Repository.

2. African Methodist-Episcopal Zion Church. — Owing to some resolutions passed by the General Conference of the Methodist-Episcopal Church of 1820, the Zion congregation of African Methodists in the city of New York seceded from that church. They were soon joined by other congregations, and in 1821 organized their first Annual Conference. Their doctrines are identical with those of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, and their government is similar, although their general superintendents are elected by the General Conference every four years, and may be re-elected at the expiration of their term of office.
They have two academies, but no well-sustained periodical.

3. Union American Methodist-Episcopal Church. — This church was organized in 1818, by seceding colored members of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, under the title of the “African Union Church.” Its present name was adopted after the close of the late war. Its doctrines are similar to those of the parent church, and its government is similar. Bishops are elected every four years.

4. Colored Methodist-Episcopal Church in America. — Before the civil war in America, the colored people in many of the Southern States were forbidden by law to hold meetings among themselves; and, accordingly, the vast majority of them united with the Methodist-Episcopal Church South. After the war and the emancipation of the slaves, there was an extensive breaking-away of the colored people from this church. Many united with the African Methodist-Episcopal Church, many with the Zion Church, and many with the Methodist-Episcopal Church. The leaders of the Southern church, deeming it wiser for the colored people among them to form separate churches, took measures which resulted in the organization of the above-named church in 1874. Their doctrines and discipline are identical with those of the Methodist-Episcopal Church South. They have now four bishops. They publish a paper in Louisville called the Christian Index. Measures are on foot looking toward organic union between this body and the African Methodist-Episcopal Church. The leaders of the colored people from this church. Many united with the African Methodist-Episcopal Church, many with the Zion Church, and many with the Methodist-Episcopal Church. The leaders of the Southern church, deeming it wiser for the colored people among them to form separate churches, took measures which resulted in the organization of the above-named church in 1874. Their doctrines and discipline are identical with those of the Methodist-Episcopal Church South. They have now four bishops. They publish a paper in Louisville called the Christian Index. Measures are on foot looking toward organic union between this body and the African Methodist-Episcopal Church.

VIII. AMERICO-GERMAN METHODISM. — The large influx of Germans to America was the occasion of great solicitude to the leaders of early Methodism; and measures were adopted, wherever practicable, to give them the gospel. Efforts of this kind have taken three leading directions, as follows:

1. German Work of the Methodist-Episcopal Church. — In the providence of God, a number of zealous Germans became connected with the church at the time of this solicitude, and were permitted for a great work. Among them were Henry Boehm, William Nast, Adam Miller, John C. Lyon, C. H. Doering, and John Swahlen. A mission was begun in Cincinnati in 1835; and others were established, at subsequent periods in Pittsburg, Wheeling (Va.), Allegheny City, Marietta (O.), Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, and elsewhere. There are now eight annual conferences in the United States, with a membership of about 50,000. Two periodicals, a weekly paper and a monthly magazine, are published by order of the General Conference. Sunday-school supplies and various standard books are also published in German.

2. The Evangelical Association, or “Albrights,” is the outgrowth of the labors of the Rev. Jacob Albright, a local preacher of the Methodist-Episcopal Church. He began to travel and labor among the German population of Eastern Pennsylvania about the year 1790. In 1796 he devoted himself exclusively to evangelistic work; and in 1800, finding his converts scattered abroad, without church homes, he organized them into classes and societies, after the manner of John Wesley. These societies unanimously elected Mr. Albright their superintendent, or bishop. The organization was completed in 1808 by the adoption of a creed, and rules of government. In doctrine and government it is essentially Methodist. Bishops are elected for four years by the General Conference, and presiding elders, for a like period, by the Annual Conferences. They have a college in Naperville, Ill., and a publishing-house is located in Cleveland, O., where they print two periodicals in German, and two in English. See Evangelical Association.

3. United Brethren in Christ. — This society was the legitimate result of the labors of the Rev. Philip William Otterbein, an eminent German scholar and missionary of the German Reformed Church to America. While engaged in the duties of his pastoral charge at Lancaster, Penn., he enjoyed a visitation of divine grace which accorded with the experience of a genuine Methodist. He united with Martin Boehm in evangelistic labors; and these two men of God formed societies, and spread the glad news through a vast territory. In 1800 the societies were united in a church organization, with the above title. A system of doctrines and a form of government were adopted in 1815. These are essentially Methodist, though having no direct connection with any Methodist body. Slavery, and connection with secret societies, are forbidden. One order in the ministry, that of elder, is recognized; the same ecclesiastical bodies are provided for as in the Methodist-Episcopal Church; bishops are elected for a term of four years; presiding elders are elected annually by the annual conferences, and are not limited as to term of service in that capacity in any district, except by vote of the Conference; lay-representation is made optional with each annual conference. They have thirteen colleges and academies, and one theological seminary, a publishing-house in Dayton, O., nine periodicals, and various benevolent societies.

IX. CANADIAN METHODISM. — The Methodists in Canada are now, with the few exceptions noted under a subsequent head, wholly independent of the parent bodies in Great Britain and the United States.

1. Methodist-Episcopal Church in Canada. — The introduction of Methodism into Canada took place as early as 1788, and was fostered by the Methodist leaders in the States for a long period. In 1820 there were 2 districts, 17 circuits, 28 travelling preachers, 47 local preachers, and almost 6,000 members. The Canada Conference was organized, under the authority of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, in 1824; and, by the mutual consent of the Church and the Conference, it was organized as an independent church, with the above title. In doctrine and polity it is like the parent church.

2. Methodist Church of Canada. — This is the largest body of Methodists in the British Provinces of North America, and was formed in 1874 by a union of the Wesleyan Methodists, the New Connection, and the Wesleyan Methodists of the Eastern Provinces; the latter having been connected with the British Wesleyans until 1855, when they formed a separate organization. In doctrine and polity it closely resembles the British Wesleyan Church.

3. The British Methodist-Episcopal Church is
composed of the colored Methodists of Canada. It was a part of the African Methodist-Episcopal Church at first, was made a separate conference in 1858, and subsequently organized into an independent church, the separation being completed in 1864. Bishop Nazrey was its first superintendent, and was followed in the episcopal office by R. R. Disney in 1875. They publish a paper called the Missionary Messenger, and sustain a prosperous mission in Bermuda.

X. BRITISH METHODISTS IN AMERICA. — These consist of a few sporadic branches of the Methodist family that strictly affiliate with bodies on the other side of the Atlantic.

1. Primitive Methodist Connection. — Branches of the British form of Methodism were introduced into Canada about 1843, and afterwards into the United States. The Canada Conference is dependent on the British Conference of Primitive Methodists, one of whose members is usually the presiding officer. There are two conferences in the United States, which are mostly independent of Great Britain,—the Eastern and the Western; but the Church has not made much progress here.

2. The Bible Christian Church, a Wesleyan body in Great Britain, has several societies in America, chiefly in Canada and the Northern States, organized into the Canada Conference. They have a weekly paper and a Sunday-school paper.

3. In addition to the above, the Wesleyans of Great Britain have some connectional societies in Canada, which properly belong to the British Conference.

XI. INDEPENDENT METHODIST CHURCHES. — A considerable number of churches in different localities have for various reasons seceded from the parent body, and become independent. At the beginning of the civil war several churches in the city of Baltimore became independent of the Methodist-Episcopal Church on political grounds. There is also another church in the same city originally in the Methodist-Protestant Church. They are mostly congregational in polity. Their present strength, in the aggregate, is indicated in the table of statistics following.

XII. GENERAL STATISTICS OF AMERICAN METHODIST CHURCHES. — The subjoined table gives the numerical force of all its sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Annual Conference Members</th>
<th>Foreign Members</th>
<th>Local Members</th>
<th>Lay Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. E. Church</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12,142</td>
<td>12,233</td>
<td>1,717,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. E. Church South</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>5,968</td>
<td>900,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African M. E. Church</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>9,760</td>
<td>391,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African M. Zion Church</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colored M. E. Church</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>113,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Protestant Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Methodist Connection</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>770</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>113,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Brethren in Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>157,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Amer. M. E. Church</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Methodist Church</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>12,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive M. Church</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>139,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Church of Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>11,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Church of Canada South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Church of Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Christian Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist E. Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>6,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent M. Churches</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>27,206</td>
<td>36,069</td>
<td>3,905,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and well-written representation of the doctrinal and ritual system of the Greek Church, not in Constantinople, and was finally appointed patriarch as calls him, a Grec-Eco-Lutheranus. He did, in that and even some of the Fathers,—as, for instance, convened the provincial synods, presided over but in the free form of a theological treatise. It is full of polemics against the Roman-Catholic Church, the bishop of the metropolis; and the former teaching the order in which, and the means by which, each single part may be most appropriately studied.

METROPHANES CRITOPULUS, a native of Beroea in Macedonia; educated at Mount Athos; and then went to England, and became intimately acquainted with Conring, Calixtus, and Helmstadt, and which was published (the Greek text with a Latin translation) by J. Horneius, Helmstädt, 1681. It is a comprehensive, clear, and well-written representation of the doctrinal and ritual system of the Greek Church, not in the strict form of a symbolical confession of faith, but in the free form of a theological treatise. It is full of polemics against the Roman-Catholic Church, but refrains from all criticism of Protestantism. See Dietelmayer: De Metrophane Critopolite Thess.

METROPOLITAN denoted, in the ancient Christian Church, the bishop of the metropolis; that is, of the municipal capital of the province. With the title followed, not only a certain rank, the privilege of precedence of the other bishops of the province, but also some real rights and duties: he had a voice in the episcopal election of the province, confirmed and ordained the bishops elected, exercised a general ecclesiastical supervision and jurisdiction in the province, convened the provincial synods, presided over them, and drew up the canons, etc. The origin of the office is doubtful: Roman-Catholic writers, and even some of the Fathers,—as, for instance, Chrysostom,—date it back to the days of the apostles. The title occurs for the first time in the canons of the Council of Nicea.

MEUSEL, Wolfgang. See Musculus.

MEXICO, a federal republic of North America, lying south of the United States. It has a coastline of 6,000 miles, and an area of 741,790 square miles. The country is an extensive plateau, culminating in a range of mountains running north and south, whose highest peaks are Popocatapetl (17,540 feet) and Orizaba (17,175 feet). Few rivers traverse the country, and none of them is navigable for large vessels. The forests abound in valuable timber; and the chief articles of commerce are sugar, coffee, tobacco, vanilla, cotton, etc. The silver-mines of Mexico were once proverbial for their wealth; and, at the close of the last century, Humboldt estimated that one-fifth of the silver current in the world had been extracted from one of them, the Veta Madre. The largest cities are the City of Mexico, with a population of 300,000, and Leon, with 100,000 inhabitants. The present population of Mexico is 10,000,000; one-sixth of which is of pure European, three-sixths Indian, and two-sixths of mixed blood. The interest of the United States in the prosperity of Mexico has recently been enhanced by the interference of Louis Napoleon in its affairs (1861-67), and the opening of the country to Protestant missionary effort, the projects of a canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans to be cut through her territory, and the construction of a railroad connecting the City of Mexico, by way of Monterey, with our own railway system.

The history of Mexico is to a large extent veiled in darkness, but has during the last four hundred and fifty years, until recently, been a history of religious superstition and moral degeneracy. The history may be divided into three periods,—the early period, reaching down to the conquest of Cortez (in 1519); the period of the Spanish domination from 1519 to 1821; and the period of national independence. The original inhabitants of the land were the Toltecs, who came from the north in the seventh century. They were followed by the Aztecs in the thirteenth century. The latter people offered human sacrifices on a large scale, and practised the revolting rite of cutting the heart from the body while it was still alive, and offering it to the gods. They had reached a measure of civilization when the arms of the Spaniard Cortez (1519-21) put an end to their domination; and his barbaric cruelties, which have only been outdone by the Turks and Saracens, and were practised in the name of the Christian religion, crushed the spirit, and checked their development. For three hundred years the land was governed by viceroys sent out by Spain, during which the Roman-Catholic religion was offered to or forced upon the people, until it became all dominant, and the church acquired a vast wealth, even to the extent of one-third of the entire landed property of the country. The first movement towards national independence was inaugurated by Miguel Hidalgo in 1810, and the Spanish yoke thrown off by Iturbide in 1821. In 1824 Mexico was declared a republic, and a constitution similar to that of the United States adopted. It now consists of twenty-seven states, one territory, and one federal district. In 1861 Louis Napoleon conceived the idea of establishing French authority in Mexico; and in 1864 Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, was at his instigation declared emperor. The priesthood of the Mexican Church sympathized with the foreign movement; but the nation refused the interference, executed Maximilian in 1867 at Queretaro, and, seconded by the sympathies of the government of the United States, drove back the invaders. The government is presided over by a Presi-
lent, elected every fourth year indirectly by the people, who also elect a national Legislature of two houses.

Though the dominion of Spain was broken in 1821, the yoke of Rome was not thrown off till 1867 and 1858, when President Juarez ordered the suppression of the lands and other property of the church, and the abolition of the convents and granted religious toleration, which up to that time had been strictly denied. The Roman-Catholic Church in Mexico had failed to lift the people out of their ignorance and superstition; and a gross worship of images prevailed, which was only a step removed from idolatry. It has now three archbishops and twelve bishops.

Protestant missions, in spite of the decree of 1857 tolerating all religions, could get no admittance to Mexico till after the failure of the French enterprise, and to this day are excluded from the state of Guererro. Bibles had been introduced into the country to a limited extent, when the army of the United States invaded it in 1847. The honor of beginning missionary efforts in Mexico belongs to Miss Rankin, who of her own impulse, and independent of outside help, established a school in Brownsville, and subsequently established herself at Matamoras in 1866. She founded more than a dozen schools, with native teachers, and finally consigned her work to the American and Foreign Christian Union. A reformatory movement from within the Mexican Church itself started with a priest, Francis Aguilar, and a layman, Hernandez, who in 1865 established the so-called “Church of Jesus.” In 1867 Aguilar opened a hall for public worship in San José de Real. At his death the church sought aid from the Protestant-Episcopal Church of the United States. In 1869 Rev. Henry C. Riley (a Chilian by birth, but of American parentage), who at the time was preaching to a Spanish congregation in New-York City, went to Mexico under commission from the American and Foreign Christian Union. Since 1878 the Episcopal Church has supported the Church of Jesus. It has acquired by its liberality two fine church edifices in the City of Mexico,—the San Francisco, and San José de Garcia. It now has a bishop (Dr. Riley, bishop of the Valley of Mexico, and Mr. Hernandez is bishop-elect of Cuernavaca), twelve Mexican presbyters, and 2,000 average attendants upon worship. The Report for 1881 only gives the number of native communicants in the City of Mexico, which is 155.

In 1871 a Dominican friar, Manuel Agius, the most eloquent preacher in the City of Mexico, who was appointed to assist Mr. Riley from the pulpit, himself became a proselyte under Mr. Riley’s preaching. He engaged with Mr. Riley in prosecuting those on the Church of Jesus, but died, much lamented, in 1872.

The Presbyterian Church established a mission in Mexico, in 1872, at Villa de Cos, Zacatecas. It has been very successful, and at present (1882) employs 8 American missionaries and 50 native preachers and helpers; has 6,000 communicants connected with its churches, 1,441 of whom were admitted in the year 1881-82. The Southern Presbyterian Church likewise conducts a mission in Mexico, with 2 American and 2 native missionaries (1882), and 236 church-members. The Congregationalists entered Mexico in 1872, and in 1882 had 2 missionaries, 5 native helpers, and 178 native church-members. The Methodist-Episcopal Church began its work in 1873, and in 1881 had 8 circuits, served by 9 foreign missionaries, 17 native preachers, 5 female and 25 other helpers, 388 communicants, and 388 probationers. It supports one theological school, and in 1881 completed a new Spanish hymn and tune book. The Methodist-Episcopal Church South began missionary operations in 1873, and had 1,064 communicants belonging to its churches in 1882. The Indiana Yearly Meeting of the Friends also have a mission in Mexico (1872), with headquarters at Matamoras, a meeting-house costing $4,000, and 186 members in 1882.

The outlook for Protestant missions is as bright in Mexico as in any other part of the world. During the ten years that have just passed, the progress has been rapid. The missionaries, however, have been called upon to meet opposition, which has been violent and bloody. The fanatical cry of “Death to the Protestants!” has not infrequently been heard in the streets of Puebla and other Mexican towns. The church has had its martyrs, among whom may be mentioned the Rev. Mr. Stephens (Consecrated a missionary). Mr. Stephenson, March 2, 1874, and a native Methodist preacher, Epimenio Monroy, at Santa Anita, April 8, 1881. See GILBERT HAVEF: Our Next Door Neighbor, a Winter in Mexico, especially chap. xv. (an interesting work), N.Y., 1875, and the art. “Mexico,” in APPLETON’S Annuals.

MEYER, Heinrich August Wilhelm, the distinguished commentator of the New Testament, was b. in Gotha, Jan. 10, 1800; d. in Hanover, June 21, 1873. His father was court shoemaker. After passing through the usual course in the gymnasium, he entered the University of Jena as a student of theology. He heard the lectures of Gabler, Schott, Danz, and Baumgarten-Crusius; also studied Arabic under Rosegarten, but was obliged, by his father’s failure in business, to content himself with a course of two years and a half, leaving the university in 1820. In 1821 he was appointed teacher in a select school for the higher classes, at Grone, near Göttingen; and in 1822 became pastor in Osthauen, where he married. Transferring his ecclesiastical relations to Hanover, he was appointed, in 1831, pastor at Harste, near Göttingen, with a salary of five hundred and twenty-nine thalers. From here he went, in 1837, to Hoya; in 1841, after declining a professorship at Giessen, was appointed Consistorialrat, and pastor of the Hof- und Schloss-Church, in Neustadt, a parish of five thousand souls. During these years he added to the duties of his office constant labor in the cause of Commentaries on the New Testament. In 1848 he resigned his pastorate, and went to Hanover to reside. In 1861 he was advanced to the dignity of an Oberconsistorialrat (member of the highest ecclesiastical court), but at his own request was allowed, in 1865, to retire on a pension. He lived a retired and uneventful life, observed a good deal of particularity in his habits, and might be found every morning, by four or five, at his desk. His body lies in the graveyard at Neustadt, and on the slab are the words of Rom. xiv. 8. Frau Meyer preceded her husband to the grave in 1894.
Meyer was a thoroughly pure nature, truly pious, humble, modest, and honest. The proofs of his eminent scholarship and untiring industry are found in his publications. It was on his regular habits of study that enabled him to accomplish as much as he did. He also understood how to concentrate his attention upon special subjects, and to avoid the diversion of outside studies. With the mention of the part he bore in the Church Conference at Berlin, 1846, and his share in the revision of Luther's version of the New Testament, we almost exhaust his activity beyond the sphere of his professional and literary work. As a pastor, he excelled: as a catechist and as a member of the Consistorium, he distinguished himself as an examiner of candidates of theology.

Meyer's reputation beyond Hanover rests upon his Commentaries on the New Testament. Upon this one department he concentrated his literary efforts, and did not turn aside to write review essays, and the like. The original title of his greatest work was Das Neue Testament Griechisch nach den besten Hülfsmitteln kritisch redigirt mit einer neuen Deutschen Übersetzung und einem kritischen und exegetischen Kommentar ["The New Testament in Greek, critically edited according to the best helps, with a new German translation, and a critical and exegetical Commentary"]. The original plan included three parts: (1) The text and translation; (2) A Commentary on the Gospels and Acts; (3) A Commentary on the rest of the New Testament. The work was designed for students; and the comments were to be strictly philological, and expressed in terse language. In 1829 the text and translation appeared, in two volumes, at Göttingen. The first volume of the Commentary, covering the three first Gospels (419 pages) followed in 1832. But the original plan was now enlarged; and Commentaries appeared on John (1834), the Acts (1835), Romans (1836), First Corinthians (1839) Second Corinthians (1840), Galatians (1841), Ephesians (1843), and Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon (1847). Unable, on account of the new editions which were called for, of these works, to comment upon the other books of the New Testament, he gave Thessalonians and the Epistles to the Ephesians, to Lünemann, the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles to Huther, and the Apocalypse to the undersigned.

The excellency of Meyer's work was acknowledged, not only in his own land, but in England and America, through Clark's translations. The Göttingen faculty (Lücke being dean) conferred upon him the degree of doctor of divinity in 1845. Meyer lived to see many editions of his work appear, and continued, down to the time of his death, to work diligently, making improvements. He grew with his work; and in each stage of his growth he expressed himself, in his Commentaries, just as he felt. His study of the divine word of the New Testament produced in him a more perfect experience of the saving grace and truth of the gospel. With the lapse of time, although he still clung tenaciously to the principles of literary freedom and philological accuracy, he assumed a more and more positive and churchly attitude. The student who compares the last editions of the Commentary with the first, as, for example, the Synoptists, will find wide differences.

Meyer was constantly correcting himself, and with relentless honesty removing from his work what he had come to regard as defects.

Since his death, the continuation of Meyer's Commentary in new editions has been intrusted to Bernard Weiss, who has published Mark and Luke (1878), John (1880), and Romans (1881); Wendt, Colossians and the Acts (1880); Henrici, First Corinthians; Sieffert, Galatians (1880); W. Schmidt, Ephesians (1875); and W. Beyschlag, James (1882). A biographical sketch of Meyer by his son, Professor Dr. Meyer of Hanover, will be found in the fourth edition of the Commentary on the Philippians. [The English translation of the Commentary, except the Revelation, from the last ed. by Meyer, ed. by Dr. Dickson, Edinb., 1873-82, 20 vols.] FR. DÜSTERDIECK.
MEZUZAH, 1498

MEZUZAH (door-post; plural, Mezuzaot). This article is thus described by Dr. Ginsburg in Kitto's Cyclopaedia. "On the inside of a piece of square parchment, prepared by a Jew especially for this purpose, are written Deut. vi. 4-9 and xi. 13-21; while on the outside are written the divine name Shaddai ('the Almighty') on the place where the first passage ends, and the words Kuzu Bemukaz Kuzu ('I go out, and shall prosper') to the left at the bottom. Thus written, the schedule is then rolled up in such a manner that the divine name is outside, and is put into a reed or hollow cylinder made of lead, brass, or silver, varying in costliness according to the circumstances of the people. In this tube there is a little hole, just large enough to show the divine name, which is protected by a piece of glass, forming, as it were, a little window, through which it can be seen. Such a Mezuzah must be affixed to the right-hand door-post of every door in the house by a nail at each end." This is in obedience to the divine command, "Thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates" (Deut. vi. 9). The Mezuzah is supposed to guard the house against malign influences.

MEZZOFANTI, Giuseppe Caspar, b. at Bologna, Sept. 17, 1774; d. in Rome, March 15, 1849. He was educated in the archiepiscopal seminary of his native city, and ordained a priest in 1797. In the same year he was appointed professor of Arabic in the university of Bologna, where he afterwards held other prominent positions, until 1831, when he removed to Rome as a member of the congregation de propaganda fide. In 1838 he was made a cardinal. As a linguist he was a great marvel. It is stated that he knew a hundred and twenty languages, could write seventy-two, and speak with fluency fifty-six; and, upon close examination, the statement does not seem to be so very exaggerated. See Russell: Life of the Cardinal Mezzofanti, London, 1837, and A. Sellier: Giuseppe Cardinal Mezzofanti, Würzburg, 1880.

MICAH (who is like Jehovah!). Of this so-called Minor Prophet little is known. His birthplace was Moresheth, a town near Gath, in the kingdom of Judah. The scene of his prophetic activity was Judah,— indeed, for the most part at least, Jerusalem; and, as the superscription reads, the time of his prophecies was the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, principally the last; or from before the fall of Samaria (722) to the sixth year of Hezekiah. The theme of his prophecy was the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem. One of his declarations is quoted by Jeremiah (xxvi. 18). From the quotation it has been inferred that Micah, during Hezekiah's reign, gathered up his prophecies into a book, and by the public reading of it ended his prophetic career. The fall of Samaria was the direct judgment of God for the sins of the northern kingdom, specially of their rulers and false prophets (Mic. i. 9-ii. 11). But Jerusalem's turn comes next (ii. 12-iii.); and then the new day will dawn, in which Zion will be obedient to the law of Jehovah, at peace, and the centre of the world. God's scattered people will be gathered; and the distress that shall come will be only the way of her eternal King (iv. 1-8). Before, however, this brilliant period, the inhabitants of Jerusalem will be carried away to Babylon; and in captivity run the great danger of losing their peculiarity,— their separation from the nations. From this danger Jehovah will deliver them, and restore them to their land. Micah repeats the prophecy of Joel concerning the "gathering of the nations" against Zion, and its extinction. But these events will not be until after the captivity. Then, turning to the nearer future, Micah declares that Zion's King will be maltreated by her foes (iv. 9-13). But from Bethlehem, the city of David, will come the King who will rule and protect the united, restored people,— the King whose coming has been from of old, from everlasting (v. 1-15). [The prophecy of the exact place of Messiah's coming is the most interesting part of this prophecy, and the fact about Micah that is peculiar to him. The prophecy is evinced by the ready response the doctors of the law gave to Herod's question (Matt. ii. 5, 6), and the talk of the people about Christ (John vii. 42).] In chapters iv. and v. Micah's prophecy reaches its height. It will be noticed that he three times sets together a nearer and a remoter future: Zion will be destroyed before it becomes the seat of the universal kingdom of peace (iii. 12, iv. 8); the people of Zion will be carried captive to Babylon before they win their victory over the "gathering of the nations" (iv. 8, 19); Zion's king will be given up to his foes before the Son of David arises, who shall found a kingdom of peace, and rule united Israel (v. 1, 8). From the height of chapters iv. and v. he descends in chapter vi. to the then present. Jehovah pleads with his people on account of their sins. He shows them what is good; but, since the people persist in their sins, Micah is inspired to pronounce a fearful curse (vi. 1-16). The believers in Israel utter a prayer of penitence, in which they humbly confess the deep and general corruption, bow before the divine wrath, but express their confidence that Jehovah will still help them, and comfort them, with the conviction that the divine anger will at last pass away, that Babylon will fall, never to rise again, and in that day the walls of Zion shall be rebuilt, and the scattered children of God shall come thither from Asyria and from Egypt, and shall fill the land from the borders of Egypt even to the Euphrates, from sea to sea, and from mountains to mountain (vii. 1-13). Then they pray for a renewal of the earlier tokens of favor (vii. 14), to which God replies he will repeat in his people the marvels of the former time (vii. 15-17); and the prophet closes with an outburst of praise for the grace and mercy of God. But although, like the former, he is abrupt, abounding in sudden and quick changes, in depth of spirituality he is the worthy
Michael, companion of Isaiah, sharing with him the marvelous mingling of mildness and strength, of gentleness and elevation, and of ecstatic liveliness and preference for artistic turns of expression.

The song of Michael frequently appears in opposition to Sammael. J. A. Fabricius gives the song only in Daniel (x. 13, 21, xii. 1), and twice in the New Testament (Jude 9, 1 and Rev. xii. 7). These passages indicate Michael's rank: he was regarded as the guardian of the people of God, their vigilant and efficient protector against all foes, earthly and devilish. In the rabbinical writings, Michael frequently appears in opposition to Sammael. J. A. Fabricius gives the song of Michael and the good angels in triumph over Lucifer and the bad angels, said to have been revealed to St. Amadeus (Codex pseudepigraphus Legends of the Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 16).

In the Roman-Catholic Church, Michael is a saint; and his festival, called "Michaelmas," is held on Sept. 29 (see art.). He is said to have announced to the Virgin Mary the time of her death, and also to have carried her soul to Jesus after her death. There are several recorded appearances of the archangel: (1) On Mount Gargania, now called Mount St. Michael, on the eastern coast of Italy, in the kingdom of Naples, at an unknown year (the day was May 8); (2) At Chonis in Phrygia, near Laodicea, in the ninth century (the day was Sept. 6); (3) On a rock in the Gulf of Avranches, in Normandy, Oct. 6, 706. On one occasion, St. Gregory the First (afterwards called Gregory the Great), who had then just been elected Pope, was leading a penitential procession about the city in order to offer up prayers for the safety of the great pestilence which followed the inundation of 589, and which was, with famine, greatly increasing the miseries of the city, already threatened by the Lombards. As he was crossing the bridge over the Tiber, directly in front of the tomb of Hadrian, he looked up, and saw Michael standing on the summit of the mausoleum, sheathing a bloody sword, in token that the plague was stayed, and heard a choir of angels around the tomb of Hadrian, he looked up, and saw Michael standing on the summit of the mausoleum, sheathing a bloody sword, in token that the plague was stayed, and heard a choir of angels around him chanting the anthem, since adopted by the Church in her vesper-service, "Queen of heaven, rejoice, because thou art counted worthy to suffer: he has arisen, as he said, Hallelujah! It is further related, that Constantine built a church in honor of Michael (hence it was called "Michaelian"), about four miles from Constantinople; and at a later date there were fifteen churches in his honor within the city.

St. Michael is the patron saint of France. It was he who appeared to Joan of Arc (see art.). In 1499 Louis XI. founded the military order of St. Michael. Originally it was composed exclusively of gentry; but afterwords literary men, judges, bankers, and artists, though not of rank, were eligible. The knights wore, pendent from a gold chain about their necks, a medal representing the archangel vanquishing the dragon. The rites of the order were at first held in the Church of Mount of Michael in Nice. The order was founded by Henry II. to the Sainte-Chapelle, Vincennes, and in 1648, by Louis XIV., to the Grand-Cordeliers in Paris. The number of knights was at first limited to thirty-six, afterwards to a hundred: the king was grand master. The order was suppressed at the Revocation of the Restoration, and ceased to exist in 1830.

Mrs. Clement thus speaks of St. Michael in Christian Art:

"Michael is always represented as young and beautiful. As patron of the church militant, he is 'the winged saint,' with no attribute save the shield and the lance. As conqueror of Satan, he stands in armor, with his foot upon the Evil One, who is half human, or like a dragon in shape. The angel is about to chain him, or to transfix him with the lance. But the treatment of this subject is varied in many ways, all, however, easily recognized. As lord of souls, St. Michael is unarmored. He holds a balance, and in each scale a little naked figure representing the soul: the beatus usually joins the hands as in thankfulness, while the rejected one expresses horror in look and attitude. In these pictures the saint is rarely without wings. When introduced in pictures of the Madonna and Child, he presents the alliance to Christ, who seems to welcome the happy soul. The old English coin called an 'angel' was so named because it bore the image of this archangel." —Handbook of Legendary Art, ed. 1881, p. 231.

Michael Paleologus, See Cerularius.

Michael VIII. (Paleologus), emperor of Constantinople, 1260–82; usurped the throne of Nicea after the death of Lascaris II., 1259, and conquered Constantinople by a stratagem the following year, driving the Latins and their emperor, Baldwin II., out of the city, and thus restoring the Byzantine Empire. In order to escape the revenge of the Latins, and also in order to baffie the intrigues of an ecclesiastical party in Constantinople, the Armenites (see Armenia), Michael opened negotiations with the Pope for the reconciliation of the Greek and Latin churches. A Greek embassy, headed by Veccus, appeared at the synod of Lyous, 1274; and in the course of the debate the Greeks gave up all the principal points of dissension,— the procession of the Holy Spirit, the supremacy of the Pope, etc. The reconciliation, however, was never carried out. The majority of the Greeks hated the Church of Rome, and still more a union with her on such conditions. Pope Martin IV. concluded an alliance with Charles of Anjou, king of Naples and Sicily, and the Venetians, for the expulsion of Michael VIII.; and the latter answered with the conclusion of an alliance with the king of Aragon for the expulsion of the French from Sicily. Greece was actually invaded by the Latins, though

---

1 The incident is probably derived from the Targum of Jonathan upon Deut. xxiv. 8, which attributes the burial of Moses to Michael, and Michael's answer from Zeph. iii. 1.
without any success; and the invasion was followed by the Sicilian Vespers. But both parties were too much occupied with troubles in their own homes to bestow any great attention on foreign affairs, and the union of Lyons was allowed to sink into oblivion.

MICHAEL SCOTUS. See Scotus, Michael.

MICHAELIS, the name of three learned Orientalists and keen theologians, who made valuable contributions in the departments of exegesis and Old Testament criticism.—I. Johann Heinrich, b. at Klenzenberg, July 26, 1608; d. at Halle, March 10, 1738; devoted himself especially to the study of the Oriental languages, taking Egyptian in 1698, at Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, with the celebrated Ludolph. He then began giving lectures at Halle, and in 1699 was made professor of the Oriental languages. He exerted an extensive influence by representing at Halle, the seat of Spener's pietistic school, the critical faculty, and becoming the soul of Francke's Collegium Orientale theologicum, as well as by editing a critical edition of the Old Testament (1720) from five original manuscripts in ten printed editions. He also published some valuable exegetical works on the Old Testament, especially on the Hagiographa (Halle, 1720, 3 vols.). —II. Christian Benedikt, nephew of the former, b. at Ehrlich, Jan. 28, 1680; became professor at Halle in 1713; acquired an extensive reputation for scholarship, especially in the Oriental tongues; d. at Halle, Feb. 22, 1764. He was not very productive as an author; but his Tractatus criticus de variiis lectionibus N.T. caute colligendis et judicandis (1749) against Bengel displays his critical acumen. His Dissert. de antiqu. economiae patriarchalis (1729) are also interesting. —III. Johann David, son of the former, b. at Elrich, Jan. 26, 1680; d. in Gottingen, Aug. 22, 1791. He was not very productive as an author; but his Tractatus criticus de variiis lectionibus N.T. caute colligendis et judicandis (1749) against Bengel displays his critical acumen. His Dissert. de antiqu. economiae patriarchalis (1729) are also interesting.

MIDDLE AGE, The, is that period in European history comprised between the date of the fall of the Western Roman Empire (476), and that of the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks (1453). It occupies that portion of Western Europe governed by the feudal system in civil affairs and by the Roman Church in ecclesiastical. It is to be regarded as an outgrowth of the fusion of the elements of imperial Roman society and the Roman-Catholic Church with the ideas and habits brought into Western Europe by the Barbarian invasions. These invasions, and the permanent occupation of the Roman territory by the Teutonic tribes, resulting in the gradual assimilation of the conquerors with the conquered, gave the characteristic tone and color to the life and thought of the middle age. To understand that life and society, we must first consider the condition of the opposite forces by which they were directed came into contact, — the epoch of the Invasions.

The first permanent occupation of the Roman territory was made by the Visigoths, under Alaric, in the year 395, who besieged and took the city of Rome A.D. 410. At that time the four most active principles of the Roman imperial organization, so far as they affected the relations with the Barbarians, were (1) Organized Christianity, or the Church; (2) The Roman Imperial organization and administration; (3) The Roman law as affecting the rights of persons and the protection of property; (4) The general use of the Latin language throughout that portion of Europe afterwards occupied by the invaders. The imperial rule was practically founded upon a military despotism. When, therefore, the military power decayed, and was no longer strong enough either...
to maintain the regular working of the administra-
tion of the imperial government over its own sub-
jects, or to prevent aggression. It was thus that the
system, having no other support, fell of its own
weight, and successful invasions and permanent
occupation began. In less than a century (386-486) the whole fabric of the Roman power
in Western Europe perished by force of these in-
vasions. A new civilization, however, was not
destroyed with the empire; and Rome was
forthwith to conquer the world by her arts, as
she had done by her arms.

The invaders, as we call them (Barbarians, as
they were called by the Romans, and as they
proudly called themselves), who permanently
occupied the Roman territory, were all of the
Teutonic race. They came from a vast and ill-
defined territory east of the Rhine, and north of the
Danube. Their organization was tribal; their
mode of life was more or less nomadic, or that of
wanderers; and the chief occupation of the most
active among them was hunting or war. All
these characteristics, to which may be added an
inborn love of plunder and love of adventure,
prompted them to cross the Roman frontier. They
were tempted by the weakness and the wealth of
the Roman provinces. They came on in success-
se waves of destruction during the fifth century.
In the year 500 the Ostrogoths occupied Italy,
and the Roman territory as far north as the Danube;
the Visigoths and the Suevi, the country from the
River Loire, south and west, including modern
Spain and Portugal; the Burgundians, the south-
eastern portion of modern France; and the Franks,
the portion of that country north of the River
Loire, as well as modern Holland and Belgium.
At this time all these tribes were nominally
Christian, but all save the Franks were Arians.
Their rule in the Roman territory, when they
occupied it, was one of simple military force.
They retained their old military organization
under their tribal chiefs, with officers subordinate
to them, afterwards called “dukes” and “counts”
in the conquered districts. The Roman provinci-
cials were usually permitted to govern themselves
in their private relations, according to the forms of
the Roman law; but the conquerors appropriated
two-thirds of the lands, and all the movable prop-
erty, of the old inhabitants. The legal condition
of these inhabitants was that of slaves, made such
by their capture as prisoners of war.

The great change in the condition of life of the
Barbarians, or that of their final occupation of the
Roman soil, was that they ceased to be wanderers
or invaders, and that, unlike the Romans, they
preferred to live in the country rather than in towns.
This peculiarity is important as affecting the dis-
tribution of population in Europe in after-times.

Of all the Teutonic tribes, the Franks proved
the most powerful, and in the end gained possess-
sion of the greater portion of Central and South-
ern Europe. Moving with irresistible force from
their country on the Lower Rhine, they defeated
in 486, under their chief Clovis, Syagrius, the
Roman patrician, and thus destroyed the remnant
of Roman power in Gaul. The Franks, after
years laborious and hardfought, they conquered the Alemanni, seated on both banks of
the Upper Rhine, the Burgundian kingdom in
the south-eastern portion of France, and the Visi-
gothic kingdom, extending from the Loire to the
Pyrenees. Thus was established the first Frank-
ish kingdom under Clovis and his race, known in
history as the “Merovingian race.” The conquests
of Clovis were much aided by the influence of the
Roman-Catholic bishops in Gaul, who desired to
extirpate the heresy of Arianism, then professed
by all the tribes in that region save the Franks.
Clovis had been baptized into the Roman-Catholic
faith; and in the persuasion of the clergy, as well
as of himself, the Frankish conquests secured
the triumph of the Orthodox Roman Church.

It may be said that the Teutonic invaders
brought into Western Europe at least five distinct
permanent influences, or tendencies: (1) The prin-
ciple of representative government as first exhib-
ited in their assemblies of freemen; (2) loyalty
in a new form, in which the king or chief, al-
though he was supposed to be of divine lineage,
had no claim to rule until he was chosen by his
fellow-warriors; (3) The sentiment of loyalty to
the chief, to whom the warrior was bound by the
tie of military patronage; (4) A feeling of per-
sonal independence and of equality, founded on
the supposed common possession of honor and
courage; (5) A strong disposition, at least in
later times, to recognize the authority of the
Roman Church.

The rule of the Merovingian kings was so
feeble, that they are known in history as rois
fainéants. Under them the disorganization of the
elements of Roman life was so great, that all
the institutions which they found in Roman Gaul
either perished, or were transformed into instru-
ments of barbarian rule, during more than two
centuries (500-730), save the Church, which con-
stantly increased in power, wealth, and independ-
ence. Towards the close of that period, owing
to the weakness of the kings of the race of
Clovis, their stewards, or “mayors of the palace”
as they were called, became virtually the rulers
of their kingdom. The family of Pepin of
Landen furnished the most conspicuous and re-
owned of these mayors of the palace. After the
Austrasian (or Eastern) Franks had crushed the
power of the Neustrians at the battle of Teutry
(687), the former, under the leadership of Pepin
of Heristal, conquered the Neustrian tribes on the
Rhine, and later, in 732, when Charles Martel
was their leader, destroyed, at the battle of
Poitiers, the power of the Saracens advancing
from Spain towards Central Europe. Pepin le
Bref, the son of Charles Martel, extended the con-
quests of the Franks, and having defeated Batch-
deric, the last of the Merovingian race, became
king of the Franks de jure, as he had been hither-
to de facto, being crowned as such by Boniface,
Bishop of Mentz, by order of the Pope, in 751.
Charlemagne, his son, made further conquests,
until his kingdom extended from the North Sea
to the Mediterranean and, from the River Elbe to
the Ebro. In the last half of the eighth century
an alliance was formed between these Carlov-
gian kings, Pepin and Charlemagne, and the
Pope, the result of which was, that the elements
of ancient Roman life were transfused into that
of the middle age; and this fusion gave the char-
acteristic color to the history of that period.

The immediate causes of this fruitful alliance
were these: the Pope's power, civil and ecclesi-
sastical, in Italy at that time, was threatened by
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the schismatic Lombards and by the Byzantine emperors, whose nominal subject the Pope was. To secure his independence, the Pope invoked the aid of the Frankish kings, Pepin and Charlemagne, not merely because they were the most powerful kings in Europe, but also because they were Orthodox Catholics. At the Pope's request, these kings made several expeditions into Italy, which resulted in the destruction of the Lombard and Byzantine power in that country, and the annexation of all its territory, save the Exarchate of Ravenna (the sovereignty of which was conferred on the popes), to the Frankish kingdom. As a reward for services previously rendered to the Church, Pepin had received its sanction to his jurisdiction of an emperor was supposed to embrace theoretically the whole world, and practically all Western Europe. There were many kings, but there could be but one emperor. The ancient imperium was divided between two persons: the emperor was Imperator semper Augustus; and the Pope, Pontifex Maximus. Each was designed to be perfectly independent, and sovereign in his own sphere; and each was supposed to be bound to the constant aid and support of the other in the government of mankind. The Church was to have uncontrolled power over the conscience: the emperor was to be lord of everything else. It was hoped in this way, by the revival of the imperial Roman forms, to secure a return of that peace and order which had been so long characteristic of the Roman rule.

The Pope was then recognized (A.D. 800) in Western Europe as the universal or supreme bishop of the Christian church. The king of the Franks, Pepin, or his brother Charles the Great, King of the Franks, and successor of Charlemagne, to come to Rome, to be there crowned emperor, and to restore order by his imperial authority. The emperor asserted that authority by deposing this very pope, and by substituting for him one whose character gave rise to less public scandal. He claimed the right, by virtue of his authority as emperor, to nominate the Pope; and this claim was put forward, and insisted upon, by many of his successors, not only of the Saxon dynasty, but by those of the houses of Franconia and Swabia as well. This gave rise to constant quarrels between the popes and the emperors. They culminated in the famous controversy known in medieval history as the "Investitures," in which the question was, whether the Pope, or the emperor, the ecclesiastical, or the civil authority, should give to the bishops throughout Europe, not merely the investiture of their sees, but also the legal possession of the vast feudal estates usually attached to them. This controversy, in which the celebrated Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII. (1076), and the Emperor Henry IV., were the conspicuous actors, involved the principle of the relations of the civil and ecclesiastical authority during the middle age. The result, so far as this particular question was concerned, was a compromise between the lay rulers and those of the Church; but the limits between their jurisdictions were never accurately defined. Hence we find throughout the middle age the most extravagant pretensions, on the part of the popes, in the name of Rome, not merely to secular-dotal authority, but to supremacy over kings and emperors, and the constant use of the discipline of the Church — excommunication and interdict — to enforce that discipline. Out of these claims grew such disputes, not merely as those of Hildebrand and Henry IV., concerning the investitures (1076), but also the controversy between Henry II. of England and Thomas Becket, in reference to the exemption of the clergy from the jurisdiction of the civil courts; the long struggle between Gregory IX. and Frederick II., as to claims of sovereignty in Naples; between Innocent III. and Philip Augustus of France, where the Pope appears as a champion of the sanctity of marriage; the excommunication and deposition of John of England; and, later, the ignoble quarrel between Boniface VIII. and Philippe le Bel of France. In all these cases, and many like them, the popes claimed supremacy in ruling over both the secular and the spiritual sovereigns, the exercise of which, they insisted, was essential to the maintenance of truth and justice in the middle age.

The empire of Charlemagne was divided among his grandsons in 843. To Charles the Bald was assigned Western Francia, or France; to Louis, Eastern Francia, or Germany; and to Lothaire, the intervening territory, with Italy, and the nominal emperorship over all. The imperial government was practically brought to an end by this treaty, and throughout Europe the feudal system of government was substituted for it. Originating in the service of the Teutonic chiefs who invaded the Roman territory were rewarded for their services by free gifts, generally of lands in the conquered districts. At the dissolution of the empire, the persistent invasions of the Northmen, and the general disorder of the times, made necessary some new method of efficient protection. Lands were granted by the sovereign to his chief warriors, on condition that their possessors should aid the sovereign in the defence of the country. The lands thus conferred were called "sefts," and their holders, "vassals;" and the relation be-
tween the parties was that of reciprocal aid and protection, the lands being held by the vassals on that express condition. Those upon whom these fiefs were conferred directly by the sovereign were called “grand-vassals.” They, in turn, parceled out their grants among their followers, upon condition that they would hold these portions subject to services similar to those to which their immediate lord owed to the sovereign. During the middle age, nearly all the land in Europe, originally the royal domain, was feudalized, or held in fief. Power and the possession of land were inseparably connected; and hence the kings who had granted away the larger portion of their private lands became merely nominal sovereigns, the true rulers being the great feudal lords. The object of the feudal system was to combine military efficiency with the Teutonic character, or for the extirpation of heresy, and did not look at the oppressed, women, and especially the Church.

Life in the middle age, for the mass of the population, was very hard; for it was hemmed in on every side by force, always thoroughly organized, but very severe, and often very arbitrary in its exactions. The serfs and villeins could not change their masters, whose caprice was often the measure of the service to be rendered to them. The workmen of the towns who were not members of the privileged trade corporations resembled the proletariat of ancient Rome: the towns themselves, as well as the traffic between them, was subject to the plundering incursions of the robber knights. The great feudal nobles claimed the right to make war upon each other, as one of their most important privileges. There was no general government to protect the people, or to redress their wrongs: the royal authority was merely nominal, and therefore wholly disregarded. The Church tried hard, by its ministries and discipline, to alleviate the hardships which grew out of this anarchical condition; but in doing so it established a rule of force in another sphere, in which the minds and consciences of mankind were brought under its absolute control. (See Milman: Latin Christianity; Guizot: History of Civilization in France; Bryce: Holy Roman Empire; Laurent: Études sur l’histoire de la humanité; Thierry: Récits Mérovingiens; Hallam: Middle Ages; Martin: Histoire de France, tom. III. and IV.; Stille: Studies in Mediaeval History.)

MIDDLETON, Conyers, D.D., an able controversial writer, and author of the famous Life of Cicero; the son of a clergyman; b. at York, Dec. 27, 1683; d. at Hildersham, July 28, 1750. He studied at Trinity College, Cambridge, and, taking orders, was settled at Trumpington, near Cambridge, his only charge. In 1718 he returned to Trinity as a fellow. He won for himself a wide reputation by his intrepid and caustic attacks on Bentley, the master of Trinity, who had called him “fiddling Middleton,” with reference to his musical propensities. Bentley, in spite of his great scholarship, was very unpopular on account of his harsh personalitites. They came to an open war in 1717, when, by a mandamus of George I., Bentley was obliged to confer the title of D.D. on Middleton. The master, however, showed his spleen by demanding an extra fee of four pounds. Middleton gave it, under protest,
MIDDLETON.

and, appealing to the courts, won a complete victory over Bentley, who was deprived of his professorship. He afterwards went too far, and was accused of libel by Bentley, found guilty, and fined. The battle, however, was not over.

Bentley in 1720 was about to issue an edition of the Greek Testament, and set out with great precipitancy some specimens. Middleton's keen eye detected errors; and immediately he assaulted Bentley in a fierce attack, completely driving him from the field, so that he renounced the idea of his New Testament, and winning the applause of the friends of Trinity, who chose him as the principal librarian of the college. In 1724 he visited Rome, and five years later wrote A Letter from Rome, showing an Exact Conformity between Popery and Paganism (4th ed., 1741), in which he boldly proved that the religion of the Roman Church was a continuation of the heathenism of ancient Rome.

He had a passion for controversy; and it seemed to be his delight, by sudden attacks upon received opinions, to startle the literary public. The controversies of this doughty champion were not confined to Bentley, but extended to Waterland, Sherlock, and others. In 1725 he assailed the whole medical profession, and sent out with great precipitancy some specimens. Middleton's assertion that there were "contradictions in the evangelists which could not be reconciled," and that "the story of the fall of man was a fable or allegory." In 1741 he published the great work of his life, the History of the Life of Mr. Tullius Cicero (2 vols.), written at the request of Lord Harvey, and after the labors of six years. There were three thousand subscribers to the work; and from the receipts he purchased for himself a home at Hildersham, near Cambridge, whither he retired for the remainder of his life. This biography has been condemned as being too partial, and praising, as Macaulay has said, acts as "wise, virtuous, and heroic," which Cicero himself condemned. In 1749 he published Examinations of the Lord-Bishop of London's Discourses concerning the Use and Intent of Prophecy, etc. His Miscellaneous Tracts, published in one volume (London, 1752), comprise Dispute or Dissension between Peter and Paul at Antioch; The Variations or Inconsistencies among the Four Evangelists; Essay on the Gift of Tongues, etc. The complete edition of Middleton's works, except the Life of Cicero, 5 vols., was published in London, 1755. The best edition of the Life of Cicero is that of London, 1848.

MIDRASH. The term "Midrash" denotes, in the abstract and general sense, "the study," "the exposition of Holy Writ." After the return from Babylon, the law was the centre of the spiritual life in Israel; and its study became the object of scientific treatment when the temple, the Jewish sanctuary, was destroyed. The "law of Moses" had not only to be adapted to the altered circumstances of life, but had also to be supplemented by more precisely determining that which was undetermined, in order to meet all individual relations and circumstances of life. This investigation and explanation of Scripture was termed Midrash, and was divided into the Halachic ("exegesis"), i.e., embracing law and practice, or doctrine in its whole extent, and Hagadic, i.e., embracing all other scientific products, all the efflux of free meditation, whether its subject-matter be historical or legendary, ethical, parobical, or speculative.

The writing down of the Midrash, i.e., of Halachoth and Hagadoth, commenced with the second century of our era, and ended in the eleventh century: since that time, history, religious philosophy, grammatical exegesis, and Cabals, became the objects of study.

Structure of the Midrashim. — A large portion of the Midrashim consists of homiletical lectures introduced by a text not contained in the Pentateuch. This is called a proem, or prōem. The most simple form of the proem is the quotation of a verse, the relation of which to the section of the Pentateuch, or rather its application to the subject, was left to the reader or hearer to be found out. Sometimes more than one text was introduced; and the exposition was given in such a manner, that the last exposition served as a connecting link between the introduction and the subject under discussion. Of a more exegetical character are the oldest Midrashim; such as Genesis Rabba, Mechilta, Sifre, Sifra.

L IT. — 1. The three ancient Midrashim, Mechilta, Sifre, Sifra, have this in common, that
they contain Halacha or Hagadah, just as the text to be treated requires it. The first two, according to their original portions, belong to Ishaqel, the contemporary and opponent of Akiba (first half of the second century).

(a) Mechiitah (i.e., "measure, form") is a commentary upon parts of the Book of Exodus; as xii. 1-xxiii. 19, xxxii. 12-17, and xxxv. 1-3. It was first printed at Constantinople in 1515. The latest editions are, Mechitiha, with notes by J. H. Weiss, Vienna, 1865, and Mechiliha de Rabbi Israel, with notes, etc., by M. Friedmann, Vienna, 1870.

A Latin translation is found in Ugolino's Thesaurus antiqu. sacrarum, vol. xiv. c. 1-586.


(c) Sifra, also Haggadah sahra[na][i.e., "Codex of the Priests"], a commentary on Leviticus, first printed at Venice in 1545. Latest editions by M. L. Malbim, with an excellent commentary der jiidischen Tradition, Vienna, 1876, ii. 225-239 in Mischnam, pp. 307 sq.; Weiss, Zur Geschichte, vii. 1349-1352, 1387-1389, iii. 1202-1209.


On Sifra, FRANKEL, i.e., 1854, pp. 387-392, 453-461; GEIGER: Zeitschrift, 1875, pp. 50-60.

On Hatora vehamito, or Haggadah sahra, ten Haggadic Midrashim are comprised, which treat (a) on the Pentateuch, and (b) the Five Megilloth (i.e., Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther).

(a) On the Pentateuch.

(b) Bereshit Rabba, on Genesis, divided into a hundred chapters, and composed in the sixth century. The last five chapters, also called Vaicikh Rabba, so called from the first word vaicikh (Gen. xvii. 12 sq.), are more modern, probably of the eleventh century. See ZUNZ, pp. 174-178, 254-256; LERNER: Anlage des Bereshith Rabba, in Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums [Berlin], 1860, 157-174, 197-237; 1881, 30-48, 92-107, 130-160, 179-197. German translation by AUG. WUNSCH, in his Bibliotheca Rabbinica, Leipzig, 1881.

(c) Shemoth Rabba, on Exodus, in fifty-two chapters, probably of the eleventh or twelfth century. ZUNZ, 256-258. German translation by WUNSCH, i.e.

(d) Vajjikra Rabba, on Leviticus, in thirty-seven chapters. Middle of the seventh century. ZUNZ, p. 182.

(e) Bamidbar Rabba, on Numbers, in twenty-three chapters, by two authors: the latter probably belongs to the twelfth century. ZUNZ, 268-269.

(f) Devarim Rabba, on Deuteronomy, in eleven chapters. ZUNZ, 251-253. [German translation by WUNSCH, i.e.]

(g) On the Five Megilloth.

(h) Shir ha-Shirim Rabba, on the Song of Songs; also called Agodath Chasikha. German translation by WUNSCH, i.e. Compare THEODOR: "Shir ha-shirim Rabba und seine Quellen," in FRANKEL-GRÄTZS Monatschrift, 1879, 337-344, 408-415, 455-462; 1880, 19-23; ZUNZ, pp. 286, 294; SAALFELD, in Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 1878, 129-135.

(i) Ruth Rabba, in eight chapters. ZUNZ, p. 265.

(j) Midrash Echa, or Megilath Echa, and Midrash Echa Rabba, i.e., Midrash on the Esther, in sections. German translation by WUNSCH, i.e.

This entire collection was first published at Venice in 1545, etc. Convenient editions are those published at Berlin, 1866, and at WILNA, 1878. Compare STEINCSCHNEIDER: Catalogus Librorum Hebroarum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, Berlin, 1882, 90, No. 3753-3784; WOLF: Bibl. Hebr., ii. 1423-1427, iii. 1215, iv. 1052 sq., 1056 sq.


Pesikta Rabbi, or Pesikta di Rab Cabana contains also a collection of lectures on the pericopes, and was compiled, probably, before the ninth century. The earliest edition is that of 1686; the latest, by M. FRIEDMANN, Vienna, 1880. ZUNZ, 289-251.

4. Midrash Tanchuma (also called Jeladenu, extending over the entire Pentateuch) was probably written about the ninth century, by an author who lived in Greece or Italy. It was first printed at Constantinople in 1520-22; latest edition,
Stettin, 1864, with the commentaries Ex. Josef and Am. Josef. See Zunz, 1512 sq.; Stettin, 1861; also together with e.

5. Jalkut, or Jalkut Shimon, i.e., a collection of Simon, who flourished in the first part of the thirteenth century. This Midrash extends over the whole Bible. Not to be interchanged with our work is the Jalkut Rubeni and Jalkut Hadasch, two cabalistic works. Our Jalkut was first published at Salonich, 1520-27. [Wolf: Bibl. Hebr., i. 1129 sq., iii. 1158; Zunz, 286-287; Rapoport, in Kerem ephem., vii. 4 (Hebrew); Fürst: Bibl. Jud., iii. 327 sq.]

6. Other Midrashim. (a) Exegetical: viz., —
   (a) Agadath Bereshith [on Genesis], in eighty-three sections, Venice, 1618. Zunz, 256; Steinschneider, 357-378.
   (c) Midrash Misilel, on Proverbs, Constantinople, 1512, Stettin, 1861; also together with r.
   (d) Midrash Shumiel: beginning of the eleventh century, and containing excerpts from older works. Constantinople, 1517, Stettin, 1860.
   (e) Halachic Midrashim: viz., —
   (f) “Questions,” of Rabbi Acha of Shabcha (about 750), on laws and usages, as contained in the Pentateuch. Best edition is that published at Dyhrenfurth, 1786, with the commentaries of Issaiah, Berlin. Zunz, 56, 96, 343, 354; Steinschneider, 4530.
   (g) Historical Haggadoth: viz., —


(d) Sefer ha-Jasher, a history from Adam to the Judges, written perhaps, in the twelfth century, Venice, 1625. Zunz, 154-156; Steinschneider, 3581-3586.

(e) Midrash Vaijuah, wars of the sons of Jacob with the Canaanites and Esau, printed in Bet-ha-midrash, iii. Zunz, 145.

(f) Pesach-haggada, for the Easter festival. Zunz, 126; Steinschneider, 2671.

(g) Midrash Petirath Aaron, and (h) Midrash Petirath Moshe, on the last days of Aaron and Moses. Zunz, 140; Steinschneider, 3806-4000; Bet-ha-midrash, i, vi.

(h) Ketib Eldad ha-Dani [i.e., “The Book of Eldad the Dane”], towards the end of the ninth century, and containing the fable of the Jews beyond the River Sambation. Bet-ha-midrash, ii., iii., v.; Steinschneider, 4984; Zunz, 139.

(i) Sefer Zerubbabel. Zunz, 140; Steinschneider, 1400, 1401. [Traditions on Armillus, i.e., Romanus, the personification of the Roman hereditary enemy of Israel, and of the last great infidel king, Constantinople, 1519.]

(j) Abba Gorion treats of the narrative as contained in the Book of Esther. Zunz, 279, printed in Bet-ha-midrash, i.

(k) Megillath Antiochus [subject, “The Wars of the Hasmoneans”]. Zunz, 154. The Hebrew text was often printed (see Steinschneider, 1882-1888). The Aramaic text was first published by H. Filipowski at the end of his Choice of Pearls, London, 1851; then by Sluzki, Warsaw, 1865, and by Jellinek, in Bet-ha-midrash, vi. A new edition is in the course of preparation by Charles II. Wright (The Megillath Antiochus, a Jewish Apocryphon, with the Chaldean Text, etc.).

(l) Midrash Ele Ezkerah [so called from the first words, “These will I remember, — Ps. xlii. 5, Hebrew text] describes the martyrdom of ten eminent teachers. Zunz, 142; Steinschneider, 3730-3732; Bet-ha-midrash, ii., vi.

Of a purely legendary character are: —

(m) Midrash Vaijuasha, the tradition about Armillus [The Roman Antichrist]. Zunz, 282; Steinschneider, 3734-3739; Bet-ha-midrash, i.
(p) Midrash Esreth ha-deberoth, on the Ten Commandments. ZUNZ, 1424; STEINSCHNEIDER, 3731, 4989; Bet-ha-midrash, i.

(Migne's) book upon the Liberty of the Priests, he betook himself to Paris in 1833, and started L'Univers religieux, later called simply L'Univer, but sold it in 1836, and went to Petit Montrouge, near Paris, where he soon built up an enormous printing-establishment, to which he gave the name Imprimerie catholique. From low prices and with great rapidity, reprints of the works of the Greek and Latin Fathers, medieval writers, and modern ecclesiastical authors, besides a theological encyclopedia of the most comprehensive description, comprising three different religious dictionaries. The principal of Migne's publications are, Scriptura sacra cursus completus

and Theologia cursus (each 28 vols., published simultaneously from 1840 to 1845); Collection des orateurs sacres (1840-48, 100 vols.); Patrologiæ cursus completus (Latin series, 221 vols., 1844 sqq.; 2d ed., 1878 sqq.; 1st Greek series, 104 vols., 2d, 66 vols.; 3d, 65 vols.). These reprints have done much to spread the patristic and scholastic writings, but are in themselves of no critical value. They were gotten up too rapidly, and not by the right persons, for scholarly work. In the establishment of Migne, printing was only one of the trades carried on: organs, statuary, pictures, and other things found or used in churches, were manufactured there. The Archbishop of Paris, deeming that the commercial element, rather than the spiritual or the ecclesiastical, was the ruling person in Migne's business, forbade him to continue it. Migne refused to stop, and the archbishop suspended him. In February, 1868, his immense establishment, which employed three hundred operatives and many literary persons, was burnt to the ground. In this fire the entire remainder of some volumes of his series were destroyed, but of these a new edition has been prepared.


MIKKELSEN, Hans, burgomaster of Malmö in Skaane; accompanied Christian II. into exile, and died at Harderwick, in Guelderland, about 1524. He was the first to translate the New Testament into Danish (the Gospels from Erasmus' Latin translation, and the Epistles from Luther's German). The translation was published in 1524.

MILAN. The Church of, was, according to legend, founded by Barnabas, and occupied a similar position between the Eastern and Western churches to that Barnabas occupied between Paul and the other apostles. Ambrose, the great archbishop of Milan (374-397), acquired his literary influence chiefly by imitating Greek models; and the Liturgy which he introduced in the Milanese Church, and which was maintained in spite of the exertions of Charlemagne and Gregory VII., originated in the Orient, and deviates considerably from the Roman Liturgy. The successors of Ambrose often appeared as mediators between Rome and Byzantium; it was in the situation and doctrinal controversies; and especially in the Three-Chapter Controversy, in the sixth century, the Archbishop of Milan and the Patriarch of
Aquilaia acted as arbiters between the Orthodox party of Rome and the Eastern Monophysites. Such a position presupposes a considerable measure of independence and power, and for several centuries the Church of Milan enjoyed both in no small degree. Ambrose was elected bishop of the people, and simply confirmed by the emperor; and in the same manner all the following archbishops of Milan were elected, down to the time of Constantius (593-600). He was a friend of Gregory the Great, and went to Rome to be ordained by him; but his suffragan bishops became so indignant at this humiliation before Rome, that they separated from him. After his death, the episcopal election again became independent of Rome, and remained so until the time of Gregory VII. In the mean time, the power of the Milanese archbishop vastly increased. From the Lombard kings, whom he crowned with the iron crown, and from the German kings, whose policy it was to prevent the large fiefs from becoming hereditary, he received extensive estates, and in the ninth and tenth centuries he was the real Duke of Lombardy. To direct an open attack against such a rival would not be prudent, and the Roman curia, with Hildebrand at its head, accordingly chose an indirect way. The Milanese clergy generally married (even the bishops), and considered this one of the liberties of the Ambrosian Church. But when the reforms of Hildebrand began to take shape, Roman emissaries appeared in the Milanese territory, stirring up the people, the laity, against the " unholy " clergy. The party of the " Patarini " was formed, a split was produced between the flock and their pastors, and then Rome could venture upon a plan of direct attack. In 1059, sent by Nicholas II, the famous ascetic, Petrus Damiani, cardinal of Ostia, appeared in Milan, at the head of a Roman committee, to investigate the ecclesiastical method of appointment practised in the diocese; and the result was an enormous number of accusations of simony. The people murmured at this interference from the site of Rome; but the clergy was smitten with terror, and submitted. When Nicholas II. died, in 1056, it was evident to the Milanese clergy, that their cause entirely depended upon the next papal election. Several Lombard bishops, consequently, immediately repaired to the court of the young Henry IV.; and the party succeeded in having Bishop Cadalus of Parma elected pope, and confirmed by Henry IV. as Honorius II. But, in the mean time, the other party, the Roman curia, with Hildebrand at its head, and under protection of the Norman ruler of Naples, had elected Alexander II. pope; and, in the contest which then issued, the latter finally came out victorious, and the spirit of independence which had hitherto characterized the Church of Milan was broken. It ought to be mentioned, though, that when, in the present century, the contest arose in Italy between the national cause and ultramontanism, the Church of Milan was the only portion of the Italian Church which espoused the national cause, and showed any readiness to make sacrifices for its sake. See Arnulf: Gesta archiepiscoporum Mediolanensium; and Landulf: Historia Mediolanensis; in picture, Monumenta Germaniae historica (cont. d’OBE BURKIN).}

**MILDMAY CONFERENCE.** A missionary convention held at the Conference Hall in Mildmay Park, London, Oct. 21-23, 1878. Valuable papers and addresses were presented, discussing the progress of Christian missions in different parts of the world. The Proceedings were published at London, 1878. The conferences are continued from time to time.

**MILETUS** (incorrectly translated Miletum in 2 Tim. iv. 20), an ancient city on the western coast of Asia Minor, about thirty miles south of Ephesus. In 500 B.C. it was the principal Greek city in Asia, and was the birthplace or home of Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, and Anaxagoras. From that time its importance waned before the growing fame and population of its rival Ephesus. At the present time, only a few ruins remain to attest the site which has been covered up by the silt of the Meander River. In the New Testament, Miletus has importance as the point where Paul stopped on his return to Jerusalem from his third missionary journey. Here he took leave of the elders of Ephesus (Acts xx. 17). The statement in Acts xx. 38 implies, as Hackett says (see Commentary on Acts, 2d ed., p. 944), that the city was some distance from the sea; and the place where Paul receded, till its site is ten miles away. The statement that Paul left Trophimus sick at Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20) favors the view of his double imprisonment. See, on this point, Howson: Life of St. Paul, chap. xvi.

**MILICZ OF KREMSIER,** the precursor of Hus; b. at Kremsier, a city near Olmuzt in Moravia, in the beginning of the fourteenth century; d. at Avignon, June 29, 1374. It is not known where he made his studies, but he assumed his first office in the service of the church in 1350. In 1360 he was canon of the Cathedral of St. Vitus in Prague, archdeacon and secretary to the emperor, Charles IV., whom he accompanied to Germany. But his whole nature and character inclined towards asceticism; and in 1363 he resigned his offices, and retired to Bishop-Teinitz, a small town at the foot of the Bohemian Forest. Having returned to Prague, he began to preach to the poor in the streets, (C) and in the Bohemian language. This innovation caused, at first, considerable surprise, but soon became the means by which he reached the very hearts of his hearers. To the students he continued to preach in Latin. He afterwards also learned German in order to preach in that language. One of the great practical results of his activity was the cleaning-out of "Benakiti," the most notorious street of the city, and its transformation into a benevolent institution, — "Jerusalem," — in which women who had been rescued from vice were taken care of. The sight of evil prevailing both inside the church and outside of it led him to the view that Antichrist had come. Reform was necessary, but it had to be made from above, by the Pope; and in 1367 he actually repaired to Rome to confer with Urban V. He was well received, but effected nothing. Meanwhile his sincerity and energy had raised him many enemies in his home, and in 1374 they addressed themselves directly to the Papal Court at Avignon with an accusation of twelve articles. Milicz immediately went to Avignon; and the denunciation which was given to him shows that he would have been declared innocent of any guilt, but he died before the verdict was given. He left several minor treatises...
MILITARY RELIGIOUS ORDERS. The military religious orders (so called) of the middle age grew out of organizations, formed before the crusades of pilgrims to the holy places in Jerusalem, designed to care for and protect those among them who reached the sacred city in a suffering or destitute condition. Pilgrimage to places in Palestine hallowed by the presence or by the events of the life of the Saviour, was long regarded as a high religious duty in Western Europe; and it was often, indeed, a form of penance prescribed by the Church. To the mass of the pilgrims, ill provided with the means of securing their safety or comfort, the long journey amidst populations bitterly hostile was a most formidable undertaking; and it is not to be wondered at that many of them when they reached Jerusalem were better fitted to become inmates of a hospital than worshippers at the holy shrines.

The pilgrims came from every part of Western Europe: but in those days, when a man crossed the frontier of his country, he was beyond the reach, and without the protection, of his own sovereign; so that had not the pilgrims who were feeble and destitute received aid and succor from those who were richer and stronger than they, and who had gone on the same errand, the larger portion must have perished miserably. These pilgrims were all engaged in a common duty prescribed by a common religion; and that religion taught them to help each other in this work. Out of this sentiment grew nearly twenty organized bodies or orders in the Holy Land previous to the Crusades and during its occupation by the crusaders, all of which had, from the beginning, in view the protection and succor of pilgrims; and, as a means to that end, they all sought to maintain the possession of the country in the hands of the Christians.

Of these orders the most famous in history, not only for what they did in Palestine during the Crusades but for their armed advocacy of the Church afterwards against the Mohammedans and the heathen, were the Knights-Hospitallers of St. John, the Knights-Templars, and the Teutonic Knights.

1. The Order of the Knights of St. John (Johanniter, Fratres hospitalis S. Johannis, Hospitalarii). — In 1048 some merchants of Amalfi in Italy (then one of the principal seats of commerce between the East and West) gained permission of the caliph of Egypt, under whose jurisdiction Jerusalem then was, to establish in that city a small chapel and a hospital attached to it for the service of pilgrims. These were placed in charge of Benedictine monks, who were called "hospital brothet." After the capture of Jerusalem by the crusaders, these monks were confirmed in their possessions by Godfrey de Bouillon. Large sums of money were given by him to maintain and enlarge their work; and he appointed a princely Knight, Gerard, their prior. Besides the hospital at Jerusalem, they established hospitals under the charge of the members of the order in the principal seaports whence pilgrims embarked for the Holy Land. In 1118, owing to the dangers which threatened the new Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, the order added to its charitable work proper the services of its members as knights and soldiers in fighting against the Mussulmans. The organization of the order was so modified, that its members became bound thereafter both by monastic and by knightly vows, agreeing to aid and defend the Church, besides receiving and caring for suffering pilgrims. It was called a sovereign order; because Richard Cœur de Lion, on leaving Acre, gave to it his conquest in Palestine. It was made free from any local ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and owed obedience only and directly to the Pope; and this was characteristic of all the military religious orders. Its members were divided into three classes: (1) The Knights, or those from whom military service alone was due; (2) The chaplains, whose duties included ministrations to the sick in the hospitals; (3) Serving brethren, who were assistants to the Knights and to the clergy.

The order spread rapidly, and its riches and power from donations throughout Europe became greatly enlarged. It was organized in seven districts, or langes as they were called; viz., Provence, Auvergne, France, Italy, Aragon, Germany, and England. The distinctive dress of the Knights was at first a black robe, with a cross of eight points of white linen affixed to it, worn on the left breast. This was afterwards changed for a red mantle with a white cross placed upon it. Their legend was Pro Fide ("for the faith"). The chief officer was called "Grand Master of the Hospital at Jerusalem, and Guardian of the Poor of Jesus Christ." The Knights of St. John by their prowess added much to the military strength of the Christians in the East during the era of the Crusades. At Antioch, at Tiberias (1187), and especially at the siege of St. Jean d'Acre, they won great renown by their conduct and valor. After the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin (1189), they retired to Acre, and there carried on their special work in their hospitals until that town was taken by the Mamelukes (1291). They then took refuge in Cyprus. In 1309 they captured the Island of Rhodes, and held it as their headquarters till 1523, maintaining their position as armed defenders of the faith; their special duty at the time being to resist the advance of the Turkish power against Western Europe by way of the Mediterranean Sea. They were unable permanently to withstand this power while they occupied these islands. In 1523 they were forced to surrender the Island of Rhodes to Solyman after a siege which is among the most remarkable in history, and in which the Knights exhibited that same heroic courage and constancy which had been so conspicuous in the early days of the order in Palestine. They had held, in spite of the most formidable obstacles, this bulwark of Christendom against the advance of the infidel for two hundred and twenty years. But their work was not yet done; and they were to earn a still higher title to fame and to the gratitude of
posteriorly, as the armed champions of Christian civilization, by their defense of the next advanced post of Christendom to which they were assigned, — the Island of Malta. This island was given to the order with great hesitation, by the Emperor Charles V. in 1530; and the Knights were there placed as the guardian of Christian interests in the Mediterranean, — in a position of extreme danger, either charitable threatened on one side by the mighty naval power of the Turks of the East, and on the other by that of the tributary provinces on the African coast. Not disheartened, they fortified Malta until it became impregnable when defended by their heroic valor. They had not long to wait to test the question whether they alone, unsupported by any of the Christian powers, would be able to withstand the naval power of the Turks, then in the height of its glory. In 1565, Solyma the Magnificent determined to capture the last stronghold of these defenders of the faith in the Mediterranean. He knew well the difficulties of the siege of such a place, defended by men like the Knights of St. John; for he had learned to know them thoroughly well at the siege of Rhodes. He therefore sent a fleet and army to accomplish his purpose, unexcelled in numbers and discipline by any previous force with which the Turks had been directed against the Christians. We cannot here describe the progress of this most famous siege (see Prescott, Philip II., book iv. chap. iv., for a full account of it); but the result was, that the Knights, by prodigies of valor hitherto unsurpassed even by themselves, drove back the Turks, and forced them to raise the siege.

With the siege of Malta ends the heroic age of the Knights of St. John, or of Malta as they were afterwards called. The Battle of Lepanto, which took place a few years after the successful defense of Malta, destroyed forever the prestige of the naval power of the Turks in the Mediterranean; and in this engagement the fleet of the Knights took an active part. For more than a hundred years afterwards, they aided in protecting the commerce of the Mediterranean from Turkish corsairs and pirates, and in such special work was completed when the decay of the aggressive power of the Turks on that sea began. They remained in Malta, with their organization unimpaired, until the French Revolution; although their revenues were much reduced by the policy of confiscation adopted by the rulers of many of the kingdoms of Europe in which their estates were situated. Henry VIII. of England seized their property, and prohibited the continuance of the order in that country. The kings of Portugal shortly afterwards followed his example; and in France their estates were made, at the Revolution, national property. How much the order must have fallen, at the close of the eighteenth century, from its once high estate, is shown by the offer made by the last Grand Master, Hompesch, in 1797, to Paul I., the Czar of Russia, to become its head and patron. As the czar was the chief of the schismsatics in Europe, and the order had been established especially to maintain the Catholic faith, this surrender is very suggestive.

In 1798 Bonaparte, on his way to Egypt, attacked and captured Malta, threatening the French Knights belonging to it with death if they resisted, as he claimed that they were fighting against the infidel in their own country. In September of the same year, the island was taken from the French by the English fleet under Lord Nelson, and in the possession of that country it has ever since remained. The Knights thereupon dispersed; and their old organization has never since been revived, although certain branches of the Order still exist, with an affiliation with it are still to be found in certain countries of Europe, and even in this country.

2. The Order of the Knights-Templars. — In 1119 Hugh de Payens, a pilgrim of noble birth, joined with eight of his companions at Jerusalem in forming an association, the object of which was purely military, as distinguished from the combined military and religious purpose of the Knights of St. John; viz., to defend and protect, by armed force, pilgrims on their way to the holy shrines. Baldwin II., king of Jerusalem, gave this association the site of the island of the temple, and the Knights are thus described in the account of the sanctuary close to the temple. Its members, who were all Knights, called themselves Fratres militiae templi, or Equites templarii. Like the other orders (the Hospitaliers and the Teutonic Knights), they were at first poor, and without any fixed revenues; but, like the others, they soon became rich through the enthusiasm with which the devotion to their work inspired the faithful throughout Europe. Their costume was originally a white mantle, with a red cross affixed to it. Their banner, called Beauseant, bore as its motto, Non nobis Domine, non nobis, sed tuo nomine da gloriam. In token of their poverty and devotion, their seal represented two Knights riding on one horse. They were from the first strongly supported by the higher authorities of the Church. The Pope, Honorius II., took them under his special protection; and, by a decree pronounced in 1128 at the Council of Troyes, he confirmed them in their privileges, and directed that they should be freed from any ecclesiastical jurisdiction save his own. St. Bernard, at the request of the Knights, drew up their code of laws, in which a spirit of severe asceticism, characteristic of their author, prevails. He imposed his social work with a maxim: "For the honor of Christ; he forbids them to flee, even when attacked by three men, and enjoins upon them to give no quarter to their infidel enemies, etc."

The Templars gained a very high reputation for courage and devotion on all the famous battlefields in which the crusaders met the infidel. Their organization, like that of the other orders, was in three classes: (1) The Knights proper; (2) The Armigeri, or Esquires, whose service was that of arms, and famuli, who were concerned in the general administration; and (3) Rich men, who were affiliated to the order, and who, without pronouncing the knightly vows, aided the objects of the order by their money-gifts. The order became so prosperous, that, in less than a hundred and fifty years after its foundation, it is said that there were no less than twenty thousand Knights and nine thousand commanderies, or houses, under its jurisdiction in Europe and the East. Its four provinces in the East were those of Jerusalem, Antioch, Tripoli, and Cyprus; and almost every country in Western Europe contained one, at least, of the provinces of the Templars. The Grand...
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Master was a sovereign prince, and in England the Master of the Temple was a baron in Parliament.

After the capture of Jerusalem (1244), the Templars retired, first to Cyprus, and afterwards (1289) to France. Unlike the Knights of St. John in similar case, their work of fighting against the infidel was now done; and when they gave up the special purpose for which they had been established, and returned to Europe, they presented the spectacle of an enormously rich and powerful corporation, owing no allegiance in the different countries in which they resided, save to the Pope; while the wealth which had been lavished upon them for a special object, that object having failed, was employed by them, according to the popular belief, only to increase their own power and dignity. They were in that position which in the middle ages was regarded as the most odious to the rulers of nations,—that of possessors of enormous privileges who do not render any adequate or equivalent service for the privileges they possess.

The order of the Templars was abolished by a decree of Pope Clement V. in 1312,—a decree extorted from him by Philippe le Bel, king of France, to whom he owed the office he held. The history of the suppression of an order, which, for nearly two hundred years, had rendered such illustrious service to the Church and to the Pope, forms one of the most curious chapters in the life of the middle age. The object of the king, who was always in need of money, was, no doubt, to gain possession of the wealth of the Templars, and perhaps to provide against a possible abuse of their power in his kingdom. This is very plain; but it is important to know what pretenses were thought necessary at that time to discredit the order in public opinion, and to insure its condemnation by the Church.

On the 12th of October, 1307, the Templars throughout France, without any warning, and pursuant to the secret orders of the king, were arrested, and thrown into prison. The next day Philip issued a proclamation, explaining in a very declamatory form his reasons for so extraordinary an act. "A terrible, horrible, inconceivable form of wickedness has come to our knowledge," he says; and he then goes on to enumerate the charges against the Templars. These charges may be classified under three heads: (1) The denial of Christ; (2) Idolatry; (3) Immoral practices. Their offense, if any, was heresy; and, by the law then existing, it could be inquired into only by the ecclesiastical authority, not by that of the king. As the charges were received, it seems generally conceded by historians, that the Templars, during their long residence in the East, had, to a certain extent, become infected with some strange Oriental doctrines and practices. It would appear that some of them professed a belief made up of opinions and rites borrowed partly from Mohammedanism, and partly from old Christian heresies, which substituted for the spirituality of the Christian system doctrines founded more or less upon the idea of force and materialism. This had its effect, doubtless, upon their ritual, and upon the form of their symbolic ceremonial. There seems to be no doubt, that, in the latter days of the order, the Knight, on his initiation, was required to deny Christ; but this is explained by saying that such a denial was a mere form, the motive of which was to assure the order that the candidate possessed what was then regarded as the highest quality of a member of a religious order,—the spirit of passive obedience to his superior, which was ascertained by the most severe of all tests,—his willingness to renounce his faith. The accusation that they worshipped a copper idol with a long beard, called "Baffomet," and that the priest during an idolatrous service used the word "Allah," seems absurd on the face of it; for the one vice or corruption from which Mohammedanism has been always free is the worship or adoration of idols of any kind. They were said to use disgusting practices at the initiation of a member (Recipienza et receptus esse osculatun in ore, in umbilico et in fovea spinae dorsi). Strange as it may seem, this has been explained to be (supposing the practice ever to have existed) symbolic, in accordance with the opinion of the time, of humility and fraternity. It is to be remembered, in considering these charges of the immoral practices of the Templars, that, so far as they are said to rest upon confessions, those confessions were extorted by torture, and that they were afterwards, in the most complete manner, retracted by the heads of the order, not only on their last trial, but even at the hour when they were being burned as relapsed heretics, and, moreover, that it is quite possible that there may have been bad men and immoral men among the Templars, without involving the whole body in their crimes, and especially without making the perpetration of those crimes the recognized rule by which the order was governed in the time of Philippe le Bel.

While it is, perhaps, impossible wholly to absolve the Templars from the charges against them, there can be but one opinion in regard to the proceedings of their judges, Philip and Clement V. The condemnation of their predecessor, Boniface VIII., and the suppression of the Order of the Templars, were the price agreed to be paid by Clement V. to Philippe le Bel for his elevation to the Papacy by the direct influence of that king. The trial of the Knights is an illustration of the efforts of the Pope to evade paying the price agreed upon, and of the determination of the king to exact it. The technical offences charged against them was that of heresy; and, by law, the ecclesiastical tribunals had exclusive cognizance of it. But the king submitted the case to the officers of the Inquisition, then recently established in France, under the authority of the fourth council of the Lateran, and the familiar means of torture, and the refusal to confront the accused with witnesses employed by that tribunal, were freely used in this case. The Pope, on discovering that his own jurisdiction, specially reserved to him by the statutes creating the order, had been invaded by the king, submitted the proceedings begun by the Inquisition, and directed that the accused should be tried by a commission of cardinals appointed by him. He seems to have been willing to condemn those members who might be proved guilty of the alleged crimes, but not, on that account, to suppress the order itself. This, however, did not answer the purpose aimed at by the king. After having made public the
so-called confessions of the Knights, made under torture, or promises of pardon, he called together, 1308, the three orders of the kingdom; and, by his representation of the enormities committed by this exposition of the law, was called upon to wait for the permission of the high priest Aaron, to meet the king at Poitiers, and there settle the question of jurisdiction. The Pope was abject and servile, but not cruel. He evaded a decision: he proposed to call. At another he declared his intention to reserve the trial of the higher dignitaries of the order to himself; and at length, wearied by the king's importunity, he even tried to escape in disguise from Poitiers. A compromise was at last effected, by which the inquisitor's powers of trying the ordinary Knights were restored, and the chiefs of the order were sent before a commission of cardinals representing the Pope directly. This arrangement was made upon the solemn promise of the king, that, in case of the condemnation of the Templars, they might withdraw from the country, and retain the possession of their estates within it. From this time the Pope, in abject terror of the king, ceased to take any active part in the defence of the Templars. In 1310 Philip, out of patience with the non-action of the Pope, directed that a provincial council, with the Archbishop of Sens at its head, should be held in Paris. This council continued the proceedings of the Inquisition. The Templars, before it, retracted in the fullest manner the alleged confession of their crimes, insisting that it had been forced from them by torture, or the promise of release, and asserted in the fullest manner the orthodoxy of their belief and the purity of the lives of themselves and their brethren. Under the strange jurisprudence of the Inquisition, they were condemned, on this avowal and retraction, as lapsed heretics. Fifty-four of the disgraced Templars, as such in Paris; all maintaining the constancy of their faith and the innocence of any crime, as long as the flames left them the power of speech. Jacques de Molai, the Grand Master, was the most conspicuous of these victims in every way. He had defended the order against the charge of the hideous crimes imputed to it, with the same intrepidity which his predecessors had shown on the bloody battlefields of Palestine; and, as his life was being consumed, he summoned his murderers, Philip and Clement, to meet him within a year at the bar of God, there to answer for their crimes. But Philip was not satisfied with the sacrifice of these illustrious victims. He asked of the general council of the Church, convened at Vienne, in France, a decree formally condemning the order. There were more than three hundred bishops from different portions of Europe present at this council, and their attitude was that of passive nonresistance to the king; but they could not be brought to take any action without better evidence than confessions wrung from the accused by torture. At last the wearied Pope, striving to satisfy the king, held a secret consistory, composed of such of the cardinals and bishops as were favorable to Prussia. But Philip, after the solemn promise of the king, that, in case of the condemnation of the Templars, they might withdraw from the country, and retain the possession of their estates within it, had been forced from them by torture, or the promise of release, and asserted in the fullest manner the orthodoxy of their belief and the purity of the lives of themselves and their brethren. Under the strange jurisprudence of the Inquisition, they were condemned, on this avowal and retraction, as lapsed heretics.
on the banks of the Elbe, when he gave them the alternative of baptism, or of being drowned. Still the country gradually became civilized under the rule of these Knights; and many important cities of the middle age, which carried on an extensive traffic with the rest of Europe by means of the Hanseatic League, grew up in their territory; such as Culm, Thorn, Elbing, Dantzic, Koenigsberg, and Marienburg, the headquarters of the Knights. Prussia under the Knights is said to have contained more than fifty cities and eighteen thousand towns and villages, and more than two millions of people. After nearly two centuries of rule, the power of the Knights was greatly diminished. Samogitia, the northern portion, was taken from them, and annexed to Lithuania in 1410; and in 1446, by the Treaty of Thorn, Culm and Dantzic, and a large portion of the bishopric of Ermland, was added to Poland. The rest of Prussia (which modern province of that name, with Koenigsberg as its capital) was left to the order as a Polish fief. In 1511 Albert of Brandenburg was Grand Master. In 1525 he adopted the Reformed doctrines, and, by the advice of Luther, married. He then became the king of Poland; and thus the old duchy of Prussia passed to his collateral kindred, the margraves of Brandenburg; and thus the order held in fief, and received it back from the trinities, and, by the advice of Luther, married. The rule of these Knights; and many important cities of the middle age, which carried on an extensive traffic with the rest of Europe by means of the Hanseatic League, grew up in their territory; such as Culm, Thorn, Elbing, Dantzic, Koenigsberg, and Marienburg, the headquarters of the Knights. Prussia under the Knights is said to have contained more than fifty cities and eighteen thousand towns and villages, and more than two millions of people. After nearly two centuries of rule, the power of the Knights was greatly diminished. Samogitia, the northern portion, was taken from them, and annexed to Lithuania in 1410; and in 1446, by the Treaty of Thorn, Culm and Dantzic, and a large portion of the bishopric of Ermland, was added to Poland. The rest of Prussia (which modern province of that name, with Koenigsberg as its capital) was left to the order as a Polish fief. In 1511 Albert of Brandenburg was Grand Master. In 1525 he adopted the Reformed doctrines, and, by the advice of Luther, married. He then became the king of Poland; and thus the old duchy of Prussia passed to his collateral kindred, the margraves of Brandenburg; and thus the order held in fief, and received it back from ...

---

**Mill, John Stuart, b. in London, May 20, 1806; d. in Avignon, May 8, 1873; was the son of James Mill (b. April 6, 1778; d. June 23, 1836), the author of the *History of British India* and the *Analysis of the Human Mind*, and the friend and collaborator of Jeremy Bentham. Educated with great care, but in a cloisteral and pedantic manner which shut him off from all the common impressions of boyhood, and trained his powers along the rules of grammar and logic, he developed a prodigious precocity; and when, in his twentieth year, he entered literature as a contributor to the leading periodicals of the day, he attracted much attention by his power of analyzing facts, his boldness in applying principles, and the conciseness and clearness with which he treated both facts and principles. In 1823 he obtained an appointment in the service of the East India Company, where he gradually rose to a very responsible position, until, in 1838, he retired on a pension at the dissolution of the company. Meanwhile he was a remarkably good author. In 1843 he published his *System of Logic*, the third great work in the field after those of Aristotle and Hegel; in 1848, his *Principles of Political Economy*, new and vigorous both in method and materials, hotly contested on many points, but hardly superseded at any; in 1859, *On Liberty*, his most popular book, and fully deserving of its popularity; later on, *Considerations on Representative Government* (1861), *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* (1865), *The Subjection of Women* (1869), etc. Posthumously appeared an *Autobiography* (1873), a painful book, and *Three Essays on Religion* (1874), rather insignificant.

In the history of literature, John Stuart Mill stands as a character almost unique. He is powerful. His argumentation carries the subject like the ocean-waves the vessel. But he is entirely devoid of any charm, even of simple, natural grace; and the dignity, which never leaves him, is always stiff, and sometimes quaint. He is stimulating, and that in a most noble way; for it is the vigor of his endeavors and the greatness of his achievements which allure to imitation. He has none of that sarcasm which irritates, that allusion which excites, that insinuation which seduces. But he is not educating in the full sense of the word. If the reader happens to be unable to accept the results arrived at, he may still admire the iron knittings of the ratiocination, just as he admires the iron knitting of a suspension-bridge, or other mechanical contrivance; but that will be all. Even when he advocates the most advanced ideas, and manages the arguments with the most perfect adroitness, there is a dryness and stiffness about him which often makes an impression almost of barrenness. Generally, this peculiarity is explained as the result of his peculiar education; and, so far as he was conscious of it, he explained it so himself. But the same education, only on another basis, has often produced quite different results. It was not the education which gave him his spiritual character, but the platform on which he was placed, and from which his education prevented him ever to free
MILLEDOLER.

Philip, D.D., b. at Rhinebeck, N.Y., Sept. 22, 1775; d. on Staten Island, Sept. 23, 1851. He was of Swiss descent; graduated at Columbia College, New York City, 1798; pastor Nassau-street German Reformed Church, New York (1795-1800), Pine-street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia (1800-05), Rutgers-street Presbyterian Church, New York (1800-13), Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church, New York (1813-25); professor of theology, and president of Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J., 1825-41. He was an excellent preacher, and particularly gifted in prayer. He was one of the founders of the American Bible Society, 1816; was moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church at Philadelphia, 1808, and president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in 1823. His publications were sermons and addresses, for which see Corwin's Manual of the Reformed Church in America, 3d ed., pp. 388, 387.

MILLENIANISM, MILLENNIUM. 1 The first term designates a Christian doctrine, the main idea of which, in the early Church, was, that there will be a kingdom of peace and joy, in which Christ, after his second coming, will gather all the saints around him, and personally rule over them. It includes the visible appearance again of Christ on the earth to establish his kingdom, the destruction of Antichrist, the distinction of two resurrections,—one of the saints, for the kingdom of a thousand years; and one of the rest of the dead, for the general judgment,—perfection of happiness, and the dominion of the righteous over the unrighteous portion of the earth. It places a period of a thousand years between the second and millenarian termination of this era (aion). The duration of the thousand years was a subordinate question. This kingdom is not the consummation of a process of evolution and development of the Church, but a special implanting of the glory of the hereafter in the perfection of this world.

1 Herzog treats this subject under the title Chiliasmus ("Chiliasm"); which is the usual German designation for Millenarianism.

The biblical authority for this doctrine is found in the prophecies of the Old Testament, as yet unfulfilled (as Gen. xii. 1 sqq., xv. 3 sqq.), or the words of our Lord (Matt. xiii. 30, 40; Luke xiv. 12 sqq.), but especially in the prophetic visions of Daniel and Ezekiel, and in the words of Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 25 sqq. The chief authority has always been the Book of Revelation. There is nothing in the sermons of the apostles about an earthly millenium in his Autobiography, no word of reproach escapes him, there is a latent regret in his words whenever he speaks of his father, and that though, in his Three Essays, he rejects every specifically Christian tenet, he almost openly recognizes that there is in religion something which he personally does not understand. His more than romantic, almost mystical, relation to his wife (see Carlyle's Memoirs) also indicates a craving for something to worship, if not a direct want of religion. See his remarkable utterances concerning Christ, p. 253, Amer. ed. For biography, see his Autobiography, London and N.Y., 1851; and A. Bain: John Stuart Mill, a Criticism, with Personal Recollections, London, 1882.

CLEMENTS PETRISKI.

MILLENIANISM. The first term designates a Christian doctrine, the main idea of which, in the early Church, was, that there will be a kingdom of peace and joy, in which Christ, after his second coming, will gather all the saints around him, and personally rule over them. It includes the visible appearance again of Christ on the earth to establish his kingdom, the destruction of Antichrist, the distinction of two resurrections,—one of the saints, for the kingdom of a thousand years; and one of the rest of the dead, for the general judgment,—perfection of happiness, and the dominion of the righteous over the unrighteous portion of the earth. It places a period of a thousand years between the second and millenarian termination of this era (aion). The duration of the thousand years was a subordinate question. This kingdom is not the consummation of a process of evolution and development of the Church, but a special implanting of the glory of the hereafter in the perfection of this world.
of its rise, the millenarian doctrine was power-
fully influenced by the historical persecu-
tions. In the tribulation of the present, the
Church took comfort in looking forward to the
certainty of a speedy recompense. The Epistle
of Barnabas (c. 15) is the first book having refer-
ences to it. The doctrine spread from Asia Minor
to the other parts of the Church, primarily among
the Jewish Christians, who regarded it as a
revelation in the scriptures (Euseb., H.E., III. 28, VII. 25), in the Testaments
of the Twelve Patriarchs (Jud., c. 25; Benjam.,
c. 10), and among the Ebionites (Jerome, In
Jes., lx. 1, lxvi. 20). The Shepherd of Hermas
has at least faint echoes of it (i. 3). Justin Mar-
inmiddle and consummation of the Church, but himself believed
Irenæus (Adv. Har., v. 32 sqq.) and Papias based
their arguments on the assertion of those who had seen the
prophecies. In the writings of Clement of Rome, Igna-
tius, Polycarp, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophi-
lus of Antioch, there are no references to mille-
narianism; but the conclusion cannot be drawn with certainty that they did not believe it.
Tertullian (Adv. Nat. Jus., v. 23 sqq.) and Papias based
their expectation of the kingdom of a thousand
years on the assertion of those who had seen the
apostles. The first thing to check the tide of
catastrophes and the introduction of a community of wives and
goods. The Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions
establishing the new Zion at Münster (1534), with
the introduction of a community of wives and
goods. The Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions
condemned this millenarianism, and later theologians
generally referred to the thousand years as passed.

MILLENARIANISM.

There is no name of importance among the
millenarians of the sixteenth century. The most
notable is that of the Catholic Church, who did not share the expectation of an earthly
consummation of the Church, but himself believed
in it. In the writings of Clement of Rome, Ignatius,
Polytropus, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus
of Antioch, there are no references to mille-
narianism. Origen, who regarded matter as the seat
of evil, regarded an earthly kingdom of Christ,
full of physical delights, as a Judaizing fable;
while N eye, an Egyptian bishop who opposed
the view of Origen, met with stormy opposition
in the churches. Methodius, bishop of Tyre (d. 311), in this, as in other points, the counterpart
of Origen, defended the millenarian doctrines
(Sympoth. decem virgum, i. 5). The last echo
in the Greek Church was heard in the pamphlet
of Apollinaris of Laodicea against Dionysius of
Alexandria for it (Basil, Epist., 263; Epipit.,
Heres., 77, 20). It maintained itself for a longer
period in the West; and Lactantius (about 320;
Inst. divin., vii. 14 sqq.), and Victorinus, bishop
of Pettau, portrayed the millennial kingdom in
the most sensual colors. Even Jerome (In Jes.,
i. 18) did not dare to condemn the traditional
churches. The Apocalypse was decided upon
by Augustine (De civit. Dei, xx. 7, 9), who declared that the Church was the kingdom of God on
earth. The new relations of the State to the
Church had contributed to the downfall of mil-
lenarianism. The protection the Church won for
itself from the State deprived the doctrine of its
vitality. In the middle ages, neither catastrophes
in nature, nor degeneracy within the Church, ex-
cited millennial expectations. The clergy pos-
sessed the kingdom of the thousand years in the
glory of a Church triumphant over emperor and
princes. The circles which were prophetic of the
Reformation looked for the regeneration of the
Church, not from the visible coming of Christ,
but in a return to apostolic poverty and piety, or
the enthronement of a righteous Pope. Peter de
Oliva (Postilla in Apocal., 1287) explained the
second coming by the operation of the Holy Ghost
in the heart.

2. The second period in the history begins with
the Reforma tion. The growing decline of the
antichristian papacy was regarded as one of the
sure signs of the approach of the Lord. Others,
upon the basis of the doctrine of the invisible
Church, became prophets of the millennial king-
dom. Innung of its rise, the millenarian doctrine was power-
fully influenced by the historical persecu-
tions. In the tribulation of the present, the
Church took comfort in looking forward to the
certainty of a speedy recompense. The Epistle
of Barnabas (c. 15) is the first book having refer-
ences to it. The doctrine spread from Asia Minor
to the other parts of the Church, primarily among
the Jewish Christians, who regarded it as a
revelation in the scriptures (Euseb., H.E., III. 28, VII. 25), in the Testaments
of the Twelve Patriarchs (Jud., c. 25; Benjam.,
c. 10), and among the Ebionites (Jerome, In
Jes., lx. 1, lxvi. 20). The Shepherd of Hermas
has at least faint echoes of it (i. 3). Justin Mar-
inmiddle and consummation of the Church, but himself believed
Irenæus (Adv. Har., v. 32 sqq.) and Papias based
their arguments on the assertion of those who had seen the
prophecies. In the writings of Clement of Rome, Igna-
tius, Polycarp, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophi-
lus of Antioch, there are no references to mille-
narianism. Origen, who regarded matter as the seat
of evil, regarded an earthly kingdom of Christ,
full of physical delights, as a Judaizing fable;
while N eye, an Egyptian bishop who opposed
the view of Origen, met with stormy opposition
in the churches. Methodius, bishop of Tyre (d. 311), in this, as in other points, the counterpart
of Origen, defended the millenarian doctrines
(Sympoth. decem virgum, i. 5). The last echo
in the Greek Church was heard in the pamphlet
of Apollinaris of Laodicea against Dionysius of
Alexandria for it (Basil, Epist., 263; Epipit.,
Heres., 77, 20). It maintained itself for a longer
period in the West; and Lactantius (about 320;
Inst. divin., vii. 14 sqq.), and Victorinus, bishop
of Pettau, portrayed the millennial kingdom in
the most sensual colors. Even Jerome (In Jes.,
i. 18) did not dare to condemn the traditional
churches. The Apocalypse was decided upon
by Augustine (De civit. Dei, xx. 7, 9), who declared that the Church was the kingdom of God on
earth. The new relations of the State to the
Church had contributed to the downfall of mil-
lenarianism. The protection the Church won for
itself from the State deprived the doctrine of its
vitality. In the middle ages, neither catastrophes
in nature, nor degeneracy within the Church, ex-
cited millennial expectations. The clergy pos-
sessed the kingdom of the thousand years in the
glory of a Church triumphant over emperor and
princes. The circles which were prophetic of the
Reformation looked for the regeneration of the
Church, not from the visible coming of Christ,
but in a return to apostolic poverty and piety, or
the enthronement of a righteous Pope. Peter de
Oliva (Postilla in Apocal., 1287) explained the
second coming by the operation of the Holy Ghost
in the heart.

2. The second period in the history begins with
the Reforma tion. The growing decline of the
antichristian papacy was regarded as one of the
sure signs of the approach of the Lord. Others,
upon the basis of the doctrine of the invisible
Church, became prophets of the millennial king-
dom. Innung of its rise, the millenarian doctrine was power-
fully influenced by the historical persecu-
tions. In the tribulation of the present, the
Church took comfort in looking forward to the
certainty of a speedy recompense. The Epistle
of Barnabas (c. 15) is the first book having refer-
ences to it. The doctrine spread from Asia Minor
define the time of the beginning of the millennial kingdom and its length have been made from Hippolytus (d. 230) down to the present. The old Fathers held that it would be free from all sin and evil. Others (Jurieu, J. P. Lange, etc.) have taken a different view, that sinners will still continue to be on the earth, but that the saints will be greatly in the preponderance, and the conflict with sin and temptation will still go on (Bengel, Oetinger, etc.). Nature will continue to be subject to change and corruption, as the new heavens and earth (2 Pet. iii. 7; Rev. xxi. 1) will follow the period of the millennial reign.

LIT. — A satisfactory work on millenarianism yet remains to be written. CORRODI: Gesch. d. Chiliasmus (not a full collection of materials), Frankfort, 1761, 2d ed., Zürich, 1794, 4 vols.; LA VATER: Aussichten in d. Ewigkeit, Zürich, 1788-78, 4 parts; J. P. LANGE: D. Land d. Herrlichkeit, Meurs, 1838; VOLCK: D. Chiliasmus, Dorpat, 1869; KOCH: D. tausendjähr. Reich, Basel, 1872; comp. DORNER: Doctrine of the Person of Christ. — Eng. Works advocating Millenarianism: JOSEPH MEDE: Clavis Apocalypctica, etc., Cambridge, 1627; T. BEVERLEY: The Kingdom of J. Christ entering its Succession at 1697, etc., London, 1689; The Universal Christian doctrine of the day of judgment, applied to the doctrine of the thousand years' kingdom (herein guided by Mr. Baxter's reply), London, 1691; T. BURNET: Libb. duo posteriores, de confagr. mundi et de fut. rerum statu, 1689; De statu mortuorum et resurgentium, 1727, 2d ed., 1733; INCREASE MATHER: A Discourse concerning the glorious kingdom of J. Christ on earth now approaching, Boston, 1770; SAMUEL HOPKINS: A Treatise on the Millennium, showing from Scripture Prophecy that it is yet to come, when it will come, etc., Edinburgh, 1806; BICKERTETH (d. 1850): Glory of the Church, Restoration of the Jews (in the complete edition of his works, London, 1839); FRERE: Eight Lectures on the Prophecies relative to the Last Times, London, 1834, The Expiration of the Times of the Gentiles, 1848; BONAR: Coming of the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus, London, 1849; CUMMINGS: Apocalyptic Sketches, London, 1849, Great Tribulation (1850), Great Preparation (1861), Second Vial (1870); E. BON, on the prophecy of the consummation. Ireneus sententious speaks of it as a period in which the saints develop, under the sanctifying influence of the Lord, into immortality and a capacity to see God. The nobler representatives have advocated the view that it is a period of transition. The Lord will be amongst his followers. Its enjoyments have been represented as those of an ever-repeated marriage-feast (Cerinthus), of luxuriously spread tables, and the riches of Crossus (Ebionites). Even higher natures, like Ireneus and Lactantius, did not completely cut loose from these sensual notions. But the ideal conception of the kingdom was that of a state free from idola try, immediate perception of religious truth, the contemplation of God, and freedom from all sin and evils, such as poverty, sickness, etc. It was to be a world's sabbath, pervaded by peace, but not by apathy. Some think that a characteristic of it will be the vigorous effort to convert the heathens and Jews. Lange, however, holds this activity will precede the dawn of the kingdom. According to Bengel, there will still be rulers, marriage, agriculture, etc. According to Oetinger, a community of goods, and equality of persons, will prevail. The old Fathers held that the earth would be free from all sin and evil. Others (Jurieu, J. P. Lange, etc.) have taken a different view, that sinners will still continue to be on the earth, but that the saints will be greatly in the preponderance, and the conflict with sin and temptation will still go on (Bengel, Oetinger, etc.). Nature will continue to be subject to change and corruption, as the new heavens and earth (2 Pet. iii. 7; Rev. xxi. 1) will follow the period of the millennial reign.

MILLENARY PETITION. 1516

MILLENARIANISM.

The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society. The nature of the kingdom. — The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society. The nature of the kingdom. — The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society. The nature of the kingdom. — The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society. The nature of the kingdom. — The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society. The nature of the kingdom. — The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society. The nature of the kingdom. — The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society. The nature of the kingdom. — The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society. The nature of the kingdom. — The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society. The nature of the kingdom. — The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society. The nature of the kingdom. — The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society. The nature of the kingdom. — The descriptions of the millennial kingdom are based upon the idea that it is to put an end to the present state of things, and to bring about a perfect and perfectible state of society.
signed by nearly a thousand ministers), praying for the "reformation of certain ceremonies and abuses of the Church," was presented by the Puritan ministers to James I., on his way to London April, 1603. An Answer was presented by the University of Oxford, for which it received the thanks of Cambridge. The Hampton-Court Conference (see Conference, III.), with its incidental issue, our Authorized Version, was the unexpected and momentous result of the Petition.

MILLER. See MILLENNIUM.

MILLER, Hugh, geologist; b. at Cromarty, on the north-east coast of Scotland, Oct. 10, 1802; d. by his own hand, in a fit of insanity, at Portobello, near Edinburgh, Dec. 26, 1856. Born in humble life, he yet was carefully though not classically educated. In 1819 he was apprenticed to a stone-mason, and followed that trade until 1836, when he received a hand-appointment at Cromarty. His name and position came to the attention of the Auchterarder Case brought him into notice, and led to his appointment, in 1840, to the editorship of a newly-founded Free Church paper, The Witness, published at Edinburgh. In its columns (1841) appeared The Old Red Sandstone, which gave him immediate, 1854, as a geologist and author. By his Footprints of the Creator (1849) and Testimony of the Rocks (1857) he popularized his favorite science, and defended revelation. His denial of the universality of the Deluge, and of the Apostolic Order of Christ vindicated, 1840; Office of Ruling Elder, New York, 1807, with the claims of the heathen world. Between 1812 and 1815, Mills made two tours to the south-west with Newell, Nott, Hall, and Judson, he held consultations on the subject of missions, in which they were all alike interested. In June, 1810, Mills, Judson, Nott, and Newell presented an address to the general association of Massachussets Proper at Bradford, calling its attention to the introduction of hand-mills, they continued to present their offerings of first-fruits thus prepared (Lev. ii. 14, xxiii. 14). The hand-mill used was that common throughout the East. It consisted of two circular pieces of stone from forty-four to eighty-centimetres in circumference, and about ten centimetres thick. The "nether" millstone was fastened to the ground; but the upper one, the "rider," could be made to rotate by means of a wooden handle fixed vertically near its edge. As only so much corn was ground at a time as was necessary for one day, the mill was an absolutely indispensable piece of furniture in every house, and none was allowed to take it as a pledge (Deut. xxiv. 6). It was generally worked by the female slaves (Isa. liv. 2; Matt. xxiv. 41). Occasionally, also, male slaves, or prisoners, were used (Judg. xvi. 21). The work was difficult and tedious, but the sound of the mill in the early morning indicated a peaceful and thrifty household (Jer. xxv. 10). In later times a larger kind of mill, worked by asses, came into use; which is referred to in Matt. xvii 8.

RÜTSCHI.

MILLS, Samuel John, one of the earliest promoters of the modern movement of foreign missions in the United States; the son of a clergyman; b. April 21, 1783, at Torrington, Conn.; d. June 16, 1818, at sea, off the coast of Africa. He entered Williams College, 1806. His mind had been deeply interested in the work of sending the gospel to heathen lands; and, while a student at college, he met with several of his fellow-students, under the shadow of a large haystack, to consult and pray together in the evening, and was particularly prominent in the discussions which led to the disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1807. Personally he was a model of a Christian gentleman. He wrote, besides minor publications, A Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century, New York, 1803, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1805, 3 vols., reprinted, London, 1805, 3 vols.; Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry, 1807, with Continuation, 1809; Memoirs of Rev. John Rodgers, D.D., 1809; Clerical Manners and Habits, Philadelphia, 1827; Office of Ruling Elder, New York, 1831; etc. By his Letters and Dialogues on the Truly Primitive and Apostolical Constitution of the Church of Christ, Philadelphia, 1835; The Primitive and Apostolical Order of Christ vindicated, 1840; Thoughts on Public Prayer, 1849; and Life of Jonathan Edwards, in Sparks's American Biography. See his Life by his son, Samuel Miller, Philadelphia, 1869, 2 vols.

MILLER, William, b. in Pittsfield, Mass., Feb. 15, 1782; d. in Low Hampton, Washington County, N.Y., Dec. 20, 1849. Limited in his educational advantages, and a farmer by occupation, he yet pretended to interpret prophecy. In 1831 he announced the coming of Christ, and the destruction of the earth in 1843. He gathered, it is said, some forty thousand followers, who were called Millerites. He was esteemed by many as an humble Christian and an honest reasoner. See his life by White, Battle Creek, Mich., 1875.


MILLS AMONG THE HEBREWS. The Hebrews, like other peoples of antiquity, did not originally grind their corn on mills, but beat it in mortars (Num. xi. 8); and, even after the introduction of hand-mills, they continued to present their offerings of first-fruits thus prepared (Lev. ii. 14, xxiii. 14). The hand-mill used was that common throughout the East. It consisted of two circular pieces of stone, from forty-four to eighty-centimetres in circumference, and about ten centimetres thick. The "nether" millstone was fastened to the ground; but the upper one, the "rider," could be made to rotate by means of a wooden handle fixed vertically near its edge. As only so much corn was ground at a time as was necessary for one day, the mill was an absolutely indispensable piece of furniture in every house, and none was allowed to take it as a pledge (Deut. xxiv. 6). It was generally worked by the female slaves (Isa. liv. 2; Matt. xxiv. 41). Occasionally, also, male slaves, or prisoners, were used (Judg. xvi. 21). The work was difficult and tedious, but the sound of the mill in the early morning indicated a peaceful and thrifty household (Jer. xxv. 10). In later times a larger kind of mill, worked by asses, came into use; which is referred to in Matt. xvii 8.
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MILLS, Samuel John, one of the earliest promoters of the modern movement of foreign missions in the United States; the son of a clergyman; b. April 21, 1783, at Torrington, Conn.; d. June 16, 1818, at sea, off the coast of Africa. He entered Williams College, 1806. His mind had been deeply interested in the work of sending the gospel to heathen lands; and, while a student at college, he met with several of his fellow-students, under the shadow of a large haystack, to consult and pray together in the evening, and was particularly prominent in the discussions which led to the disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1807. Personally he was a model of a Christian gentleman. He wrote, besides minor publications, A Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century, New York, 1803, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1805, 3 vols., reprinted, London, 1805, 3 vols.; Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry, 1807, with Continuation, 1809; Memoirs of Rev. John Rodgers, D.D., 1809; Clerical Manners and Habits, Philadelphia, 1827; Office of Ruling Elder, New York, 1831; etc. By his Letters and Dialogues on the Truly Primitive and Apostolical Constitution of the Church of Christ, Philadelphia, 1835; The Primitive and Apostolical Order of Christ vindicated, 1840; Thoughts on Public Prayer, 1849; and Life of Jonathan Edwards, in Sparks's American Biography. See his Life by his son, Samuel Miller, Philadelphia, 1869, 2 vols.

MILLER, William, b. in Pittsfield, Mass., Feb. 15, 1782; d. in Low Hampton, Washington County, N.Y., Dec. 20, 1849. Limited in his educational advantages, and a farmer by occupation, he yet pretended to interpret prophecy. In 1831 he announced the coming of Christ, and the destruction of the earth in 1843. He gathered, it is said, some forty thousand followers, who were called Millerites. He was esteemed by many as an humble Christian and an honest reasoner. See his life by White, Battle Creek, Mich., 1875.
Mr. Mills reached his destination, but on the return journey died, and, like Adoniram Judson, was buried in the sea. His name will always be indelibly associated with the history of foreign missionary endeavor in the United States, as one of the earliest of that country's great missionaries. His first impulse. See Gardiner Spring: Memoirs of the Rev. Samuel Mills, New York, 1820; and Anderson: History of Missions of the American Board of Foreign Missions in India, 1874.

MILMAN, Henry Hart, D.D., church historian; b. in London, Feb. 10, 1791; d. at Sunninghill, near Ascot, Sept. 24, 1868. His father, Sir Francis, was physician to George III. He was educated at Oxford, where he took the Newdigate prize for poetry by his Apollo Belvedere, 1812; and became fellow of Brasenose College, 1815; was ordained a priest, 1816, and appointed vicar of St. Mary's, Reading, where he remained, until, in 1835, he became rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster, and canon of Westminster. In November, 1849, he was promoted to the deanship of St. Paul's, London. From 1821 to 1831 he was professor of poetry at Oxford; in 1827, Hampton lecture on Homer; in 1838, delivered as bishop of Lichfield on the Gospels, and the Lord's Supper; in 1839, his sermons on the same year; The Fall of Jerusalem (his most admired poem), 1820; The Martyr of Antioch, 1822; Belshazzar, 1822; Anne Boleyn, 1826; Nala and Damayanti, or other Poems translated from the Sanscrit, Oxford, 1834. A collected edition of his Poetical and Dramatic Works appeared, London, 1839, 3 vols. His poetry attracted considerable attention in its day, but is now forgotten, with the exception of a few hymns, especially two, When our heads are bowed with woes, and Ride on, in majesty. But, if he disappointed the expectations of his contemporaries as a poet, he more than justified their praises as an historian. As such he published The History of Jesus, 1829, 3 vols., 2d ed., 1830, often since, republished in America (it made a great success), especially because of its so-called rationalism in dealing with the miraculous element; and portions were suppressed. The author was denounced, as by Rev. J. J. Blunt in his Hulsean Lectures for 1832, on the Principles for the proper Understanding of the Mosaic Writings. After a time the excitement ceased; and at present the History is considered as an interesting performance, but defective in needful learning: a new edition, partly re-written, and greatly improved throughout, was issued 1869; The History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire, 1840, 3 vols., revised edition, 1846 (this marked a decided advance: the facts were better marshalled, and the subject was better mastered); History of Latin Christianity, including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V. (A.D. 1455), 1854–56, 6 vols., 2d ed., revised, 1858 (this is one of the best ecclesiastical histories in the English language, based upon ample knowledge, written in a picturesque style, sympathetic, yet outspoken in its judgments). A complete edition of his Historical Works appeared 1866–67, 16 vols. 8vo. Dean Milman edited the works of Horace, illustrated, 1849, and also Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 1835–39, 12 vols., 2d ed., 1846, 6 vols., revised and enlarged by Dr. William Smith, 1854, 8 vols. (this is now the standard edition of Gibbon, republished, New York, 1880, 6 vols.). Two posthumous volumes of Milman's are Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral, 1865, and Sacraorata, Erasmus, and other Essays, 1870. But this long list of volumes constitutes only a partial enumeration of his labors. He took part in religious discussions; and, true to his theological leanings, he advocated the "ablication of subscription to the Articles, and proposed subscription to the Liturgy instead."

MILNER, the name of two distinguished brothers and church historians.—I. Joseph was b. Jan. 2, 1744, in Leeds; d. Nov. 15, 1797, in Hull. By the early death of his father he was left without means, but was enabled, by the kindness of friends, to pass from the Latin School at Leeds to Catherine Hall, Cambridge. He became the chancellor's medal for the classics in 1766. The death of his principal friend, and the exhaustion of his means, forced him to quit the university. He became head master of the Latin grammar-school at Hull, vespers' lecturer in the principal church, and vicar of Trinity Church just before his death. In 1770 he underwent a radical spiritual change, and became so powerful a preacher of repentance as to draw upon himself the sobriquet of "Methodist." He, however, overcame all prejudice, and must be regarded as one of the earliest movers in the so-called "Evangelical Movement." Among his published works are Gibbon's Account of Christianity considered, 1781; Some Remarkable Passages in the Life of William Howard, 1785; Essays on the Influence of the Holy Spirit, 1789; two volumes of Sermons, 1801, 1808; and especially a Church History, for which see below. —II. Isaac was b. in Leeds, Jan. 11, 1751; d. in London, April 1, 1820. At the death of his father he was put to work in a woollen-factory, but, with the aid of his brother, became sizar in Queen's College, Cambridge, 1770. Here he rose to the highest academic honors,— fellow-professor of experimental philosophy, 1787, master of Queen's College, 1788, and twice vice-chancellor. In 1780 he was elected member of the Royal Society, and in 1791 appointed Dean of Carlisle. He shared the religious tendencies of his brother, and became one of the founders of the Evangelical party. Two volumes of his sermons were published in 1820. He died in the home of his friend Wilberforce.

The great literary work of the two brothers was The History of the Church of Christ; the three first volumes of which, extending down to the thirteenth century, were by Joseph (1794 sqq.). Vols. iv. and v. were by Isaac (1803–09). A new edition of the whole work appeared in 1818, and a revised edition by Dr. Grantham in 1847. The work was translated into German in 1808, 2d ed., 1849. Joseph Milner wished to present the history of the Church from a practical religious standpoint. He got the idea from John Newton's little book, Review of Ecclesiastic His...
MILNOR, James, D.D., b. in Philadelphia, June 20, 1773; d. in New-York City, April 8, 1844. He was admitted to the bar 1794; in 1810 he sat in the House of Representatives, and opposed the war of 1812. In 1814 he entered the Protestant Episcopal ministry; and from 1816 till his death he was rector of St. George's, New York. He published only a few sermons and addresses, but for a long time, their work remained the most popular manual on church history, until a German master [Neander], in the same spirit, but with a more comprehensive plan and with greater scholarship, worked over the materials. Joseph's complete works were edited by Isaac Milner, 1810, 8 vols., and again, 1827, 9 vols. For his life, see the biography by Isaac in vol. 1. of the Sermons, 1861; and also Mary Milner: The Life of Isaac Milner, 1842.

C. SCHOLELL.

MILNOR, James, D.D., b. in Philadelphia, June 20, 1773; d. in New-York City, April 8, 1844. He was admitted to the bar 1794; in 1810 he sat in the House of Representatives, and opposed the war of 1812. In 1814 he entered the Protestant Episcopal ministry; and from 1816 till his death he was rector of St. George's, New York. He published only a few sermons and addresses, but for a long time, their work remained the most popular manual on church history, until a German master [Neander], in the same spirit, but with a more comprehensive plan and with greater scholarship, worked over the materials. Joseph's complete works were edited by Isaac Milner, 1810, 8 vols., and again, 1827, 9 vols. For his life, see the biography by Isaac in vol. 1. of the Sermons, 1861; and also Mary Milner: The Life of Isaac Milner, 1842.

C. SCHOLELL.

His father, who abandoned the Roman-Catholic communion, became a copying lawyer, and retired with an independence. Milton's education was strict; but he cultivated a love of music, and became an accomplished organist. He attended St. Paul's School, London; entered Christ College, Cambridge, 1625, and, in spite of an intervening rustication, took the degree of B.A. in 1628 and of M.A. in 1632. He had been set apart for the ministry, but, on leaving Cambridge, retired to his father's home in Horton, Buckinghamshire, where he spent six years in study, and wrote his first important poetic works, L'Allegro, II Penseroso, Arcades, Lydidas, Comus, etc. In 1638 he travelled in Italy, his poetical gifts and elegant Latinity winning for him triumphs, and his religious opinions involving him in danger. Returning to London in 1639, he became tutor to his two nephews; but he soon became involved in the controversies between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, and wrote in 1641 Of Reformation, touching Church Discipline in England, and the Causes that hitherto have hindered it; Apology for Smectymnuus, etc. He espoused the Presbyterian cause against the Episcopal, whose cry was, "No bishop, no king." In these writings he betrays fine eloquence and an accurate knowledge of antiquity, but often resorts to biting sarcasm, and, after the manner of the age, descends to rude personalities. He was married in 1643 to a royalist lady, Mary Powell, who, after four weeks, returned to her parents, where she remained, in spite of her husband's appeals. This experience led Milton to write the Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, etc. (1645), and The Judgment of Martin Bucer touching Divorce (1645), in which he advocated the propriety of divorce when the two parties were uncongenial to one another. In 1645 his wife returned to him. She died in 1652. In 1644 Milton published his famous work, Areopagitica; a Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing.

Milton took an intense interest in the political agitations of the time, and left no doubt of his position, in Tenure of Kings and Magistrates (1649). The same year he was appointed secretary for foreign tongues. Other works bearing upon the political controversies appeared from him: EikonokLASTes (1649), against the Eikon Basilike, which advocated the cause of the royal martyr, Charles I.; Defensio pro populo anglicano (1651), against the learned Salmassius of Leyden, who had asserted the inviolability of kings. Having long suffered from weak eyes, he was warned by his friends against undertaking this work. But as he nobly says, "I did not balance whether my duty should be preferred to my eyes." And indeed this second work cost Milton his eyesight. His enemies saw in this affliction a judgment of God. He himself bore it with wonderful patience and resignation. He continued to hold his public office. He began the work of the day with the reading of the Scriptures. In 1656 he was married a second time, to Catharine Woodcock, who died in fifteen months; and in 1660 he was married again, to Elizabeth Minshull. In 1665 he published his Paradise Lost. It was published in 1667 (the author receiving five pounds in hand, with the promise of the same sum for every edition of fifteen hundred sold. Three editions had been disposed of by 1678, and in 1681 his widow re-
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MINOR PROPHETS.

MINOR CANONS are "priests," in collegiate churches, next in rank to the canons and prebendaries, but not of the chapter, who are responsible for the performance of the daily service. The stipend of a minor canon is, in England, fixed by law at a hundred and fifty pounds per annum. The office may be held by a vicar.

MINOR PROPHETS, The ("brief in words, mighty in meaning"), are twelve in number; viz., Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. In the Hebrew canon they constitute only one book. They are called the "Lesser, or Minor Prophets," because their prophecies were briefer, not because they were less important, than those of the four Greater Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel). All these writings together do not equal in length those of Isaiah. Yet Hosea exercised the prophetic office longer than any other prophet; and the study of the Minor Prophets by the Greater is evident from these facts,—that Isaiah adopted a prophecy of Micah (Isa. ii. 2-5; cf. Mic. iv. 1-5); Jeremiah employed verses of Obadiah to denounce anew the punishment of Edom (Jer. xlix. 9; cf. Obad. 19); and a prophecy of Joel was expanded by Ezekiel (Ezek. xxxviii. 22; cf. Joel ii. 2). The first five of the Minor Prophets antedate the earliest of the Greater Prophets, while Malachi post-dates them; so the twelve began and closed the cycle of written prophecy which stretched from the ninth to the fifth century B.C. They are arranged in three groups chronologically, but there is some question as to the order among themselves. Thus the prophets of the pre-Assyrian and Assyrian time (Hosea to Nahum) come first; those of the Chaldean period (Habakkuk and Zephaniah) come next; and the post-exilian prophets (Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi) come last. It is noteworthy, however, that the Septuagint puts the first six thus: Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, and Jonah. In regard to their contents, they may be said, in general, to present peculiar difficulties, arising, in part, from the obscurity of their allusions; but, on the other hand, they yield to no other portion of Scripture in attractiveness. Nothing elsewhere exudes in vividness the description Joel gives of a plague of locusts; no such indignant protest, earnest exhortation, and terrible denunciation, are contained in such small compass as in Malachi; the "burdens" of Zechariah equal in interest the "burdens" of Isaiah; while the swift changes of Hosea from righteous anger to divine love are as characteristic as anything in Holy Writ. The story of Jonah is as familiar as a nursery tale, yet it is a truthful account of a thrilling episode. Nahum's eloquence moves with the rapidity of the chariots whose motion it so graphically describes. Obadiah and Habakkuk are sublime in their poetry and their moral earnestness. To the Christian these Minor Prophets are particularly interesting, because the gospel was preached, and the glory of the latter day proclaimed, by them. And nowhere else are there clearer prophecies of New-Testament events; so that, to learn where Christ was born, the scriptures...
unrolled the scroll to Micah (Matt. ii. 6; cf. Mic. v. 2); John the Baptist was the Elijah whom Malachi had foretold (Matt. xi. 14; cf. Mal. iv. 5); the second coming of the Saviour was predicted by Zechariah (John xix. 37; cf. Zech. xii. 10); and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost was a fulfilment of Joel's prophecy (Acts ii. 16; cf. Joel ii. 28).

LIT.—For a detailed examination of each prophet, and of the contributions of the ancient apologists, see the separate articles in this Encyclopaedia: for an elaborate Introduction to the Minor Prophets, see Professor Charles Elliott, D.D., in Lange: The Minor Prophets (New York, 1876, pp. 3-49), and the literature there given, from which the subjoined list is partly taken. The following are a few of the best commentaries upon the Minor Prophets as a whole. —1. In Latin. By CALVIN, 1559 (best ed. Brunsv., 1685 sqq., Eng. trans., Edinb., 1846-49, 5 vols.); GROTIUS, 1644; CocCERIUS, 1652; CALVOVIUS, 1877; J. H. Michaelis, 1720; Clericus, 1731; DATHE, 1773; E. C. Rosenmüller, 1858; 2. In French. By DURRY, 1707; REUSS (Prot.), 1875. —3. In German. By Luther, 1529 sqq.; Eichhorn, 1816; Hitzig, 1838 (4th ed. by Steiner, 1881); Ewald, 1840-41 (2d ed. 1867-68, 3 vols.; Eng. trans., 1875-81, 6 vols.); Umbreit, 1845; Schinz (R. C.), 1854; Keil, 1866 (Eng. trans., 1865, 2 vols.); Lange, 1868-76 (by Schneller, Kleinert, and Lange; Eng. trans. of Schneller and Kleinert in Lange series, ed. Dr. Schaff, 1875). —4. In English. By TrAPP, 1854; NewCOME, 1785; Henderson, 1845 (rep. Andover, 1866); Pusey, 1860-77; CowLEs, 1867; Lange, 1875 (ed. Dr. Schaff, original Com. on Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, by McCurdy, Chambers, and Packard respectively); Wolfen- dale, 1879 (homiletical). SAmUEL M. Jackson.

MINORITES. See Franciscans.

MINUCIUS FELIX, Marcus, author of the dialogue Octavius, which, in spite of its lack of originality, and profound theological intuition, occupies a prominent place among the ancient apologies of the Latin Church, both on account of its genuine enthusiasm and elegant form, and on account of the clear and pointed manner in which it presents and refutes all the various objections to Christianity at that time circulating among educated Pagans. Of the personal life of the author we only know that he was a successful lawyer in Rome when he was converted to Christianity; even the date of his great work is somewhat doubtful. Formerly critics generally agreed in placing Minucius between Tertullian and Cyprian. Certain parts of Octavius seem to be based on Tertullian's Apologeticus, and certain parts of Cyprian's De idoliorum vanitate are evidently borrowed from Octavius. Now, as the Apologeticus was written in 197, and the De idoliorum vanitate in 247, Octavius must have been written in the first decades of the third century. In 1762, however, in an epistle Ad Gerhardum Meermann, J. D. Van Hoven drew attention to the fact that the general state of Christianity, and the specific Pagan objections to it, as represented in Octavius, do not correspond to a period so late as the first decades of the third century; and, in the course of time, more and more scholars adopted the view that Minucius preceded Tertullian, and wrote his Octavius in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. In 1888, finally, A. Ebert produced almost conclusive evidence in favor of this view by showing that there exists a direct relation between Octavius and Cicero's De natura deorum, while the corresponding passages of The Apologeticus seem to have been derived from Octavius. Of the work of Minucius, there exists only one manuscript, which was presented by Leo X. to Francis I. It was first published by Faustus Sabaeus, Rome, 1549, afterwards often reprinted by Halm, Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat., ii, Vienna, 1867. [There are translations into English in REEVE: Apologies of Justin Martyr, ii., and in vol. 2 of the Writings of Cyprian, in the Ante-Nicene Library, Edinburgh, 1873. See also P. FéLICÉ: Etude sur l'Octavius de Minucius Félix, Biels, 1880; R. Kuhn: Der Octavius d. Minucius Félix, Leipzig, 1882.]

MIRACLE-PLAYS. See Religious Dramas.

MIRACLES. Ancient theology defined a miracle as an act performed by suspending the laws of nature. But the laws of nature cannot be suspended. They continue acting, even in the very moment when a higher power succeeds in overcoming them. I throw a stone up in the air: the force I must use in order to make the stone ascend, and the immediate descent of the stone as soon as that force is used up, prove that the law of gravitation was not suspended, but simply overcome. It will be better, therefore, to consider miracles as phenomena truly belonging to the natural sphere, but resulting from a cause superior to nature.¹

There is a question of principle here, Can such phenomena occur? And there is also a question of history. Have they ever occurred? But, before entering upon the examination of these two questions, we wish to draw attention to certain facts in the history of the world which have a direct bearing upon the subject.

First, Nature exists, but how? Does she exist by virtue of her own laws? That would be to say that she was her own cause, or, in other terms, that she is eternal. But it would also be to say that she is immutable, or, in other terms, to deny the possibility of any progress in the natural sphere: for a progress eternally commenced is also eternally terminated, and is no progress: so that, if science can show that any progress has taken place in the development of nature, that progress proves that nature is not eternal. Nature exists, then, not by force of her own essence, but on account of a power superior to herself and her laws.

Next, in the very lap of nature moves along the life of organic beings, obeying laws infinitely higher than those to which inorganic matter is subject. Geology declares that there was a time when no organisms were found on our globe, and fixes, so to speak, the date at which organic life first made its appearance. Whence did it come? From the very forces of nature? Science says, No. "It is a fact as sure as the law of gravitation, that life can come only from life," was said before the most learned assembly in the world, and by its president.² The first living cell, then, ¹ The reader will notice that we do not speak at all here of those internal miracles which the Holy Spirit works in the human soul.

² Sir William Thomson's discourse at the opening of the British Association at Edinburgh, 1871.
MIRACLES.

which was ever found on earth, whence did it come? Was it brought hither on the wings of an aerolite, as the president hinted? No. Such an hypothesis cannot be seriously maintained, as it only removes the difficulty a little farther away, without contributing anything to its solution. The presence of organic life on earth is a second fact which testifies to the existence of a cause superior to nature and natural laws.

Finally, in the midst of organic life there sprang up, at a given moment, intelligent life, the life of freedom. What was its cause? Moral obligation and the feeling of responsibility, the two distinctive characteristics of a free and intelligent being, are phenomena foreign to the world of organic forces, vegetable or animal. In the animal kingdom the individual is only the irresponsible organ and the momentary bearer of the species, obeying its instinct as its supreme law. The free being, on the contrary, can not only resist its natural inclinations, but even sacrifice them in the name of a higher law,—that of duty. In him an order of things appears absolutely superior to that of organic forces, vegetable or animal. In the animal the work is incomplete, and he himself never troubled, with the invisible Creator, and nature is thereby implied. On the contrary, the Creator has forever exhausted its power of action by bringing forth its most brilliant effect, the free and intelligent human being, or whether it may be supposed still to manifest itself at proper occasions; which is only another form for that question of principle mentioned above.

The objection to the possibility of miracles is this: when once the development of the creation was completed, and the actual order of things definitively established, the Creator could not again interfere with his work, without acknowledging that his work was incomplete, and he himself imperfect. It must be remembered, however, that the culminating point of the development of nature is a free and intelligent spirit, man. There are, then, two free beings face to face with each other,—man and God; and any further intervention of God in the realm of nature, in which he has established man, must depend upon the future relation between those two free beings. If man takes the course which will lead him to the realization of the divine idea, God can confine himself to simply allowing the human race to develop in history, under the guidance of his Spirit, those multitudinous germs which he has planted in it. But if man, on account of his freedom, takes another course, and starts an abnormal development, leading to his own ruin, and frustrating the divine purpose of the creation, God must either destroy that lost creature, and replace him with another, or do something to draw him away from his bad course. In the latter case, the door is opened for divine intervention, even in the form of miracles; and no acknowledgment, from the side of God, of the imperfection either of his work or of himself, is thereby implied. On the contrary, that which makes his renewed intervention necessary, the human freedom, will still continue the most beautiful expression of the perfection of his work.

As the question is here of a problem of freedom, reasoning a priori can give no answer. Experience must be called in to explain; and thus the question of principle becomes a question of history. How has man used his freedom? And how has God used his?

With respect to man, history speaks very clearly. While the animal remains true to the law of its nature, and never falls below itself, man has always a feeling that he has not reached his true standard. He often degrades himself, sinking, not only below himself, but even below the animal; and a feeling of guilt and corruption always pursues him, even though he be one of the best representatives of the race.

With respect to God, history speaks no less distinctly; showing that God has deemed it more worthy of himself to save the fallen race than to destroy it, and replace it with a new. At the very moment when the sin of mankind had reached its acme, and was about to end in complete social dissolution, a reverse movement was started among one of the smallest and one of the most obscure nations, and soon felt as a spiritual elevation, destined to regenerate the whole race. The vital principle of that movement of restoration was a man who lived in a filial communion, never troubled, with the invisible Creator, and submitted his will to the divine will with a fidelity never shaken, either by the allurements of enjoyment, or the miseries of suffering.

This phenomenon, to which, as all agree, no other phenomenon in the moral world can be compared, is the great miracle placed in the centre of the history of the world. From that fundamental miracle proceed, like radiant beams, all the particular miracles which illustrate the life of the Saviour and his apostles; and to that refer, as preparations for the often-predicted and long-expected, all the miracles of the history of the ancient people of God.

The life of Jesus lies before us in four narratives, nearly contemporary with the events they relate. The trustworthiness of those narratives depends principally upon their spiritual character, their holy simplicity, their sublime sobriety, which becomes so much the more striking when compared with the fictitious air and turgid style of the so-called apocryphal Gospels, composed in the first half of the second century. There are, however, two other features, which, when combined, testify most impressively to the truth of the narratives,—their perfect harmony with respect to all that is essential, and their independence with respect to a great number of details, in which they not only differ from each other, but even contradict each other. Finally, it must be remembered that at least the first three Gospels are simply the oral reports of the apostles put into writing,—reports, which, put into circulation immediately after the first Pentecost, very soon, and under the very eyes of their authors, assumed that fixed character which they have retained.

1 See Philip Schaff: The Person of Christ, N.Y., 1880.
ever since. See the first four verses of the Gospel of Luke.

At the moment when the events of the life of Jesus were told by the apostles, and written down by the evangelists, thousands of persons who had been witnesses to the ministry of Jesus were still alive; and they would immediately have been changed into so many contradicts of the truth of that which was related, had it not been incontestable,—the more easily so, as they lived in the midst of a community so utterly hostile to the gospel as were the Jewish people. Or how could the preaching of the apostles have vindicated itself in the face of a general denial of the facts on which it was based? The apostles told that a blind man had been cured at Bethsaida; that a demoniac had been cured in the synagogue of Capernaum, and a leper in the neighborhood of the city; that a young man, the son of a widow, had been raised from the dead at Nain. . . . These cities existed. The inhabitants who had been present at the event were still living. When, under such circumstances, the apostles and evangelists dared to tell and repeat publicly such events, they must have reckoned upon the general recognition of the truth of the events.

But was it not in many cases easy for the apostles, it has been said, to fall into delusions, and take ordinary facts for prodigies? There were so many elements of the supernatural in the life of Jesus, that those who witnessed it might easily be led to consider as miraculous something which in reality was quite natural? Yes; but then, beside them stood Jesus, with his absolute veracity. The imagination of the apostles might have been led astray; but in such a case Jesus would never have failed to correct their conception; he never did. At this point, however, he confirms, instead of correcting, their conception. Before them, and before the whole people, he appeals to the works which his Father has given him to do; and he publicly reproaches the cities of Bethsaida, Chorazin, Capernaum, in which he had stayed, that they were not converted, though they had seen so many miracles,—yes, for that very reason he deems them more culpable than Tyre and Sidon (Matt. xi. 20).

Critical has ceased, of late, to deny the extraordinary character of many of the events of the life of Jesus; since, as Reuss says with good reason, "If in the acts of Jesus there were nothing surpassing every-day experience, his history would thereby only become so much the more incomprehensible." But an attempt has been made to reduce the extraordinary cures which Jesus accomplished every day to the peculiar influence which an exquisite character always exercises over diseased states (Renan, Keim). Recourse has been had to what is called "religion"—miracles that is, effects of natural but still unknown causes. Such explanations, however, would be suitable only on the condition that the persons cured by Jesus had in each case been present; but the daughter of the Canaanite woman lived in the interior of the country when her mother spoke with Jesus in the vicinity of Sidon; and the nobleman's son lay dying on his couch at Capernaum, when, at a distance of many miles, Jesus said to his father, "Thy son liveth" (Matt. xv. 22; John iv. 50). Without laying any stress on the fact that Jesus wrought other miracles than his cures, it will suffice to analyze one single case of his miraculous curing, in order to show the insufficiency of the above explanations. When the Pharisees accuse Jesus of blasphemy, because he says to the palmy-stricken man, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," he answers them, "Which is the easier to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee, or, Rise and walk?" Now, it is, of course, infinitely easier to ascertain the effect of the latter words; and consequently Jesus adds, "But, that you may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, I say unto thee, Arise and walk."

The dramatic form of this scene, which was evidently taken from life, and has been preserved identical in all the three narratives, proves that Jesus felt absolutely sure that he could cure the sick man who lay stretched on his couch, before the eyes of all present, immediately and completely. But could he have felt so if he had had nothing at his disposal but common natural, as even unknown power? Certainly not: a merely psychological effect always depends, to a great extent, upon the disposition of the sick. And let it not be overlooked, that, in speaking as he does, he risks his whole position. If the sick man had not risen in perfect health from his couch, Jesus would, by his own words, have been convicted of lying and blaspheming, and his Messianic claims would have shrunk into an empty pretension.

The true character of the miracles of our Gospels appears in an equally striking light when comparing them with the fictitious miracles of the apocryphal Gospels. Those Roman standards which bend before Mary and her son, that dyer's vat from which the infant Jesus draws up clothes of whatever color he likes, that water split on the stairs, and brought back in a napkin, etc., — that is what man can invent: mere exhibitions of magical power, without any relation to the moral attributes of God. Quite otherwise with the miracles of our Gospels. They combine all the features of a divine character. Omnipotence never acts unless in the service of holiness and love. And is it not singular, that though afterwards, and with such models before their eyes, the Christians have proved so awkward in inventing miracles, it should have been possible, earlier, and without any models, to invent them in a manner so sublime, and so fully in harmony with the nature of God?

Indeed, the reality of the miracles of Jesus, in the full sense of that word, must, to the eyes of wise criticism, be a historical fact beyond doubt. But then the question arises, Why did Jesus divide his daily work between an activity of that kind and the labor of teaching? For it is evident from the reports of our Gospels, that Ewald has it, the working of miracles was, almost to the very end of his life, "his every-day task." It might be said that the miracles of Jesus were the simple and spontaneous effect of his sympathy with human misery, just as the alma naturally results from the meeting between the rich and the poor. It is however better to understand of the true significance of the miracles of Jesus to explain them in that way. However great may have been his sympathy with human sufferings, he wrought his miracles, not from that impulse, but because he was the Sav-
four. His miracles belong to his office as Saviour. Otherwise he would not have cured some blind people and some lepers, raised the dead, etc.; he would have destroyed all blindness, all leprosy, death itself, forever.

Nor can it for a moment be maintained, that, by his supernatural acts, Jesus thought of producing, or, so to speak, compelling faith. He has never ascribed to miracles the power of conversion. On the contrary, “If they hear not the words of the preacher,” he said of the Jews (Luke xvi. 31), “neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead.” He refused those signs in the heavens which the Pharisees demanded of him; and, indeed, the true faith is not an effect of a surprise of the senses, but of the awakening of the conscience and the contrition of the heart. It is the consciousness of sin which leads men to Jesus.

For what purpose, then, were the miracles wrought? Jesus calls them signs; and so they were,— external manifestations destined to make the maker of the world manifest, and to make men understand the moral work he had come to accomplish in the race (comp. John vii. 26, 27). As his teaching was a miracle in words, so his miracles were a teaching in acts. By this means he revealed himself as one who had the power of curing the spiritually blind and mute, the spiritual leper and palsy-stricken,— as one who had the power of delivering souls from Satan, and freeing them from the eternal death which threatened them. Each group of his miracles illustrates a special side of that work of spiritual deliverance which he had come to accomplish. But this is not all. When he extends his miraculous power to nature proper,— stilling the storm, multiplying the loaves, etc.,— he reveals himself, not only as the curer of the moral miseries of humanity, but also as the future restorer of nature itself, and proves that he has the power of establishing perfect harmony between the whole universe and a sanctified humanity. Thus the miracles serve, not to produce faith in carnal hearts, but to make manifest to souls disposed to believe, or already believing, the riches of the treasure which have been offered them in the person of Jesus.

With respect to the manner in which Jesus wrought his miracles, two quite different points of view may be observed in his own words on the subject. On one occasion it is the Father who accomplishes the work on the demand of Jesus (John xii. 40-42): at another the miraculous power seems to be inherent in his personality (Luke vii. 46). In order to establish perfect harmony between these two points of view, which appear to be fully reconciled to each other in the consciousness of Jesus, it would be necessary to penetrate into the inscrutable mystery of the miracle. But we have, at least, an analogy in the spiritual miracles which he wrought before our own eyes: on the one side it is the spirit of God which seizes and converts the soul; on the other it is the work of the words of the preacher.

The miracles of the apostles stand in the same relation to those of Jesus as the miracles of Joshua to those of Moses. For example, those of Elijah: they are a continuation and a complement. Without going into details, we may simply remark, that, on this point, it becomes absolutely impossible to speak of legends, as Paul himself appeals to the miracles he has wrought, and does so three times. The two persons whose eyes he wrought them (2 Cor. xii. 12; Rom. xv. 18, 19). Therefore, if anybody chooses to doubt the reality of the miracles ascribed in Acts to Peter in founding the church among the Jews, and to Paul in founding the church among the Gentiles, he must begin by wiping out those two declarations of the former apologist.

The miracles recorded in the Old Testament have accompanied the whole series of revelations by which the way has been prepared for the act of salvation, just as the miracles of Jesus and the apostles have signalized the accomplishment of that act and the foundation of the church. But the latter, as, indeed, the whole apparition of Jesus, would be much more extraordinary, not to say completely incomprehensible, if they had entered history ex abrupto, without any preparation or announcement.

There is an objection often made to the miracles of biblical history,— that no miracles are wrought now; and that objection is generally substantiated by the alleged observation, that miracles are most frequent in the most distant periods of history, but become more and more scarce as we approach the epochs of a higher civilization, and disappear altogether in modern times before a fuller comprehension of the action of natural laws. But here two remarks are to be made. First, miracles serve only as an accompaniment to the work of God for the salvation of the human race. That work was completed by Jesus and his apostles, and what is now left to be done is simply the individual appropriation of God's work. But for that purpose no miracle is necessary, or, rather, the miracle now retreats into the private personal sphere. Second, the alleged decrease in the series of miracles is absolutely false. In the most ancient epoch of the history of mankind (from Adam to Moses, comprising about twenty-five hundred years), biblical history does not record one single miracle, properly speaking; for the divine apparitions accorded to the patriarchs belong to another category. The first miraculous acts in the domain of nature are the signs given to Moses at the moment he entered upon his office,— illustrations of the name Jehovah, expressions of the absolute monotheism founded by him. Then six or seven centuries elapse, and no miracle occurs; but it re-appears at the moment when the existence of monotheism is seriously threatened by the invasion of the grossest paganism, in the times of Elijah and Elisha. Again two or three centuries roll on without any miracle, until the period of the Babylonian captivity, when the reign of God seemed completely wiped off from the face of the earth, and the truth of monotheism had to be vindicated in the most striking manner against the victorious power of paganism: it was the time of Daniel. Finally, an interval of four centuries separates this third epoch of miracles from the fourth, which is also the last, the most striking, and belonging to the full dawn of history,— the epoch of Jesus and his apostles. Here it is observed that miracles are nothing but legendary fictions, why, then, are they concentrated on certain decisive points, instead of being scattered uniformly
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over the whole surface of biblical history? and why are they most numerous in that epoch which is nearest to modern times?

But which is said to the contrary, the biblical miracles are, nevertheless, according to all laws of historical criticism, true realities. They form the brilliant connection between the first creation which we contemplate, and the second and much more magnificent creation which we expect. They proclaim the eternal realities. They form the brilliant connection between the first creation which we contemplate, and the second and much more magnificent creation which we expect. They proclaim the eternal realities. They form the brilliant connection between the first creation which we contemplate, and the second and much more magnificent creation which we expect. They proclaim the eternal

Miracle in the Early Church. — The Christian theologian and apologist strongly emphasized the miraculous in proof of the divine origin of Christianity, and claimed its continuance in the church. So Irenæus boasts of the wide spread of the gift of miracles among Christians. But at a later period the great difference between the unusual events happening in the church, which were still in the line of natural powers, and the really miraculous events in the apostolic age, which was recognized by the church fathers, and Augustine particularly calls attention to it as a wise providential arrangement; since, in consequence of the wide spread of Christianity, there was no further need of the miraculous to awaken faith, and the commonness of miracles would weaken their impressiveness (De civ. Det, 22, 8; De utilit. cred., 16; De vera Relig., 25). Augustine, however, held firmly to the belief in the existence of miraculous powers, and that on the ground of personal experience. Later still, when Catholicism had settled its idea of “saintship,” miracles were a prerequisite to canonization. At the same time, the possibility of similar actions being performed by heathens and atheists, through demoniac agency, was granted. By distinguishing between the latter and the genuine divine miracles, the ethical value of both was determined. Far higher than the miracle which affected the body, such men as Augustine and Origen put that which affected the soul,—the miracle of grace, whereby the soul was healed, and its eyes opened.

With the apologetic use of miracles began the discussion as to their nature. Origen explains the possibility of the operation of God in external nature by supposing it in accordance with the higher, ideal divine order, but at the same time depreciates the value and importance of the phenomenal world. Augustine says that a “miracle is not contrary to nature, but to what we know of nature” (De civ. Det, 21, 8; Contra Faust, 26, 3). As the context in these quotations respectively shows (“the will of the creator is the nature of each created thing,” and, “for whatever is done by Him who appoints all natural order and measure and proportion, must be natural in every case”), Augustine conceives of “nature” as entirely under the control of God. God can, therefore, do in it precisely as he pleases.

Miracle among the Schoolmen. — The schoolmen more sharply define a miracle in relation to nature. Thus Thomas Aquinas: “A miracle is something out of the order of nature” (Summ., p. 1, qu. 110, art. 4). But they do not advance substantially beyond Augustine and Origen, in considering whether and how far such a divine action conflicts with the laws of nature. Albertus Magnus denies that God can do any thing against
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nature, but asserts that God has implanted the possibility of miracles in the very nature of things; cf. Neander [Torrey's trans., vol. iv. 470 sqq.]. This is the most peculiar idea which the schoolmen contributed to the subject. They emphasize the ethical importance of miracles. They also distinguish between miracles and wonder, by limiting the latter to the demonstrative use of natural powers, either unknown, or used in strange, unexpected ways. The belief in the existence of such powers led to their search, and hence the rise of magic.

Luther's Treatment of the Miracle. — Luther loved to think of the apparently chance events of our lives as being wrought by angelic ministrations, both good or bad. He set no limits to this angelic agency; yet he recognized an order in nature, according to which God worked in producing these results. He saw a greater miracle in the growth of the fourteenth century than in the feeding of the five thousand. He assigned to the miracles of Holy Writ their place in the development of the Christian revelation; but, now that Christ has come, he asserted that miracles were no more needed, and therefore maintained that papal miracles were either fraudulent or devilish. Like Origen and Augustine, he put spiritual miracles far above the physical.

The Older Protestant Theologians have nothing especial to contribute to the doctrine of miracles. They merely define a miracle in the scholastic manner, and advance no farther the solution of the problem how an event which is contrary to the visible can yet be in accordance with the invisible order of nature. To the boast of the Roman Church to be the true church, because it still possessed miraculous powers, they replied, that the time of miracles was past, that those claimed by the Roman Church were false, and that the Protestant Church had greater miracles in its amazing success.

The Socinians and Arminians were equally strong in maintaining that God revealed himself in nature by means of supernatural works. Grotius and others, that Arminians and Socinians, made the miraculous the corner-stone of his defence of the divine origin of Christianity.

But opposition to this extreme emphasis of the miraculous set in, partly from anti-Christian philosophical, and partly from so-called "rational," considerations. Leibnitz has a place for miracles in his system of philosophy. He defines them as events inexplicable by natural causes. He affirms that the laws of nature are not necessarily eternal, like logical and metaphysical truths; rather, God can for his own purposes exempt the creature from the operation of these laws, and do something which natural laws of themselves never could do. Finally he puts the miraculous in the divine plan, and makes it part of the pre-established harmony. But he fails to assign to the miraculous its part in the development of God in history.

Spinoza, on the other hand, made a profound and comprehensive philosophical attack upon the possibility of miracles (Tract. theolog. polit., cap. vi.). He declared that nature with her laws, and the contents of the will, intelligence, and nature of God, are identical: hence God cannot work contrary to the laws of nature, because that would be working against himself. He therefore denies any interference on God's part with nature.

The English Deists attacked the belief in miracles in another way. They separated God so far from all human and mundane affairs, that a revelation and a miracle are alike unthinkable. It was, however, Hume who gave the most momentous and destitute or demonstrational use of natural powers, either unknown, or used in strange, unexpected ways. The belief in the existence of such powers led to their search, and hence the rise of magic.

Schleiermacher, later, on, endeavored to do away with the miraculous, in the interest, however, of piety and religion. In his Christliche Glaube, § 14, he first of all contests the apologetic value of miracles. He argues, that although it is true, that, because of the subjective inclination of his religious nature, man expects peculiar and more decided effects upon nature with each new stage of development of his spiritual life, still, piety never truly produced the necessity.

The modern opponents of miracles claim that the advance of science has rendered belief in them impossible, but they limit their attention to the material phenomena which science has brought them. They also fall back upon Hume's idea, and insist, that since miracles are contrary to all human experience, while human fallibility and liability to deception is part of universal experience, therefore miracles cannot be proved on human testimony.

Spinoza sought to explain the recorded miracle by natural causes; the Deists would treat them as allegories; the Naturalists hesitated not to declare the record a mixture of self-deception and fraud; the Rationalists claimed the so-called miracle-workers had not intended these actions should be described as miracles, but the recorders, influenced by the spirit of their times, had put them in that shape; and finally the idea found currency that they were myths. See Mythical Theory.

In the modern believing school of Twesten, Nitzsch, and others, miracles are accepted and defended as part of the divine order of things. At the same time, they are assigned to a different
position in Christian apologetics; not being made the principal argument, as by Grotius. These believing theologians lay due stress upon the scientific determination of the uniformity of natural operations, but maintain that there still is room for miracles as part of the revelation of God. But the question remains, how far the true idea of a miracle enters at all into their conception.

There are scholars who deny miracles in general, and yet make an apparent exception in the case of Jesus, who, as they see, by reason of his lofty moral character, possessed extraordinary power over natural forces. On the other hand, many who defend miracles seem really to put them on the level of natural events; because the higher law, according to which, as they claim, miracles proceed, is itself a law of nature. But in truth there, an miracle cannot be explained upon the ground of laws inherent in nature: they are only explicable on the supposition of a divine direct action upon nature. It must be allowed that our spiritual nature is acted upon by the personal God, and that in this way God revealed himself in Bible times, agreeably to the spiritual requirements of the age.

Before the last word can be spoken upon miracles, some definite idea must be attached to the phrase "natural laws." It will require a more comprehensive treatment of the subject than the scientists are inclined to give it, before such an idea can be defined; for much more than material nature must be studied.

From what has been said, it will be perceived why miracles can no longer form the foundation, or even the starting-point, of the Christian apology. No matter how well attested these biblical miracles may be, they will not be believed by those who have no Christian faith. Miracles part of Christianity, and must be taken along with it.

Lit. — Julius Müller: Disputatio de miraculorum Jese Christi natura et necessitate, 1838, 1841; Julius Köstlin: De miraculorum, que Christiani et primo ejus discipulis fecerunt, natura et ratione, Breslau, 1860; Wardlaw: On Miracles, Edinburgh, 1882; Trench: Miracles of our Lord, London, 1890, 12th ed., 1894 (often reprinted); Bushnell: Nature and the Supernatural, New York, 1898; McCosh: The Supernatural in Relation to the Natural, London, 1892; Mozley: Eight Lectures on Miracles, Boston Lectures of 1865, London, 1865, 6th ed., 1883, reprint from 3d ed., New York, 1878; G. P. Fisher: Supernatural Origin of Christianity, New York, 1865, enlarged ed. 1877, pp. 47, 166; Dunsarius: De religione. Mirandula, Feb. 24, 1498; d. in Florence, Nov. 17, 1494. In 1477 he entered the university of Bologna to study canon law; and from 1479 to 1486 he visited all the great universities of Europe, studying theology and philosophy, Plato and Aristotle, the Cabals, and Averroes. In 1487 he repaired to Rome, and issued a hundred theses, referring to every branch of knowledge (De omnibus scibili, afterwards published under the title Conclusions philosophicae, cabalisticae, et theologicae), challenging all the scholars of Europe to come to Rome and dispute with him. The motive of this vain-glorious bravado of the young man of twenty-four years was not simply to flaunt his own erudition, which, however, was immense. He had the idea, that, as truth is one, science must also be one; that it must be possible to establish a unity, not only between the different spheres of truth, religion, and philosophy, but also between the individual forms of science, — Plato and Aristotle. For this idea he labored with great enthusiasm and energy, but without being equal to the task. His theses are often very confused. They aroused the suspicion of the curia, and the disputation was interdicted. Disgusted, Mirandula left Rome, and then settled at Florence as a conspicuous member of the circle which gathered around Lorenzo di Medici. In 1493 he was relieved by a papal brief from the odor of heresy which hovered about him. His Heptapian, a work on the creation, and De Ense et Unio, an attempt of reconciling Plato and Aristotle, caused no offence. The latter part of his life was chiefly devoted to ascetic practices. His estates of Mirandula and Concordia he transferred to his nephew, and his personal property he gave to the poor. The most complete edition of his works is that of Basel, 1601. See Dreydorff: Das System des Mirandula, Marburg, 1858; W. H. Patern: Studies in the History of the Renaissance, London and New York, 1878; Clemens Petersen.
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MISSION (Liber Missalis, or Missale), an office-book of the Roman-Catholic Church; contains the Liturgy of the mass. The earliest appearance of this kind of books, the Libri Sacramentorum, or Sacramentaria, dates back to the time of Gelasius I.; the latest development, to the sixteenth century, when, on the instance of the Council of Trent, a complete revision was undertaken. Editions of the Missal in the original Latin have often been published, e.g., Paris, 1739, and Berlin, 1841; and The Roman Missal for the use of the laity, containing the masses appointed to be said throughout the year, appeared in London (n.d.). See also E. F. Robertson: The Roman Liturgy and Devout Catholic's Companion, Edinburgh, 1792; and art. Mass.

MISSION, among Roman Catholics and Ritualists, is a term for revival meetings, wherein the priest preaches upon the most vital and stirring themes. By direct address, animated music, and fervent prayers, interest is awakened in spiritual things. Such services have been greatly blessed.

MISSION, Inner. See Inner Mission.

MISSION-SCHOOLS. (1) Institutions for the training of missionaries and the several in Great Britain and Switzerland (Barmen, Bremen, Berlin, Basel). They are usual in connection with the chief mission stations in foreign lands. (2) Schools in poor districts in city or town, supported by gifts; designed to reach with the gospel an outlying class. In connection are various benevolent agencies.

MISSIONS, Protestant, among the Heathen. I. INTRODUCTORY. — Christianity is through and through a missionary religion. The missionary spirit of the New Testament struck its roots in the Old Testament (against Max Muller: Lecture on Missions, delivered in Westminster Abbey, Dec. 3, 1879); so that in this respect, also, Christ came to fulfill. The missionary spirit is one of the essential features of the gospel. All men stand in need of salvation. God will have all men to be saved, and come to a knowledge of the truth. The gospel must therefore be proclaimed to all nations. This great truth Christ embodied in his last command (Matt. xxviii. 19). But more than this: missionary activity is the vital law of the Christian Church; and the outgoings of the missionary spirit have a healthful and strengthening effect upon the Church itself, as the history of the past hundred years plainly shows.

The most intense and burning missionary spirit existed in the apostolic age. In this period of its first love, the whole Church was a missionary organization; and, although the number of the missionaries was not large, their enthusiasm was all-controlling, and the co-operation of the congregations was vigorous. The missionaries followed the public roads which God himself had laid out, and occupied the stations which his hand had indicated. In this divine preparation lies one of the main reasons for the relative importance of the results of missionary activity. At the close of the first century there were, perhaps, 200,000 Christians; at the close of the third, 6,000,000, or one twentieth part of the entire population of the Roman Empire. (See Warneck: D. apostol. u. d. moderne Mission, pp. 47 sqq.)

The Christianization of the Roman and Greek world was not accomplished till after Christianity had been made the State religion, and until the close of the fifth century. National Christianity has been characterized as a misfortune. In some respects it undoubtedly was. But we must not forget that Christ's last command was to "make disciples of all the nations" (Matt. xxviii. 19); compare Matt. xiv. 14, Luke xxiv. 47, Rom. xi. 25). Nor may we forget that the Christianization of the nations is not attainable without a certain measure of co-operation on the part of the national powers. The truth of this statement is confirmed by the history of modern missionary effort, as in the case of Madagascar, and will be confirmed when the emperor of Japan or of China accepts Christianity, or the British Government in India forsakes its attitude of neutrality in matters of religion; which they will do as soon as the percentage of Christians in these lands becomes sufficiently large to make it safe and politic. The conversion of individuals comes first, and is preparatory; but the Christianization of peoples as such follows properly and necessarily. There are three stages in the history of missionary effort: (1) The despatch of missionaries and the conversion of detached individuals; (2) The organization of the native forces; and (3) The conversion of the masses.

Without going into a description of the missions of the apostolic age and of the middle ages, it is sufficient to say, with regard to the latter, that, while the methods they used for the Christianization of the heathen nations were largely mechanical, they did not lack men of apostolic fervor. On the other hand, they had to deal with rude and barbarous nations; while the missions of early Christianity were among cultivated peoples. Nor may we forget that the standard of spiritual knowledge is far higher to-day than it was in the middle ages. The false conception of the nature of the Church is to blame, if we find armies following the steps of the missionaries, and prosecuting orders of monks and princes taking the place of congregations filled with the spirit, and proselyting the work, of missions.

By the thirteenth or fourteenth century, missionary activity in the Church had ceased. All Europe, except Lapland and a part of Spain, was nominally Christian. On the other hand, Mohammedanism had made spoil of the Christian congregations of Western Asia and Northern Africa. An extensive missionary field still existed when the Reformation was effected.

II. HISTORY. 1. THE PERIOD OF THE REFORMATION — The discovery of America in 1492 was the occasion for renewed missionary activity in the Roman-Catholic Church, which again fell into the errors of the middle ages. In his Eclesiastes sive de ratione concionandi, Erasmus at once sharply criticised this method of evangelization, and strongly urged upon his contemporaries the duty of carrying on missions. Luther with great emphasis denounced the worldly methods of proselyting; as Plitt (Kurze Gesch. d. lutherischen Mission) and others affirm, definitely urge the despatch of missionaries to the heathen. Nowhere can a fair inference be drawn, from his writings or sermons, that the thought of a mission to the heathen was in his mind. In spite of Ostertag, Plitt, and Kallkar, who agree in asserting that Luther employed
MISSIONS.

1629

MISSIONS.

every opportunity that a text afforded him of urging the destitution of the heathen and Turks, and the despatch of preachers to them, we must affirm that the great Reformer failed to appreciate the missionary obligations of the Church. [See art., Jabes, Missiones AMONGST THE.] What is true of Luther may also be said of Calvin, who, in his comment on the great missionary command
ment (Matt. xxviii. 19), does not speak a word about the present duty of the Church to the heathen. The Reformers were powerful missiona
ries within the limits of the Church; but, of missions to the heathen world, they did not think.

This defect has been explained on the ground of the heathenism in the Church, which was sufficient to engage all the thought and energies of the Reformers. A better explanation is to be found, so far as Luther is concerned, in his eschatological views. He regarded the world as near its dissolution; and therefore he exclaims, "Let the Turks believe and live as they choose, just as the Pope and other false Christians are allowed to live." It was his energetic purpose to save "the Turks, Heathen, and Jews" within the bounds of Christian lands. Another important consideration, not to be forgotten, is, that the Protestant churches were not brought into direct contact with the heathen world, while the Roman-Catholic churches were. Spain and Portugal at that time had the hegemony of the seas until the latter part of the sixteenth century, and the Jesuits developed an immense missionary activity.

From this review of the period of the Reformation we draw two inferences: (1) A church may have a vigorous spiritual life, and yet not prosecute missionary activity; and (2) A church may be active in missionary operations, and yet spiritually dead. This history further teaches, that there are two conditions of true missionary activity,—spiritual vitality and geographical openings. The latter were not offered to the Protestantism of the Reformation period. The time had not yet arrived in Protestant missions. This is proved by two enterprises in the sixteenth century,—the mission to the Lapps, inaugurated by Gustav Vasa of Sweden in 1559, which did not bring forth fruit till much later; and the colony established by Durand de Villegaigonn in Brazil, 1555. This movement of French Protestants was commanded by Coligny. Villegaigonn even wrote to Calvin for Reformed preachers. Two ministers, 12 other Swiss, and 300 Frenchmen went out. But Villegaigonn, who had in the mean time returned to the Roman-Catholic Church, drove them out of the colony. The majority returned to Europe on a miserable vessel; and, of the five that remained, three suffered death for their faith.

2. THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. — The state of affairs was far more unfavorable for Protestant missions in the seventeenth century than it had been in the period of the Reformation. Especially was this true in Germany. [It can hardly be said to be true of England and the Netherlands.] The Thirty-Years' War, and the unfruitful theological conflicts about orthodoxy in Germany, kept out all thoughts of practical missionary work. In spite of this, however, a star shone here and there from the dark heavens. Seven jurists of Lübeck bound themselves to obedience to the missionary mandate, and more especially to promote the revival of the Christian churches of the East. One of them, Peter Heiling, actually went forth in 1682 from Paris to Abyssinia, where he died in 1684, and translated the New Testament into the Amharic language. The first to make a stirring appeal to the German Church was Ernst von Welz, who in 1684 published two works. The one bore the title, A Christian and Cordial Call to all Orthodox Christians of the Augsburg Confession, concerning a Special Society by which, with Divine Help, our Evangelical Religion may be diffused. The other bore a similar title. In the former, three questions were proposed: (1) Is it right for us Christians to monopolize the gospel? (2) Is it right that we have so many students of theology among us, and do not urge them to labor in other parts of the vineyard? (3) Is it right that we spend so much money in luxuries upon ourselves, and hitherto have not thought of contributing anything for the diffusion of the gospel? Welz wrote still another tractate, in which he urges the establishment at Breslau of a faculty of missions (Collegium de propaganda fide), and the instruction of the students in three departments,—Oriental languages, the methods of converting the heathen, and geography. But these appeals went unheeded; and, after receiving ordination at Zwolle in Holland, he set apart 86,000 marks (89,000) for missions, and went to Dutch Guinea, where he soon died. Welz's pure motives, enthusiasm, and sacrifice of his property, assure him a permanent place in the history of missions.

Hawemann (Christianismi Luminaria Magna, p. 588), Dannhauer, Christian Schriver, and Spener in earnest words reminded the Church of Germany of its duty to the heathen; but Ursinus, who declared the project of Welz visionary, was followed by the Church as a whole. The great Leibnitz, however, was moved with missionary ideas, designated (partly in a scientific interest) China as a suitable field where Christian missionaries ought to go, and even incorporated these thoughts in the constitution of the Berlin Academy of Sciences (July, 1700).

In the seventeenth century the hegemony of the seas passed into the hands of England, Holland, and Denmark. Thus a door was opened to heathen peoples. The Dutch, who deprived the Portuguese of nearly all their East Indian colonies, developed a decided missionary activity. One of the avowed aims of the East Indian Han-delmaatschappij, chartered in 1602, was the conversion of the heathen. The history of these early Dutch missions has not been sufficiently explored; but we know that unevangelical means were soon employed, as in Ceylon, where the Dutch governor made the tenure of even the lowest governmental positions, and even the governmental protection, conditional upon signing the Helvetic Confession. Thousands pressed to baptism, which was denied to no one who could repeat the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. By the close of the seventeenth century, 300,000—yes, according to Brown, by 1722, 424,—302—Singalese had been baptized. The same measures were employed in Java, where 100,000 received baptism. Father Valiana of Leyden sought by his missionary institute (founded in
1622, which collapsed after the despatch of twelve students) to develop a real missionary interest, as also did Hurnniss, in his Admonition to legation ad Indos capessenda (1618), and Hoverbeek of Utrecht, by various writings. — Summa controversiarum cum gentibus, Judaeis, Mahometanis et Papistis, 1659; De convertendis et convincendis Judaeis, 1665, etc. There were some faithful workers on the mission-fields, but the result of the missions was only a nominal Christianity. The Dutch also carried on a mission for a while in Brazil, where the West India Company (founded 1621) established a trading-port. Moritz of Nassau-Siegen, who went out as governor in 1636, sent back for eight ministers, who were to divide the mission of the first missionary operations among the organized congregations had been established, and schools planted. But the missionary operations came to a close by the cessation of the colony in 1637.

In England the political and religious controversies of the seventeenth century were the occasion of the first missionary operations among the Indians of North America. The Puritans, who emigrated to New England made some effort in this direction. [The charter granted by Charles I. to the Massachusetts Company in 1628 expressed the hope that “the colony would win the natives of the country to the knowledge and obedience of the true God and Saviour of mankind”; and the colonial seal bore the impression of an Indian, with a label in his mouth bearing the words, “Come over and help us.” In 1646 the Massachusetts Legislature passed an act encouraging missions among the Indians.] The pious John Eliot (see Eliot) devoted (1648) his life to this work (see Fritschel: Gesch. d. christl. Missionen Nordamerikas im 17. u. 18. Jahrh.), and gave to the Indian the first translation of the New Testament. His example was followed by others, among whom the Mayhews have an honorable prominence. These were the first missions to be carried on by Protestants in the true spirit of the gospel, and of permanent value. Sermons were preached, and instruction given, in the Indian languages, congregations organized, and natives trained for the ministry. Up to 1680, 14 well-organized congregations had been established, with 1,100 members. In 1644 a petition was handed to the Long Parliament by seventy clergymen, asking that something be done for the diffusion of the gospel in America and the West Indies. In 1648 Parliament sent a circular to the churches, calling for gifts to missions. One result of this movement was the organization of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England, of whose history, however, hardly anything is known. It was presumably the mother of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, established in 1701, with which the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, established in 1698, stood in close relations. Both these societies, however, during the first century of their existence, were more concerned for the colonists than for the heathen.

Cromwell made a bold proposition in regard to missions. He proposed that a society (Congregatio de praedico fidei) should be formed, with seven directors and four secretaries, drawing their salaries from the State, and the world divided into four districts. Although this plan was not executed, it attests the awakening interest in the spread of the gospel. The same may be said of several individual enterprises: such as the departure of Oxenbridge, a Puritan clergyman, to Surinam for the translation of the Gospels into Malay by Professor Hyde of Oxford, and of Grotius' Truth of the Christian Religion into Arabic by Pococke; and the appeal of Humphrey Prideaux to Dr. Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury, to found an institute for the training of missionaries.

Denmark manifested no missionary concern in this century. It had established colonies in the East Indies in 1620, and in the West Indies in 1672, and was exceedingly zealous in the interests of orthodoxy of doctrine. In this it resembled Germany, and followed Germany in forgetting to send the gospel to the heathen. Its orthodoxy was a barren tree. It remained for the pietistic circles, in contrast to the strict orthodox circles in the Lutheran Church in Germany, to arouse it to a sense of its duty to the heathen.

3. The Eighteenth Century. — The beginning of the eighteenth century was an epoch in the history of Protestant missions. In 1705 Lütken, the court preacher at Copenhagen, who had for seventeen years been in Berlin, and stood in friendly relations with Spener, and carried on a correspondence with Francke, was appointed by the Danish king, Frederick IV., to secure foreign missionaries. Two pietists, Ziegenbalg and Plietenschau, students of theology, were recommended to him, and through him to the Danish king, and sent to Tranquebar, India. The king provided for their support, and in 1714 a Danish Collegium de curru evangelii promovendi was organized. But, in spite of these things, the affairs of the Tranquebar mission were conducted from Halle; and the main leader was August Hermann Francke. This godly man seems to have gotten his first missionary impulse from Leibnitz (see Kramer: Life of Francke), and was the author of that remarkable missionary tractate, Pharus missionum evangelicae, in which he urges Frederick of Prussia to take up the work of converting the heathen, especially the Chinese. As the principal representative of the pietistic movement, next to Spener, and as the founder of the Orphan House at Halle, he was providentially fitted to induce a spirit of devotion in young missionaries, and to develop a missionary constituency at home. Without Francke, the Danish mission would soon have collapsed. He was the first to edit, from 1710 on, regular missionary reports. In one word, Halle was the centre of the Tranquebar Mission, and the first real missionary, that of Bogatzky, was written under this influence,—Wach auf, du Geist der ersten Zeugen. On the other hand, the orthodox party looked with suspicion upon the movement; the Wittenberg faculty calling the missionaries “false prophets;” and others, even Neumeister, the author of Uber den Eifer d. Sünden an, declaring missions to be unnecessary.

The Tranquebar mission continued to do efficient work until the close of the century, when rationalism at home undermined its roots. The English missionary societies, and, later, the Leipzig society, began the work. Its most prominent workers were Ziegenbalg and Schwartz, and the
MISSIONS.

visible results were the conversion of 40,000 souls. (See Germann: Ziegenbalg und Flütschau, and the
ant. SCHWARTZ.) Denmark also directed its attention to Lapland and Greenland. The self-denying Thomas von
Westen made three missionary tours to Lapland (1716-22). Hans Egede is the real apostle of
Greenland, where he spent fifteen years with his family. The close of this period he returned to
Copenhagen to train missionaries. In this lat-
ter enterprise he was not successful; but there were
others to take up his labors,—the United Breth-
ren of Herrnhut, to whose missions we now turn.

In 1731 Zinzendorf visited Copenhagen, and
was induced by what he saw to carry out the
missionary thoughts a previous visit to Ziegenbalg
and Hallé had started. A negro returned with him to Herrnhut, and begged the Brethren to
send the gospel to his fellows in St. Thomas.
Members of the community at once offered them-
seones for Greenland and the West Indies. On
Aug. 21, 1732, Dobbert and David Michaelmann,
each with eighteen marks for travelling expenses,
set out for Greenland and the West Indies. On
21st, 1734 (where ten in a
short time became victims to the climate); Surin-
am, 1735; Guinea and Cape Colony, 1737; the
Indians of North America, 1740; Jamaica, 1754;
Antigua, 1758; Barbadoes, 1765; Labrador, 1770;
St. Kitt's, 1777; Mosquito Coast, 1843; Australia,
1849; the Himalayan region, 1838; Demerara.
Up to 1750, or in twenty years, the United
Brethren of Herrnhut had established more mis-
sions than the combined Protestant Church in
two hundred years. The salvation of the heathen
lay, day and night, upon the heart of Zinzendorf.
Herrnhut became the salt of the earth, and re-
mains to this day the missionary church par excel-
ence. (See Römer: D. Missionarck d. evang.
Brüdergemeinde, 2d ed., 1881.) The Moravian
missionaries started out with the motto, "Venture
in faith." They were uneducated, but their
humility and fidelity gradually overcame all the
prejudices against "the illiteratelaymen." They
were enjoined to practise rigid economy, and to
labor with their hands. They were to use only
spiritual means, and to aim at the conversion of
individuals. The United Brethren have sent out
(00, 1832) 2,212 missionaries (male and
female), of whom 804 are still laboring, 327 of
whom are men (Rückschau auf unsere 150 jährige
Missionsarbeit, Herrnhut, 1882). In 1882 the 150th
anniversary of Moravian missions was appropri-
ately celebrated in Herrnhut, and all the various
Moravian churches of Germany and the United
States, face THOMPSON: Moravian Missions,
N.Y., 1882.

Unfortunately, the example of the Moravians
was not at once followed by the rest of the
Protestant Church. The responsibility for this
neglect lies with the rationalism and the deism
which undermined the faith of England and Ger-
many. Unfortunately, the rationalism and deism
thrust the churches of the Protestants into a
chronic state of apathy. Germany more in-
active in this century than other countries, and
no other country can show such noble workers as
Francke and Zinzendorf. In Holland, the duty
of missionary effort was forgotten. In England,
the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in
Foreign Parts was founded in 1701, but it de-
clined on a sluggish existence till the opening of this
century. It did very little for the Indians and
negroes of America. The Society for Promoting
Christian Knowledge did somewhat better. Col-
lections were taken up for it at court, and George
I. showed his interest in writing a coronation
breviary to Ziegenbalg and Gründler (Sherring: History of Protestant Missions in India, pp. 9, 13). In Edin-
burgh, a Scotch society for Promoting Christian
Knowledge was founded in 1708, and also a Cor-
poration for the Propagation of the Gospel in
New England. They sent a few missionaries to
the Indians, and amongst those sent by the former
society was the godly and devoted David Brainerd.
[Jonathan Edwards also labored among the Stock-
bridge Indians.] With the grand opportunities
afforded by its Colonies, and domination on the
seas, England did next to nothing, during the eighteenth century, for missions. This is to be
found in the low state of religion and the
influence of the deistic movement. Never were
such elegant moral sermons preached, and never
had immorality reached so high a point. It was
with the dawn of a new era of faith in England,
at the close of the century, that the missionary
spirit of the nineteenth century was begotten.

4. The Nineteenth Century. — The great
religious revival, starting with the labors of the
Wesleys and Whitefield, gave the impulse to recent
modern missions. God was opening the doors to
the nations, and the period had dawned which he
had chosen for the missionary era. Not only had
Cook's voyages and discoveries aroused an intense
interest in the lands and peoples across the sea,
but the missionary societies found in them an
argument to which they could appeal. Since
that time, down to Stanley's journeys in the
Dark Continent, missions and geographical dis-
covery have stood in closest connection; and we
may say, with Livingstone, "The close of the
geographical discovery is the beginning of the
missionary enterprise." To this consideration
we must add the remarkable progress in inven-
tion, exploration, and the facilities of com-
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the more determined became the conflict at home, until, in 1813, the door was finally opened to missionary operations in India by a parliamentary decree. (See India.) The new missionary interest of England was communicated to Germany; although at first, all the official organs of the Church assented a hostile attitude, so that not the Church as a body, but detached Christian circles, took up the matter. Independent societies were formed, which may be regarded as a substitute for the orders of the Roman-Catholic Church, and may be looked upon, unless all signs are deceptive, as a divine preparation for the ecclesiastical organization of the future. We now turn to the history of the foundation of the several missionary societies, and, first of all, to England. This history forms one of the most refreshing episodes in the annals of the Protestant Church; for it is an earnestly supported Try Wilberforce. In 1812 it sent out 96 missionaries, of whom 28 were German, and 32 English clergymen: the rest were laymen. In 1815 it founded the Missionary Society at Islington, which had, up to 1875, sent forth 420 missionaries. Fourteen of the society's missionaries have received the honor of episcopal consecration, among whom is one native, Dr. Crowther. It established stations in Western Africa (Rio Pongas and Sierra Leone) in 1804; India, 1814; New Zealand, 1814; Ceylon, 1818; British America, 1823; Eastern Africa, 1843; China, 1845; Mauritius, 1856; Japan, 1869; Persia, 1875; Victoria Nyanza, 1876. The Sierra Leone Church, with its more than 5,000 communicants, is now self-supporting. Statistics for 1858: European (male) missionaries, 230; native, 230; native lay helpers, 2,559 male, 461 female; native communicants, 36,326; schools, 1,617; scholars, 68,647; income, £221,136; organ, The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record. Its offices are in Salisbury Square, London. This society, by its tolerant and fraternal Christian spirit, has the confidence and hearty moral support of all Christian denominations.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (S. P. G.), founded in 1701, began a new life in the early part of this century. It has become more and more the representative of the High-Church party and principles, and prosecutes the work of establishing new bishoprics with great zeal. Feeling itself to be the representative of the Church par excellence, it has entered territory already sufficiently occupied by other societies, and has thereby caused not a little trouble. It lays great stress upon the organization of bishoprics. It has opened stations in India (1818), Ceylon, South Africa (1820), the West Indies, Australia, and New Zealand (1839), Borneo (1849), British Columbia (1859), China (1874), Japan (1873), etc.; and has even intruded into Madagascar (1864) and the Fiji Islands (1879). The report of the society does not give separate statistics. The society, perhaps, has 20,000 native communicants, and perhaps £184,079 income in 1881; organ, The Mission Field. Its offices are 19 Delahey Street, Westminster.

The Universities' Mission to Central Africa stands in close connection with the S. P. G., and was founded in 1860. Bishop Mackenzie was con-
The Methodists have, from the beginning of their history, had an intense missionary spirit. Thomas Coke, in 1798, was the first director of their foreign work. The Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society was formed after his death in 1815, India, 1817, the South Seas (Australia, New Zealand, Fiji Islands), 1822, China, 1831, and also in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Malta. Its work in Canada and British America has been taken up by the Canada Wesleyan Society, which also has a mission in Japan. The missions in the South Sea Islands are now likewise independent of the mother-society. Statistics for 1882 (including Europe, India, China, Africa, West Indies): Missionaries and assistant missionaries, 531; other helpers, 10,191; church-members, 89,349; income in 1881, £162,935; organ, The Wesleyan Missionary Notices. Its offices are 66 Paternoster Row, London.

The Welsh Calvinist Methodist Society (1840) has a successful mission in India, with 66 congregations and 2,055 church-members in 1881. The Primitive Methodist Missionary Society was founded in 1843. The United Methodist Free Churches Missionary Society (1856) has stations in the West Indies, China, and Africa, with 16 missionaries, and 5,000 communicants. The Methodist New Connection Missionary Society (1860?) has a mission in China; employed (in 1882) 5 European missionaries, 62 local preachers, and numbered 1,131 communicants; income, £4,829. Its office is 4 London-House Yard, London.

The Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church in England, founded in 1855, has stations in India, China (1856), and Formosa (1865). In 1881, it has 0,570 communicants, and employed 17 clerical and 4 medical missionaries; income £14,028; organ, The Messenger and Missionary Record of the Presbyterian Church in England. Its offices are 7 East India Avenue, London. The Irish Presbyterian Foreign Missionary Society began its existence in 1840; has stations in India, China, and Spain, and employed 10 European missionaries, and numbered about 300 native communicants; income, £9,984. The Friends' Foreign Mission Society (1865) prosecutes missionary work in India, Syria, and especially Madagascar (3,250 church-members). The China Inland Mission (1865), employing 70 missionaries, and numbering 1,000 communicants, and the Congo (or Livingstone) Inland Mission, employing 14 missionaries, are undenominational. In addition to these organizations, there are a number of efficient ladies' associations in England.

Scotch Societies.—The Glasgow and the Scottish Missionary Societies were founded in 1796, and sent missionaries to Sierra Leone, Cape Colony, India, and Jamaica. It was not till 1824 that Dr. Inglis succeeded in bringing the Established Church as a body to prosecute missions. Its first missionary was Dr. Duff (see DUFF), who went to India, and was soon followed by Wilson, Mitchell, and others. These missionaries addressed themselves more particularly to the work of education. At the Disruption, in 1843, two societies ensued. The missionaries in India, however, united with the Free Church; but the missionary property went to the Established Church. The latter soon sent fresh missionaries (1845), and has established stations in Eastern Africa (1876) and China (1877). In close connection with it stands the Ladies' Association for the Advancement of Female Education in India. The organ of the Established Church's mission is The Church of Scotland Monthly Record. Much more extensive has been the work of the Free Church. Besides its Indian stations, it has established missions in Southern Africa, among the Hottentots (1844) and Zulus (1867), in the New Hebrides (1849), Syria (1872), Lake Nyassa, Africa (Livingstone mission) (1881). Statistics for 1882: Ordained European missionaries, 88; ordained native missionaries, 11; medical missionaries, 9; other European helpers, 26; native, 313; communicants, 4,271; income, £29,567. The Ladies' Society for Female Education in India and South Africa is connected with the Free Church; organ, The Free Church of Scotland Monthly Record. Its offices are in Edinburgh. The United Presbyterian Church of Scotland began operations among the heathen in 1835, and has missions in the West Indies (Jamaica and Trinidad), Kaffraria, Spain, China, and Japan. Statistics for 1882: Established Church's missions, 47; ordained native missionaries, 18; European medical missionaries, 5; native helpers, 320; European zenana agents and teachers, 17; communicants, 10,215; day schools, 182; pupils, 10,051; income in 1881, £23,615; organ, The Missionary Record of the United Presbyterian Church in America. Societies.—The churches of North America, as has already been noticed, were interested, in the eighteenth century, in the works of carrying the gospel to the Indians. It is characteristic that the modern missionary movement in the United States started in an institution of learning,—Andover Seminary. The mover was Samuel J. Mills (see art.), who was deeply interested in missionary subjects while a student at Williams College. At Andover Seminary, he, together with Hall, Judson, Newell, and Nott, formed a missionary society, and with three other of them presented to Dr. Eastman, a Massachusetts Proper, convened at Bradford, an appeal in behalf of missions. The result was the founding, on June 29, 1810, of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. This organization at first proposed a union with the
London Missionary Society, but the idea was abandoned; and in 1812 the first missionaries were sent to India.—Judson, Rice, etc. The former became a Baptist, and went to Burmah. The mission was ultimately established in Bombay (1813) and Ceylon (1816). The Board began its mission to the Indians in 1816; in the Sandwich Islands in 1820; in Palestine, by the dispatch of Pliny Fisk and Levi Parsons, in 1818; Turkey, 1822; Zululand, 1836; South China, 1847; Micronesia, 1852; North China, 1854; Japan, 1869; Spain and Mexico, 1872; Austria, 1875; Central Africa, 1882. *Statistics for 1882*: American ordained missionaries, 16; American assistants, male and female, 392; native pastors, 148; native preachers, 438; church-members, 19,755 (exclusive of the Sandwich Islands); high schools and seminaries, 85; schools, 847; whole number of pupils, 36,885; income, $159,700, of which $110,000, was from women's societies. The Hawaiian Evangelical Association of the Sandwich Islands carries on an independent mission in the Micronesian Islands, with (in 1880) 40 stations and 2,904 adherents. Since 1869 the Woman's Board of Missions has co-operated with the American Board. Its organ is *Life and Light for Women*. The American Missionary Association of the Congregational Church carries on operations among the Indians, negroes, and Chinese in America, and the negroes in Western Africa. It employs 84 missionaries and 180 teachers in the South, and 8 missionaries and 5 teachers in Africa; organ, *The American Missionary*. Down to the year 1837, the Presbyterian Church as a whole supported the American Board. At the division of the church at that time, the Old-School body constituted a separate Presbyterian Board. The New-School body continued to support the American Board until the re-union of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church in 1870; so that it is now completely under the control of the Congregational Church. Organ, *The Missionary Herald*. Its main offices are at 1 Somerset Street, Boston.

The Baptists, at their General Convention in Philadelphia (1808), began to consider the establishment of a missionary union, but in 1845, when the Baptists of the South withdrew, changed the name to the American Baptist Missionary Union. The occasion of the organization of the Baptist Society was the change of views, on the subject of baptism of the organization of the Baptist Society. The Seventh-day Baptists (1842) have a mission in China. The Baptist Church of Canada began missionary operations in 1866, and supports 4 missionaries among the Telugu of India, and numbers 500 communicants.

The two branches of the Presbyterian Church in the North, at the re-union in 1870, united in the support of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, which has its headquarters at 23 Centre Street, New York. It conducts missions in Syria (begun by the American Board in 1818), Persia and India (begun by the American Board in 1836), Siam (1840, and among women, 1857), Liberia and Gaboon in Western Africa (1842), China (1844), Japan (1859), the United States of Colombia, Chili, and Brazil (1856-59), Mexico (1872), and among ten tribes of Indians. *Statistics for 1882*: 140 American missionaries; 84 ordained native, and 328 licentiate native, preachers; 240 American, and 607 native missionary associations; 2,644 communicants, and 20,064 scholars in its schools; income, $583,124; organ, *The Foreign Missionary*. There co-operated with this society 7 women's missionary societies, whose contributions, 1870-71, amounted to $7,327; in 1881-82, to $176,190.

The Presbyterian Church South formed its missionary society in 1862, and conducts missions among the Indians, in Mexico, Brazil, Italy, Greece, and China. *Statistics for 1882*: Ordained American missionaries, 20; female assistants, 26; medical missionary, 1; native preachers, 13; other native helpers, 43; day schools, 15; scholars, 500; communicants, 1,505; income in 1881, $69,309, $10,084 of which came from ladies' missionary associations; organ, *The Missionary*. The Board of Foreign Missions of the United Presbyterian Church of North America has established stations in Egypt (1820), China (1844), and Japan (1850). *Statistics for 1882*: American missionaries, 15; female missionaries, 21; ordained native missionaries, 8; other helpers, 189; communicants, 1,565; schools, 75; scholars, 2,367; income in 1881, $77,572. Its offices are at 100 North 18th Street, Philadelphia.

The Reformed Presbyterians in the United States began missionary operations in 1859, and have 6 missionaries in Syria.

The Board of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Church in America was constituted as a separate body in 1858, and established stations in China (1844), India (1854), and Japan (1859). *Statistics for 1882*: American ordained missionaries, 16; assistant missionaries, 24; native ordained ministers, 13; other native helpers, 147; day schools, 95; scholars, 2,340; communicants, 2,929; income in 1881, $72,960, of which $18,308 came through the Woman's Board; organ, *The Towner and Mission Monthly*. Its offices are in Vesey Street, New York.

The German Reformed Church is represented by 1 missionary in India; and, since 1880, supports 1 missionary in Japan.

The Cumberland Presbyterian Church began...
Before the organization of any of the modern German societies, Father Janicke founded with prayer a mission school in Berlin, which flourished till Jänicke's death, in 1827, and furnished nearly 80 missionaries to the English societies. Income, 366,864 marks, more than half of which came from foreign lands.

The real mother of the German societies was the Basel Society for the Promotion of Pure Doctrine and Piety, founded in 1780 (Die deutsche Gesellschaft zur Besörderung reinen Lehres und wahrer Gottseligkeit), which, under England's lead, soon took a deep interest in missions, and through its secretaries, Blumhardt and Spittler, established the Basel Missionary School in 1815. This institution at first only contemplated the training of missionaries, but in 1822 determined to establish stations. This is the real date of the Basel Missionary Society, which has sent missionaries to Persia (abandoned in 1835), Western Africa, India, and China, and labors with increasing success. Both Lutheran and Reformed clergymen are employed. This is still the most important among the German societies, and employed in 1880 115 missionaries, and had 6,700 communicants; income, 482,168 marks; since for 1882, 15 American ordained missionaries; 60 native ministers, and about 2,500 communicants; income in 1881, 103,741. Its offices are in Nashville, Tenn.

The Methodist-Episcopal Church of Canada (1824) has missions among the Indians and in the Bermudas and Jap.; employs missionaries, and has 5,600 communicants.

The Board of Missions of the Protestant-Episcopal Church in the United States was constituted in 1821, and prosecutes missionary operations in Greece, Mexico, Western Africa, China, Japan, and Hayti. Statistics for 1881: Native communicants, 2,301; income, 118,265. Its offices are in the Bible House, New York; organ, The Spirit of Missions.

The Disciples of Christ prosecute missionary labors in India, Turkey, and Australia.

The United-Brethren Church organized a missionary society in 1853, and sustains missions in Germany and Africa.

The Evangelical Association prosecutes missionary work in Japan, with 4 missionaries, and in Germany. In Japan, according to Rev. Dr. Hartzer's report (Aug. 21, 1882), the mission had 51 native members, 3 regular preaching places, 4 Sunday schools with 15 officers and teachers, and 117 scholars; 2 day schools with 72 scholars.
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4,500 communicants. This is its only mission. Income in 1880, 222,000 marks; organ, Das evang.-luth. Missionsblatt.

The year 1836 was fruitful in the formation of German missionary societies. Gossner, who dissented from his Berlin brethren in demanding a lower literary standard for the colonies but the missionaries, and who held that they ought to follow the example of Paul in working with their hands, at the age of sixty-three began an independent activity. Without any ostentation, he trained young artisans, until, within ten years, 80 missionaries were settled in Australia, India, North America, and Western Africa, who had graduated from his tuition. Gossner was every thing in his society, and pulled harder on the prayer-bell than on the alms-bell (mehr die Bet.-als die Bettelglocke). In the second decennium he sent out 58 missionaries. At his death, in 1858, the management of this society, called the "Gossner Society," was put in the hands of a committee. It now carries on operations on the Ganges, and very successfully among the Kohils. Statistics for 1880: missionaries, 21; communicants, 8,000; income, 160,929 marks; organ, Die Biene auf dem Missionsfelde. (See Dalton: Johannes Gossner.)

The Hermannsburg Society (Die Hermannsburg-Mission) likewise owes its origin and peculiarities to the genius and enthusiasm of one man, the pastor at Hermannsburg, Ludwig Harms (see art.). Harms had early begun to co-operate with the North German Society; but, on the impulse of repeated applications from the sons of peasants for missionary training, he erected a missionary institute in 1849, and, four years subsequently, sent out 12 pupils and 8 colonists to Southern Africa. The ship for their voyage was constructed by the people of Hermannsburg (an inland town) themselves. It was Harms's plan to station missionaries in groups, and to colonize towns, among the heathen. Hermannsburg, in Southern Africa, is one of the results. Statistics in 1880: 90 missionaries, stationed in Africa, India, Australia, and New Zealand; communicants, 2,000; income, 288,386 marks; organ, Hermannsburg Missionblatt.

The Pilgrim Mission of St. Chrischona at Basel is a missionary institute founded in 1848, and trains up missionaries for the Mohammedans and Oriental churches. In 1877 a German missionary institute was founded in Schleswig-Holstein, which in 1880 despatched 2 missionaries to India; income, 23,000 marks. The Knak Ladies' Missionary Society (1850) has charge of a foundling and orphan house in Hong Kong. The Ladies' Society for Female Education in the East (1842) has 18 female laborers to India, Palestine, and South Africa. The Jerusalem Union, founded in 1815, limits its activity to Bethlehem in Palestine. The Kaiserswerth Deaconness Institute has sent out 18 female laborers to India, Palestine, and schools in the East. The Kaiserswerth Deaconness Institute has 50 sisters laboring in hospitals, orphan-asylums, and schools in the East. The Kaiserswerth Deaconness Institute was founded in Berkel, which was removed to Rotterdam in 1821. The society has confined its operations to the Celebes, Amboyna, and Java, and has to-day 16 missionaries and 20,000 communicants; organ, Maandberigt van het Ned. Zendeling. The other Dutch societies employ about 30 missionaries in the Dutch colonies but have not been very efficient. Among these organizations are De Doopsgezinde vereeniging tot bevordering der Evangelieverbreiding in de Neder-oorzaeche bezittingen (1849), Het Java-Comité (1854), De Utrechtse Zendelingvereeniging (1859), etc. It is computed that the Molucca Christians number 40,000, but there is not much vital Christianity among them. In spite of the large number of Dutch missionary societies, it must be said that Holland, which has been made rich by her colonies, has done her Christian duty by them only in a very small degree.

In France, the Société des Missions évangéliques was organized by the various French Protestant denominations in 1824, and has 23 missionaries in South Africa, Senegambia, and Tahiti, and 4,000 communicants; income, 220,000 francs; organ, Journal des Missions évangéliques. In Denmark, the Danske Missions-Selskap was formed in 1821, and supported the Basel society till 1864, when it established an independent mission in India, and put itself in connection with the clergy of Greenland. There are, perhaps, 7,000 communicants connected with the Danish missions to Greenland. In Norway, the Norske Missions-Selskap zu Stavanger was organized in 1842, and has 15 missionaries laboring in Zululand (100 communicants) and Madagascar (1,200 communicants). In Sweden, the Svenska Missions-Sällskapet was formed in 1835. In 1876 it was turned over to the State Church of Sweden, which supports some missionaries in Zululand and among the Tamils in India. An independent society, the Evangeliska Fosterlands Stiftelsen, was formed in 1856, and has missionaries in Abyssinia. In all, Sweden supports about 12 missionaries. A missionary society was organized in Finland, 1859, and has stations in Ovamboland, Africa.

The following table of statistics may be regarded as approximately correct, and, if any thing, rather an underestimate. The statistics do not include women's societies as separate organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRIES</th>
<th>Missionaries</th>
<th>Missionary Income</th>
<th>Communicants</th>
<th>Missionary Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany and Switzerland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European States</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>164,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>323,000</td>
<td>1,800,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above survey, it becomes apparent that ours is a missionary age, and that missionary activity has increased as the century has progressed. Missions are a matter of voluntary associations. This may be regarded as providential, and perhaps preparatory for the Church of the
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future. The churches that are independent of the state are by far the most active in the cause of missions, and just because they have been called upon to support their home organization by their own gifts. The methods of carrying on missionary operations are, on the whole, consen tient. All Protestant societies are agreed that spiritual agencies must be employed; and in this they greatly diverge from the Roman-Catholic Church. Missions are everywhere the mother of the state and at least 12,000 schools owe their origin and support to foreign missionary societies. During the century, 230 translations of the Bible have been made, at least 70 of which were in languages theretofore absolutely without a literature. The literary services of missionaries to mission-lands have been simply immense. (See Wernecke: D. gegen saatigen Beziehungen zwischen d. modernen Mission und Kultur.) There is a general agreement that the native churches should be brought up as soon as possible to self-support and independence. At present there are no less than 25,000 native helpers, of whom at least 1,500 are ordained ministers. The London Missionary Society had, in 1882, 369 native ordained missionaries; the American Board, 148 native pastors, 498 native preachers and catechists, and 1,055 native school-teachers; and the Presbyterian Board (North), 84 native ordained pastors, 128 licentiates, and 467 lay helpers. Recently industrial missions, which combine preaching with practical instruction in the arts of civilized life, have been organized in Central Africa. The medical missions are also doing a grand work.

iii. survey of the mission field: North America. — The missions in Greenland began with the labors of Egede in 1721, and the Moravians in 1733. Few heathen remain; but the Christians are still on a low plane of Christian living, and not till within the past ten years have serious attempts been made to train a native ministry. In Labrador, the Moravians established a mission in 1771, and 1,590 Christians are the reward of their toilsome labors. In British America and Canada, the Church Missionary Society is the most active, and has five dioceses, — Athabasca, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Moosonee, and Metcha kia. It began its work in 1826, and has 11,500 communicants connected with its missions. In 1839 the Wesleyan Missionary Society entered the same field. Its work is now carried on by the Methodist Church of Canada.

In the United States, there are three classes who properly come under the head of missionary subjects, — the Indians, Chinese, and Mormons. The negroes (see art.) do not properly belong here, as they are American citizens. John Eliot, the Mayhews, David Brainerd, and others labored with fidelity and success among the Indians. At the present time the different tribes are apportioned to different denominations, which have the sole right of prosecuting religious work amongst them. There are, perhaps, 25,000 Indian communicants in the different churches. For the missions among the Chinese and Mormons, see those articles.

1 This part of the German article has been more abridged than the other parts, as the information is given, even at greater length, under special heads; e.g., China, Japan, Turkey, the Islands.

In the West Indies, the unexampled cruelty of the Spaniards exterminated the aborigines, and substituted in their place African slaves. In 1838 England gave freedom to the slaves in her colonies, and the example has been recently followed by Spain. The population of the West Indies is 4,412,700, of whom 2,061,000 are under the crown of Spain. Here, again, the Moravians were the first to begin missionary operations (1732). They now number, on eight islands, 36,500 Christians. The Methodists followed in 1786, at Antigua, and have to-day 41,000 communicants. The Baptists came next, in 1813, and have in Jamaica 28,000, and the rest of the islands 5,160, church-members. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel also carries on a very important work in five dioceses. It has given birth to an independent West Indies' Missionary association, which has sent some missionaries to Western Africa. The London Missionary Society, the American Missionary Society, the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and the Episcopal Church of the United States, also have missions in the West Indies; and the Northern and Southern churches of the United States. The labors of the missionaries have been richly rewarded (see art. Mexico). In Central America, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Methodist, have stations in Honduras (4,000 Christians), and the Moravians on the Mosquito Coast (1,080 Christians). The most hopeful missionary fields in South America are Brazil and Chili.

The Islands of the Pacific Ocean. — Here we see a remarkable change in the condition of the natives. The American Board began its mission on the Sandwich Islands. The London Society in 1797 sent missionaries to Tahiti and the Friendly Islands. The work in Tahiti has passed over to the French Church, which has more than 6,000 communicants. The apostle of many of the groups of the South Sea Islands was John Williams. (See Williams.) The Wesleyan Church is the predominant one on the Samoan, Tonga, and Fiji Islands, where a most remarkable revolution has taken place, transforming cannibals into church-going and school-attending peoples. (See Fiji Islands.) On the New Caledonian, New Hebrides, and Queen Charlotte Islands, the London, several Presbyterian, Methodist, and Dutch societies, and the S. P. C. G., are laboring. The rude populations of the New Hebrides have at last become accessible. One of them, Eromanga, is famous as the scene of the martyrdoms of Williams and the two Gordons. In 1881 a memorial church was dedicated on the island, and three sons of the murder of Williams were present. An eyetum is wholly evangelized. The Methodists of Sydney entered New Britain in 1874, with some helpers from the Tonga and Fiji Islands. Four evangelists have been murdered, but converts have been made. To New Guinea two missionaries from the Gesner Institute were despatched in 1856, but in 1871 the London Society began the active prosecution of work. (See Murray: Forty Years' Mission-Work in
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Polynesia and New Guinea, London, 1878.) Missions in New Zealand were begun by the Church of England in 1814, which was followed by the Wesleyans in 1822. (See NEW ZEALAND.) The aborigines of Australia are being cared for by the Moravian, the Hermannsburg, Presbyterian, and other societies. It is a laborious and discouraging work; but about 1,000 have been won to Christianity, and in 1885 the missionary schools among them received the prize from the Australian Government.

Asia.—Beginning with the Indian Archipelago, we find that very little has been done on Java (only 4,000 Christians) and Borneo, where four missionaries and three of their wives were murdered in 1856. The work at Sumatra, which has been carried on for twenty years by the Rhenish Society, is more hopeful; and 6,000 Christians are gathered into 14 congregations. An especially effective work has been carried on, since 1826, on the Celebes, where among the population of two million, Protestants are growing in numbers. Nevertheless, the Christian population of the Celebes, where nearly the whole of the population is under Kristian influence. On the way to India we touch upon Ceylon, with a population of 2,500,000. The Buddhists here are in the majority. The Dutch Government Christians, which once numbered 300,000, have pretty much disappeared. The two Church-of-England societies, the Baptists, Wesleyans, and the American Board, number about 25,000 native Christians. It is on the Island of Ceylon that the exclusive bishop of Colombo (S. F. G.) has his diocese.

In India we tread upon the most important and most vigorously cultivated mission-field of the day. More than 350 missionaries, belonging to 35 societies, divide the territory between them. Recently the number of native Christians has grown very rapidly. Fifty-eight translations of the Bible into its languages have been made. Schools have been planted, until they have an attendance of 150,000. Female workers are beginning to make their influence felt in the zenanas; and year by year the number of native preachers and teachers is increasing. (See art. INDIA.)

In Siam, the American Baptists and Presbyterian-secrets have missions; the former (in 1882) with 500 communicants, the latter with 265 (including the Laos). China, in which the London Missionary Society began its mission in 1807, is one of the most important as well as populous dioceses of the globe. It has now Christian churches, with 20,000 communicants, and 10 hospitals manned by devoted American and English medical missionaries. Japan, which was opened to commerce by the United States, has been the scene of missionary operations from 1859. The Americans (Hepburn, Verbeck) were the first to occupy the ground. Hopeful as this field has been and is, through the enterprise of the Japanese Government in adopting the ways of European civilization, there is much danger ahead from the spread of materialism (Darwinism, etc.) views by American teachers at the universities. (See arts. CHINA AND JAPAN.)

In the Mohammedan lands of Western Asia and Turkey, the missionaries have, in spite of guarantees of religious freedom, been obliged to confine themselves more or less closely to the remainder of the old Christian sects. The American Board is the most active in the countries of Islam, and is followed by the Church Missionary Society and the Presbyterians. In Persia, where Henry Martyn died (1812), the gospel has a firm foothold at Isphahan, Teheran, Tebriz, and Orohia. (See art. PERSIA.) The missions in Syria (see art.) have been very successful, although but few Mohammedans thus far have been baptized. The missions of the American Board in Turkey are likewise in a very prosperous condition. The Armenians contribute the largest number of converts. Robert College at Constantiopole, as the Presbyterian College at Beyrut, etc., stands a shining lighthouse, shedding light over a large area. (See TURKEY.)

Africa.—In Northern Africa, missionary operations are carried on with some success by the United Presbyterians among the Copts in Egypt, and by Miss Whately in Cairo. The first extensive African mission-field stretches along the western coast, from Senegal to Gaboon, from which the Baptists and the Congo inland mission are penetrating towards the Livingstone, or Middle Congo River. More than 200 French, American, German, English, and native missionaries, belonging to 15 societies, are laboring here, amongst peoples deeply sunk in heathenism, and exposed to a deadly climate. They have a population of 90,000 under their immediate care. Sierra Leone, populated in the early part of the century by freed negroes, is now an independent diocese. The Episcopalian Church has 18,980 under its care; the Wesleyans, 17,098; Lady Huntingdon's Connection, 2,717, etc. (For Liberia, see special article.) On the Gold Coast, Wesleyan, Basel, and North German missionaries are laboring, the first with 6,038 communicants. The Wesleyans also hold Yoruba, with 1,236 communicants. The Niger mission (begun 1857) has been successful in training up an efficient corps of native workers, at the head of which stands the colored Bishop Crowther. The Bihé mission was begun by the American Board in 1880.

In Cape Colony, including Kaffraria, by the government census of 1875 there were 175,963 colored Protestant Christians. The Church Missionary Society and the Wesleyan societies are pressing towards the Eastern Lake. Tanganyika, and the Church of England at Blantyre. Central Africa at the present is the most interesting African mission-field. The Scotch have two missions at Nyassa, and the Church of England at Blantyre on the Shire River. The London Society, after severe sacrifices, are firmly established on Lake Tanganyika, and the Church Missionary Society, after still severer trials, on Victoria Nyanza.
The whole number of Christians (not communicants) connected with the missionary fields may safely be calculated at 2,000,000. This seems a small number compared with the uneducating the heathen nations, which cannot be the law of the progress of the kingdom of Christ. The results of modern missionary activity. The gospel has had a wonderful power in civilizing and educating the heathen nations, which cannot be remembered, that we are still in the first stage of the modern missionary movement. The work hitherto done has been preparatory. Another age will reap the harvest. We must remember again, that the law of the progress of the kingdom of Christ is the law of the mustard-seed's growth now, as much as ever before. And once more we must remember, that numbers do not exhaust the results of missions. The most of the Christians are still weak, and in the first stages of Christ's time to build up independent native churches.

**Fairman**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRIES</th>
<th>Population of the World</th>
<th>Protestants</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>515,520,000</td>
<td>75,144,000</td>
<td>297,520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1,023,700,000</td>
<td>430,000 (?)</td>
<td>11,928,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>260,679,000</td>
<td>740,000 (?)</td>
<td>5,340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>96,277,000</td>
<td>37,200,000</td>
<td>27,735,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Seas</td>
<td>4,031,000</td>
<td>1,544,000</td>
<td>2,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,456,923,000</td>
<td>115,218,000</td>
<td>390,541,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**MITE**

Mite, the rendering, in the Authorized and Revised Versions, of μητον, a very small coin of bronze or copper, equal in value to a little more than one mill, but in Christ's time to only half a mill.

**MITRE**

Mitre is used in the Old Testament version as the name of the head-dress of the Jewish high priest, and generally as the name of a peculiar head-dress worn on solemn occasions by the pope, the bishops, the abbots, and other prelates of the Roman-Catholic Church. It consists of a ring or coronet, from which arises, in front and back, two tall, tongue-shaped flaps, referring to the "clenved-tongues" of the first Pentecost. It seems to have originated in Rome; but no certain mention of it is found before the ninth century: in the fourteenth it was generally used throughout the West. It is always made of costly materials, embroidered, and often studded with precious stones.

**MIXED MARRIAGES.** See MARRIAGE.

**MIXED MULTITUDE**

Mixed multitude, the happy expression in the Authorized Version for the riff-raff who followed the Israelites out of Egypt (Exod. xii. 39), and, later, the returning exiles from Babylon (Neh. xiii. 3). They may have been, in some cases, allied to true Israelite families.

**MIZPAH**

Mizpah, or Miz'Peh (watch-tower), was the name of several places in Palestine. I. The Mizpah of Gilead (Judg. xii. 29), probably identical with Ramath-mizpeh (Josh. xiii. 26), and, later, the returning exiles from Babylon (Neh. xiii. 3). They may have been, in some cases, allied to true Israelite families.

**MIZ'Pah, or Miz'Peh (watch-tower), was the name of several places in Palestine.**

**MO'AB**

Moab, the land of the Moabites, was situated along the eastern shore of the Dead Sea and the lower course of the River Jabbok, and extending more than three thousand feet above the level of the sea and the river, it is mountainous throughout, but well watered and fertile. Not only cattle were
raised there in olden times (2 Kings iii. 4), but also corn and fruit and wine were produced; and in times of scarcity the Israelites looked to Moab for supply (Ruth i. 1,2; comp. Jer. xlvi. 7 sqq., where the richness of Moab is spoken of). In Isa. xva. 1-6 several cities are mentioned,—Hezbron, Medeba, Dibon, Ar of Moab on the Arnon (at one time the capital of the country), Rabbath-Moab, Luhith, Zorah.

Both with respect to descent and with respect to language, the Moabites were closely related to the Israelites on the one side, and the Edomites on the other. Chemosh was the name that of their national god (1 Kings xi. 7, 33; 2 Kings xxiii. 13), whence they were often called "the people of Chemosh." (Num. xxi. 29; Jer. xlviii. 40). He was worshipped with human sacrifices (Amos ii. 1), especially with sacrifices of children (2 Kings ii. 27). Besides him, also Baal-peor was worshipped in the time of Moses (Num. xxi. 3, 5; Deut. iv. 19); but it is uncertain whether he bore his name to the mountain Peor, or whether he assumed his surname from that mountain as the principal seat of his worship. The rites of his worship were extremely licentious. It is probable, however, as Jerome states in his Commentary on Isa. xv. 2, that Chemosh and Baal-peor were, like Baal and Moloch, simply two different conceptions of the same divinity. However that may be, the Moabitic worship belonged to the lowest stage of the Chaldee-Canaanitic religion. Chemosh is designated as an abomination (1 Kings xi. 7; 2 Kings xxiii. 13). The people themselves were addicted to the basest sensuality. Of the valor and warlike fortitude of the Edomites, there is not the least trace among them.

The Emim, the original inhabitants of the country, were subdued by Chedorlaomer in the time of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 5); and as, after that time, they seem to have been gradually dying out, the Moabites may not have experienced any great difficulties when settling in the country. It proved more difficult for them to maintain themselves there. In the territory north of the Arnon, the best part of the country, they were subdued by the Amorites under Sihon; and, after the arrival of Israel on the stage, they underwent the same fate in the territory south of the Arnon (Num. xxxii. 34 sqq.). It is impossible, however, to define the character and the degree of the dependency in which they lived. They had their own kings. They were among Saul's enemies. By David they were punished with great severity (2 Sam. viii. 2). The Psalmist says, "Moab is my wash-pot" (Ps. lx. 8, cviii. 9). When the separation into two kingdoms took place, Moab followed Israel, and King Mesha paid a tribute of a hundred thousand lambs and as many rams (2 Kings iii. 4). For the revolt against Nebuchadnezzar the Moabites were very zealous; but, when he approached to take revenge, they joined him, and could look on in peace while Jerusalem was besieged and taken. After that time, nothing more is heard of them. From Ez. ix. 1 and Neh. xi. 11, it is not certain whether they existed any more; and when Josephus (Ant., XIX. 15, 4, and I. 11, 5) speaks of Hezbon as a Moabitic city, and of the Moabites as a great nation, he does so simply on account of the descent of the population of the Moabite territory. The country belonged to the empire of the Nabataeans until 105 A.D., when it was conquered by the Romans, and the name of its capital, Rabbath-Moab, was changed into Aretopolis. In the fifth century, a bishop of Aretopolis is mentioned. At the time of Abulfeda, the name of Kerak, or Karrak, occurs for the southern part of Moab, and that of Belca for the northern. At present, all the old cities are in ruins, the country is much depopulated, and the inhabitants have become somewhat brutalized. The whole region was explored by Seetzen, 1806, Burckhardt, 1812, De Saulcy (Voyage autour de la mer morte), 1858, Tristram (Land of Moab), 1873, and Conder (Heth and Moab), 1886.

One of the very few remnants of Moabite civilization which have come down to us, and without comparison the most interesting one, is the so-called "Moabite stone," a slab of black basalt 5 feet and 8 inches high, 2 feet and 3 ½ inches wide, and 1 foot and 1 7/8 inches thick, covered with an inscription of thirty-four lines in Hebrew-Phoenician characters. It was discovered in 1868 by Mr. Klein, of the British Missionary Society, near the walls of the old Dibon. The stone is now in the Museum of the Louvre in Paris.

The inscription has been read by Dr. Ginsburg, M. Ganneau, and Professor Schlottmann. The latter's translation is as follows:—

"I Mesu, son of Chamos-nadab, the king of Moab [son of Yabini. My father ruled over Moab ... years], and I ruled after my father. And I made this high place of sacrifice to Chamos in Korkha, a high place of deliverance, for he saved me from all [who fought against Moab].

"Omiri, king of Israel, allied himself with all his [Moab's] haters, and they oppressed Moab [many days]; then Chamos was irritated [against him and against his] land, and let it go over [into the hand of his haters], and they oppressed Moab very sore.

"In my days spoke Chamos, I will therefore look upon him and his house, and Israel shall perish in eternal ruin. And Omri took possession of the town of Medeba, and sat therein [and they oppressed Moab, he and] his son, forty years. [Then] Chamos looked upon Moab in my days.

"And I built Baal Neon, and made therein walls and mounds. And I went to take the town of Kirjathaim, and [Num. xxi. 25] I saw it quite . . ."

"I allowed to dwell therein the men of . . . and I saw it quite . . ."

"And I built Baal Neon, and made therein walls and mounds. And I went to take the town of Kirjathaim, and [Num. xxi. 25] I saw it quite . . ."

"And I allowed to dwell therein the men of . . . and I saw it quite . . ."

"And Chamos was irritated [against him and against his] land, and let it go over [into the hand of his haters], and they oppressed Moab very sore.

"In my days spoke Chamos, I will therefore look upon him and his house, and Israel shall perish in eternal ruin. And Omri took possession of the town of Medeba, and sat therein [and they oppressed Moab, he and] his son, forty years. [Then] Chamos looked upon Moab in my days.

"I built Baal Neon, and made therein walls and mounds. And I went to take the town of Kirjathaim, and [Num. xxi. 25] I saw it quite . . ."

"And I allowed to dwell therein the men of . . . and I saw it quite . . ."

"And Chamos was irritated [against him and against his] land, and let it go over [into the hand of his haters], and they oppressed Moab very sore.

"In my days spoke Chamos, I will therefore look upon him and his house, and Israel shall perish in eternal ruin. And Omri took possession of the town of Medeba, and sat therein [and they oppressed Moab, he and] his son, forty years. [Then] Chamos looked upon Moab in my days.

"And I built Baal Neon, and made therein walls and mounds. And I went to take the town of Kirjathaim, and [Num. xxi. 25] I saw it quite . . ."

"And I allowed to dwell therein the men of . . . and I saw it quite . . ."
hundred men, fully told. And I beleaguered Jahaz and took it, in addition to Dibon. I built Korcha, the wall toward the forest, and I built her gates, and I built her towers, and I built her king's house and I made store-places for the mountain water in the midst of the town. And there were no cisterns within the town, in Korcha, and I said to all the people, 'Make [yourselves] every man a cistern in his house.' (Here follows a sentence with difficult expressions at the beginning, and a gap in the middle. The following is conjectural): —

"And I hung up the prohibition for Korcha [against association with the] people of Israel."

I built Aroer, and I made the streets in Arnon. I built Beth Bamoth for [it was destroyed]. I built Bezer, for men of Dibon compelled it, fifty of them, for all Dibon was subject; and I filled [with inhabitants] Bikra in which I added to the land. And I built the temple of Diblathaim, and the temple of Bezer, and I made the streets in Anion. I built Korcha, the wall toward the forest, and I made the streets in Arnon. I built the temple of Diblathaim, and the temple of Bezer, and I made the streets in Anion. I filled Bikra which I added to the land. And I built the temple of Diblathaim, and the temple of Bezer, and I made the streets in Anion. I built Korcha, the wall toward the forest, and I made the streets in Arnon. I built the temple of Diblathaim, and the temple of Bezer, and I made the streets in Anion. I built Korcha, the wall toward the forest, and I made the streets in Arnon. I built the temple of Diblathaim, and the temple of Bezer, and I made the streets in Anion.

This inscription, if genuine, is the oldest Semitic inscription existing. Besides the Moabite stone, some Moabite pottery has been found. It is mostly in the museum of Berlin; but its genuineness is still more doubtful than that of the stone, as the manufacture of antiquities has become quite a flourishing industry of late in many Asiatic cities.


MODALISM denotes the doctrine, first set forth by Sabellius, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit were not three distinct personalities, but only three different modes of manifestation. See Christology, Monarchianism, Sabellianism, Trinitas.
Mohammed.

He made a scanty living as an attendant on caravans, and by watching sheep and goats. He said, God never calls a prophet without preparing him. He had not been a prophet before, and appended the examples of Moses and David. In his twenty-fifth year he married a rich widow, Chadijah, fifteen years older than himself. He took charge of her caravans, made several journeys, and was faithful to her. She bore him six children, but they all died except Fatima. He also adopted Ali, who became famous in the history of Islam. On his commercial journeys he became acquainted with Jews and Christians, and acquired an imperfect knowledge of their traditions. He spent much time in retirement, fasting, and prayer. He was subject to epileptic fits, and snorted like a camel. He could not read; and his knowledge of the Bible history was derived from hearsay and apocryphal sources, but entered largely into his religion.

In his fortieth year (A.D. 610) he received a call from the angel Gabriel in the wild solitudes of Mount Hirf, a few miles from Mecca. At first he was frightened, and tempted to commit suicide; but his wife predicted that he would be the prophet of Arabia. The angel appeared to him again in a vision, saying, "I am Gabriel, and thou art Mohammed, the prophet of God. Fear not." Now began his public career as a reformer. The revelations of Gabriel, now like the sound of a bell, now like the voice of a man, continued from time to time for more than twenty years, and are deposited in the Koran. For three years Mohammed labored with his family and friends, and made about forty converts. His wife was the first, then his father-in-law Abu Bakr, the young energetic Omar, his daughter Fatima, his adopted son Ali, and his slave Zayd. Then he publicly announced his mission as prophet, preached to the pilgrims, attacked idolatry, reasoned with opponents, and, in answer to their demand for miracles, pointed to the Koran "leaf by leaf." He provoked commotion and persecution, and was forced to flee for his life with his followers to Medina, July 15, 622.

This flight is called the Hegira, or Hijra. It marks the beginning of the Mohammedan era and of his marvellous success. He was recognized at Medina as a prophet of Allah. With the increasing army of his followers, he took the field against his enemies, conquered several Jewish and Christian tribes, entered Mecca in triumph (624), demolished the idols of the Kaaba, became master of Arabia, and made it resound with the shout, "There is but one God, and Mohammed is his prophet." In the tenth year of the Hegira he made his last pilgrimage to Mecca, at the head of forty thousand Moslems. Soon after his return, he died of a violent fever, in the arms of his favorite wife Ayeshah, in the thirty-third year of his age. He suffered great pain, cried and wailed, but held fast to his faith. Among his last words were, "The Lord destroy the Jews and Christians! Let his anger be kindled against those who turn the tombs of their prophets into places of worship! Let Islam alone reign in Arabia! Gabriel, come close to me! Lord, grant me pardon! eternity in paradise! Pardon!"

II. Character of Mohammed. — It is written in the Koran, If restored to chronological order, it shows a gradual change of tone. In the earliest Suras, or parts of the Koran, Mohammed is the false prophet of the Apocalypse, as the first-born of Satan. But modern historians give him credit for sincerity in his first period. He started as a religious reformer, fired by the great idea of the unity of the Godhead, and filled with horror of idolatry. He believed himself to be called of God, and endeavored to unite the Jewish and Christian elements into one ruling religion of Arabia on a monotheistic basis. The way was prepared for him by the Hymns, i.e., converts, or puritans, a sect of inquirers who were dissatisfied with idolatry, and inclined to monotheism as the religion of Abraham. Some of them, especially Waraka (a cousin of Chadijah), were acquainted with the Bible. Mohammed consolidated and energized this reform-movement. At first he suffered much persecution, which would have discouraged any ordinary man. In his Meccan period he revealed no impure and selfish motives. He used only moral means; he preached, and warned the people against the sin of idolatry. He was faithful to his one wife. But his great success in Medina spoiled him. He degenerated, like Solomon. He became the slave of ambition and sensual passion. He first preached tolerance, but afterwards used the sword for the propagation of his religion. He watched in cold blood the massacre of six hundred Jews in one day, and commanded the extermination of all idolaters in Arabia, unless they submitted in four months. After the death of Chadijah, he married gradually fourteen or fifteen wives, and left at his death nine widows, besides slave-concubines. He claimed special revelations for exceptional liberty of sexual indulgence and the marriage of relatives forbidden to ordinary Moslems. In his fifty-third year he married Ayeshah, a girl of nine. He maintained, however, the simplicity of a Bedouin sheik to the end. He lived with his wives in lowly cottages, was temperate in meat and drink, milked his goats, mended his sandals and clothes, and aided his wives in cooking and sewing. He was of medium size, broad-shouldered, with black eyes and hair, a long nose, a patriarchal beard, and a commanding look. He had no learning, but a fervid imagination, poetic genius, and religious enthusiasm. He was liable to fantastic hallucinations, and alternations of high excitement and deep depression. His nervous temperament and epilepsy help to explain his revelations, whether pretended or real. Judged in his relation to heathen idolatry, Mohammed was a reformer, and filled his followers with the grand idea of an almighty, omnipresent, righteous maker and ruler of the world. Judged in his relation...
to Christianity, he was an enemy of the true religion and a scourge of the Eastern Church.

III. THE MOHAMMED RELIGION.—The religion of the Prophet of the East is monotheistic, so-called after its founder, or ISLĀM, so called after its chief prophet—Mohammed. The three most important ingredients of the new faith were derived from the Semitic race. It was composed of Jewish, heathen, and Christian elements, which were scattered throughout Arabia before Mohammed. It borrowed monotheism and many rites and ceremonies from the Jews, and may be called a bastard Judaism, descended from Ishmael and Esau. It was professedly a restoration of the faith of Abraham. In relation to Christianity it may be called the great Unitarian heresy of the East. Christ is acknowledged as the greatest prophet next to Mohammed, conceived by the Virgin Mary, at the appearance of Gabriel, under a palm-tree, but only a man. God has no wife, and therefore no son. The doctrine of the Trinity is misunderstood (the Virgin Mary, as the mother of God, being regarded as one of the three), and denounced as idolatry and blasphemy. Jesus predicted the coming of Mohammed, when he promised the Paraclete. He will return to judgment. The Christian elements in the Koran are borrowed from apocryphal and heretical sources, not from the canonical Gospels. With these corrupt Jewish and Christian traditions are mixed, in a moderated form, the heathen elements of sensuality, polygamy, slavery, and the use of violence in the spread of religion. Mohammed also retained the superstitions of the famous black stone in the Kaaba at Mecca, which fell down from paradise with Adam, and is devoutly kissed by the Moslem pilgrims on each of their seven circuits around the mosque.

The fundamental article of Islam is, "There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet." It has six articles of faith,—God, predestination (fatalism), the angels (good and bad), the books (chiefly the Koran), the prophets, the resurrection and judgment, with eternal reward and punishment. Absolute submission to the sovereign will of Allah is the first duty of a Moslem (derived from Islam), and his strongest motive in action and prayer. Carnal pleasures and other indulgences are enjoined. Pork and wine are strictly forbidden, and Mohammedanism is in this respect a vast abstinence society. Slavery, polygamy, and concubinage are allowed. Ordinary Moslems are restricted to four wives: pachas, or nobles, and sultans, may fill their harems to the extent of their wishes and means. Woman, in Mohammedan countries, is always veiled, and mostly ignorant, and slavishly dependent. In nothing is the superiority of Christianity more striking than in the superior condition of woman and home life. Believers are promised a sensual paradise, with blooming gardens, fresh fountains, and an abundance of beautiful virgins. Infidels, and those who refuse to fight for their faith, will be cast into one of the seven hells beneath the lowest earth and seas of darkness. The sword is the most effective missionary. Infidels (including Jews and Christian converts) are denounced as idolaters, and forced to pay tribute. The worship is very simple, like that of the Jewish synagogue. It consists chiefly of reading the Koran, and prayer at stated hours, which are strictly observed, with the face turned to Mecca, at the call of the mueddin (crier) from the minaret.

IV. The Koran.—This is the Mohammedan Bible, the supreme rule in all matters of religion, and even in law and philosophy. It claims to be given by divine inspiration of Gabriel. Mohammed dictated it "leaf by leaf," as occasion demanded. A year after his death, Zayd, his chief amanuensis, collected the scattered fragments "from palm-leaves, and tablets of white stone, and from the breasts of men," but without regard to chronological order. It consists of 114 suras (chapters or revelations), and 6,225 verses, and is composed in imperfect metre and rhyme, somewhat resembling Hebrew poetry. It is held in the greatest veneration, and too sacred to be translated or printed, or sold like a common book, although in India these scruples have recently been overcome. The finest manuscript copies are found in the mosques, in the Khedive's library at Cairo, and in the National Library of Paris. The material is derived from Talmudic and heretical Christian traditions, and from the poetic imagination and religious enthusiasm of Mohammed. It contains injunctions, warnings, exhortations, and is interspersed with narratives of the fall of Adam and Eve, Noah and the deluge, Abraham and Lot, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Hagar and Ishmael, Moses and Joseph, the Baptist, Jesus, and the Virgin Mary (strangely confounded with Miriam, the sister of Moses). It abounds in historical and chronological blunders, magivings, and repetitions, but has also passages of great poetic beauty, and is considered the model of pure Arabic. "It sometimes crawls in the dust, and is sometimes lost in the clouds" (Gibbon). "The style is severe, terrible, and at times truly sublime" (Goethe). Carlyle calls it "the confused ferment of a great, rude human soul, rude, untutored, that cannot even read, but fervent, earnest, struggling vehemently to utter itself; yet a wearisome, confused jumble, with endless iterations." The Koran is the most powerful rival of the Bible, but infinitely below it in purity, interest, and value. The one is of the earth, earthly; the other is from heaven, heavenly. The Koran is sectional: the Bible is universal.

V. History.—Mohammedanism conquered Arabia during the lifetime of its founder, and spread, after his death, with extraordinary rapidity by fanaticism and the sword. Mohammed's successors as prophet-kings fired the courage of the wild sons of the desert, used to every privation and endurance, with the battle-cry, "Before you is paradise; behind you are
Mohammed

The weakness of the Byzantine Empire, the unfortunate rivalry between the Greek and Latin churches, and the distractions of the Greek Church by idle metaphysical disputes, greatly aided the conquerors. They subdued Palestine, Syria, Egypt, North Africa, the south of Europe, and conquered even the Pyrenees, threatening to stable their horses in St. Peter's at Rome, but were defeated by Charles Martel at Tours (732). This battle arrested their western conquests, and saved Europe. But in the ninth century they conquered Persia, Afghanistan, and a large part of India. In the eleventh century the Seljuk Turks conquered the Arabs, but adopted their religion; in the fifteenth century they captured Constantinople, and overthrew the Byzantine Empire (1453). They turned the magnificent Church of St. Sophia into a mosque, and reduced the Greek Church to a condition of slavery. From that stronghold they even threatened the German Empire, until they were finally defeated at the gates of Vienna, and driven back across the Danube (1868). The German diets in the Reformaton period were held fully as much against the Turks as against the Lutherans. Luther himself, in one of his most popular hymns, prayed for deliverance from "des Papst's und Türk'en Mord," and the Anglican Liturgy, in the collect for Good Friday, invokes God "to have mercy upon all Turks," as well as upon "Jews, infidels, and heretics." The Turks have ruined every country they conquered, and are hated by the subject races, even the Mohammedan Arabs.

Some of the books about Mohammed:
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MOHLER, Johann Adam, b. at Igersheim, Wurttemberg, May 6, 1796; d. at Würzburg, April 12, 1838. He was educated in the lyceum of Ellwangen; studied theology at Tubingen; was ordained priest in 1819; visited, with a stipend, the Mohammedan Missionary Problem, 1879, and which after his death were collected in 1884; T. P. Hughes: Diet. of Islam, London, 1884; W. MUIR: Mahomet and Islam in seinem Einfluss auf das Leben seiner Bekenner, Leipzig, 1881; J. IIauhi: Der Islam, London, 1843, New York, 1844, 9th ed., 1884 [translated into English by J. R. Robertson: Symbolism, or the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, London, 1843, New York, 1844, 2 vols.]. There is considerable idealization in his representation of Roman-Catholic theology; and his representation of Protestantism is not altogether free from caricature; nevertheless, though represented as a revolutionary movement, breaking up the unity of the Church, the Reformation is conceived of as sprung from a genuinely religious though misguided craving; and the treatment of the details, always moderate and always veracious, is often surprising. The sensation which the work produced was immense also among the Protestant. F. C. Baur wrote against it, Der Gegen- satz des Katholicismus und Protestantismus, Tubingen, 1844; C. J. Nitzsch wrote against it, Eine protestantische Beantwortung der Symbolik Möhlers, 1835; and others. Möhler answered, Neue Untersuchungen der Lehrgensätze zwischen Katholiken und Protestanten, 1884; and a protracted controversy began. This controversy, especially with his colleague F. C. Baur, made his stay in Tubingen unpleasant, and in 1885 he accepted a call to Munich. The climate of that place did not agree with his constitution, and his health was gradually failing. Shortly before his death, he retired to Würzburg as dean of the chapter. In the Hermeneis controversy he took no part, though it was well known that he was not in favor of the movement.

LIT. — His life was written by Reithmayer in the fifth edition of the Symbolik, and by B. Wörner, 1866. See STRAUS: Kleine Schriften, 1866.

WAGENMANN.

MOLANUS, Gerhardt Walther, b. at Hamelun-ton-the-Weser, Nov. 1, 1833; d. at Loccum, Sept. 7, 1722. He studied theology at Helmstadt, where he was appointed professor of essay, he wrote at that time in the Tubinger Quartalschrift, not only Roman-Catholic, but also Protestant; and his first larger work, Die Einheit der Kirche oder das Prinzip des Katholizismus (Tubingen, 1825), which attracted general attention among scholars, was not altogether free from giving some offence in Roman-Catholic circles. It was followed, however, next year, with another large work, Athanasius der Grosse und die Kirche seiner Zeit (Mayence, 1827), which proved to be in perfect harmony with the views of the Roman-Catholic Church; and in the same year the author was appointed professor of church history at Tubingen. His lectures drew large audiences, and exercised great influence on the younger generation of Roman-Catholic theologians. They were often frequented, even by Protestants. Nevertheless his Kirchengeschichte (published by P. R. Gams, Regensburg, 1836-40, 2 vols.), reveals now and then an almost evangelical spirit; and his first larger work, Die Einheit der Kirche oder das Prinzip des Katholizismus (Tubingen, 1825), which attracted general attention among scholars, was not altogether free from giving some offence in Roman-Catholic circles. It was followed, however, next year, with another large work, Athanasius der Grosse und die Kirche seiner Zeit (Mayence, 1827), which proved to be in perfect harmony with the views of the Roman-Catholic Church; and in the same year the author was appointed professor of church history at Tubingen. His lectures drew large audiences, and exercised great influence on the younger generation of Roman-Catholic theologians. They were often frequented, even by Protestants. Nevertheless his Kirchengeschichte (published by P. R. Gams, Regensburg, 1836-40, 2 vols.) is not his chief work. He felt that Roman-Catholic theology was sorely in need of a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of the principles of the Reformation, and of the divergencies between Romanism and Protestantism; and, after an exhaustive study of the symbolical books of the two confessions, he published his Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegenässete der Katholiken und Protestanten (Mayence, 1827; 5th ed., enlarged and improved by Reithmayer, 1835; 9th ed., 1884 [translated into English by J. R. Robertson: Symbolism, or the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, London, 1843, New York, 1844, 2 vols.]). There is considerable idealization in his representation of Romanism; and his representation of Protestantism is not altogether free from caricature; nevertheless, though represented as a revolutionary movement, breaking up the unity of the Church, the Reformation is conceived of as sprung from a genuinely religious though misguided craving; and the treatment of the details, always moderate and always veracious, is often surprising. The sensation which the work produced was immense also among the Protestants. F. C. Baur wrote against it, Der Gegen- satz des Katholizismus und Protestantismus, Tubingen, 1844; C. J. Nitzsch wrote against it, Eine protestantische Beantwortung der Symbolik Möhlers, 1835; and others. Möhler answered, Neue Untersuchungen der Lehrgensätze zwischen Katholiken und Protestanten, 1884; and a protracted controversy began. This controversy, especially with his colleague F. C. Baur, made his stay in Tubingen unpleasant, and in 1885 he accepted a call to Munich. The climate of that place did not agree with his constitution, and his health was gradually failing. Shortly before his death, he retired to Würzburg as dean of the chapter. In the Hermeneis controversy he took no part, though it was well known that he was not in favor of the movement.

LIT. — His life was written by Reithmayer in the fifth edition of the Symbolik, and by B. Wörner, 1866. See STRAUS: Kleine Schriften, 1866.
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...of this kind, but only a dualism of gender. In Melchart the benevolent element was not altogether wanting, as is apparent from the proper name Gadmelchart ("fortune of Melchart").

Melchart (or Molech) was the sun-god, as is evident from the festival of his resurrection, and the designation of Carthage's main divinity as Baal Chamman, ("Baal of the sun"). Nonnus Dionys., xi. 370 sqq.), calls Heracles of Tyre Helios ("the sun"). Melchart was represented by some of the ancients with the figure of a bull and horns. The representation in the collection of rabbinical writings (thirteenth century), that the statue of Molech was of brass, with outstretched and burning arms, into which children were thrown, is of doubtful value. Ciltarch speaks of living human sacrifices offered to Chronos, which were burned. They were offered, in time of danger or calamity, as the most precious gifts men could make. Sometimes large numbers were offered at once by the Carthaginians, as, on one occasion, two hundred children of the best families (Agathocles).


Wolf Baudissin.

Molina, Luis, b. at Cuenca in New Castile, 1535; d. in Madrid, Dec. 12, 1600. He early entered the Society of Jesus; became a pupil of Petrus Fonsenca, the Lusitanian Aristotle; taught theology for twenty years at Evora, and was finally appointed professor of morals in Madrid. His De justitia et iure (1589-1598, 5 vols.), his Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans (1592), etc., obtained for him a great reputation; but his most celebrated work is his Liber arbitrii cum gratia donis, divina praescientia, providentia, praedestinatio, et reparatione concordia, Lisbon, 1588, often reprinted. It is in the form of a commentary on some passages of the Summa of Thomas, an attempt at reconciling the prevailing Semi-Pelagian views with Augustine. But the reconciliation is a mere illusion: under the cover of the bland and subtle words, the conflict continues raging. The book was accepted with ostentatious praise by the Jesuits, but fiercely attacked by the Dominicans and a long and curious controversy ensued. (See the article, Congregatio de auxilia gratiae, and the literature there given).

Molina, Miguel de, b. at Saragossa, Dec. 21, 1640; d. in the dungeons of the Inquisition in Rome, Dec. 29, 1697. He belonged to a distinguished Aragonese family; was educated for the church, and ordained priest, and settled in 1669 or 1670 in Rome, where his excellent education, the amiability of his character, and his peculiar spiritual tendency, soon brought him into intimate connection with the Pope, the cardinals, and the
highest society. In 1678, shortly before his great patron, Cardinal Odeschalchi, ascended the papal throne, under the name of Innocent XI., he published, against his own will as it is said, but at the instance of the Provincial of the Franciscans, Giovanni di Santa Maria, his Guida spirituale, to which, shortly after, was added the Breve trattato della cattolica comunione. It made an immense sensation. Originally written in Spanish, it was immediately translated into Italian and French, in 1687 also into Latin by Francke [and in 1690 into English anonymously, even without publisher's imprint]. It forms the basis for the so-called "Quietism," and corresponds closely with other phenomena of the age. What Jansenism was in France, and Pietism in Germany, and Quakerism in England, Quietism was in Spain. But it was in many respects a more extreme and consequently a more dangerous movement. Its dying away from the external world in order to serve God internally, by meditation and contemplation alone, led, or might easily lead, to a frivolous enthusiasm. By remaining internally, by meditation and contemplation alone, from the external world in order to serve God prepared for attack. Paolo Segneri, a member of their order, and a fanatical ascetic and penitence-for, that, while it fascinated some, it provoked others. The Jesuits smelt an affinity to the Reformers. The Pope gave the preacher, published his Concordia Ira et Laetitia (Bologna, 1681); and the effect was, that the Inquisition appointed a committee to examine the book of Molinos. But such was as yet the position of Molinos in Roman society, that the examination resulted in an unqualified acquittal. Polemics were then replaced by intrigue. Pére la Chaise induced Louis XV. to urge the Pope to interfere. Rumors of people who abstained from confession, of monks and nuns who threw aside, not only rosaries and images, but even relics, etc., were eagerly circulated as evidences of the pernicious influence of Quietism. The Pope gave the case over to the Inquisition; and the Inquisition had the audacity to ask, not the Pope Innocent XI., but the king of Denmark, to be examined concerning his own personal relation to the affair. In the course of 1685 Molinos was arrested, and all his papers (about twenty thousand letters) were confiscated; and Aug. 28, 1687, the Inquisition publicly condemned his doctrines. The stake he escaped. He recanted, he is said; and the sentence of death was commuted into imprisonment for life. On Nov. 26, 1687, Innocent XI. issued a bull against him. Very severe measures were taken against his adherents. 

The sixty-eight propositions, on which the verdict of the Inquisition is based, are found as an appendix to Francke's Latin translation of Guida spirituale. A few of his letters are published in Recueil de diverses pieces concernant le quietisme, 1688. See also Three Letters concerning the Present State of Italy, printed as an appendix to Peter Martyr's Tractatus de morte et quies, 1690; Myriken Molinos, Copenhagen, 1852; translated into German in Zeitschrift für histor. Theologie, 1854; HEIDEN : Geschichte der quietistischen Mystik, Berlin, 1875; [JOHN BIGELOW : Molinos the Quietist, New York, 1882, which contains a translation of the bull of Innocent XI., pp. 115-127, in which are the sixty-eight propositions referred to above].

MOL (Willem, b. at Dort, Feb. 23, 1812; d. in Amsterdam, Aug. 16, 1879. He studied theology at Leyden, and was appointed pastor of De Vurvesche, in the province of Utrecht, 1837, pastor of Arnhem, 1844, and professor of theology in Amsterdam, 1846. Church history was his domain, more especially the history of the Dutch Church before the Reformation; and his Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland voor de Hervorming (Utrecht, 1864-71, 6 vols.) is a work of the highest merit. He also wrote Geschichte van het kerkelijke leven der Christenen gedurende de eerste eeuwen, Amsterdam, 1844-46, 2 vols., and a number of minor treatises. He founded the society, which, from 1856 to 1868, published the Kalender voor de Protestanten in Nederland. His life was written by ACQUOY, in the Memoirs of the Royal Academy of Sciences, Amsterdam, 1873, and by ROGGE, in Mannen van beteekenis in onze dagen, Haarlam, 1879.

MOLLER, or MOLLER, generally called Heinrich von Zülpichen, b. 1648, in the county of Zülpichen, in the Netherlands; burnt at the stake at Heide, in Holstein, Dec. 11, 1624. In 1484 he entered the order of the Augustines; studied philosophy and theology with great zeal, and visited, in 1515, the university of Wittenberg, where he became intimately acquainted with Luther. In 1518 he was made prior of the Augustine Convent of Dort; but as the first reformatory steps of Luther caused a great commotion throughout the whole Augustinian order, and Moller seemed likely to become the centre of that movement in the Netherlands, he was compelled to flee from the country in order to escape from the Inquisition, 1520. He first settled in Bremen, where he was elected preacher at the Church of St. Ansagar, and in a short time introduced the Reformation. But in 1524 he removed to Meldorf, the principal town of the Ditmarsh, on the invitation of Nicholas Boje, the regular pastor of the place; and in the beginning his preaching was received there with much applause, but a few years later the mayor of the Ditmarsh, who formed a peculiar, half-independent republic in the midst of the dominions of the king of Denmark, became so incensed against him, stirred up by the monks and the Roman-Catholic priests, that one night they broke into his house, carried him to Heide, passed a sentence before the civil council, condemned him as a heretic, and burnt him. See LUTHER: Vom Bruder Heinrich, in Werke, vol. 26 (ed. of Erlang.); PAUL CROCIUS: Das grosse Martyruch, Bremen, 1692; CLAUS HARMS in PIPER: Evangel. Kalender, 1832; O. WIEBNER, Berlin, 1884.

MOLOKANI, The, a Russian sect, living, for the most part, in the province of Samara and the adjoining Kirghis Steppe. They condemn image-worship as idolatrous, reject the episcopacy, hold Scripture as the only rule of faith and conduct, have no paid clergy, but only a presbyter chosen by the congregation; SCHRADER, in his Mythologien, 1885, has published their meetings of worship in private houses. They have no creed, and their theology is said to be in a vague and unfinished state; but the religious life in the congregation is pure and
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vigorously, and the discipline exercised in the congregation by its own members is very severe. Concerning their origin and history very little is known. They are mentioned for the first time in an official report to Catharine II. From time to time they have been persecuted, but in the last half-century all persecutions have ceased. See WAllace: Russia, New York, 1878. p. 295.

MONARCHIANISM. Down to the end of the second century, not only the Logos doctrine, but also the conception of Christ as the Son of God, pre-existing before the creation of the world, was the exclusive possession of a few theologians. Though it was generally recognized that the Logos should be spoken of Christ, "ος πριν το θεον ("in the same manner as of God," II. Clem. ad Cor., 1.), hardly any one, with the exception of the philosophically trained apologists, was thereby led to speculate on the idea of God. All that was developed and defined concerning the personality of the Redeemer during the first quarter of the second century, called for the first expression to the Logos-christology: it was an anxiety with respect to monotheism. For was it not open atheism, when worship was claimed for two divine beings? Not only uneducated laymen were forced to think so, but also those theologians who knew nothing of the Platonic and Stoic philosophy, and who would hear nothing between 150 and 180 was based upon the short formula of Matt. xxviii. 19. The acknowledgment of the supernatural conception of Jesus, by which his pre-existence was vaguely but indubitably presupposed, was considered sufficient to distinguish the true Christian from the strict Jewish-Christians and those who in Christ admired only a second Socrates; while, on the other hand, the acknowledgment of a real birth by a woman, and a real human life in accordance with the prefigurements of the prophets, formed a bar against Gnosticism.

During this state of incipiency, a multitude of various christological views began to germinate, co-existing, at least for a time, peacefully side by side. In spite of their multitudinousness, however, they may all be reduced to two formulas,—either the one: either "ος πριν το θεον ("in the same manner as of God," II. Clem. ad Cor., 1.).'

It was, however, not an anxiety with respect to the divine dignity of Christ, which, in the second century, was called for the first time. At the beginning of the second century, the Logos-christology: it was an anxiety with respect to monotheism. For was it not open atheism, when worship was claimed for two divine beings? Not only uneducated laymen were forced to think so, but also those theologians who knew nothing of the Platonic and Stoic philosophy, and who would hear nothing between 150 and 180 was based upon the short formula of Matt. xxviii. 19. The acknowledgment of the supernatural conception of Jesus, by which his pre-existence was vaguely but indubitably presupposed, was considered sufficient to distinguish the true Christian from the strict Jewish-Christians and those who in Christ admired only a second Socrates; while, on the other hand, the acknowledgment of a real birth by a woman, and a real human life in accordance with the prefigurements of the prophets, formed a bar against Gnosticism.

During this state of incipiency, a multitude of various christological views began to germinate, co-existing, at least for a time, peacefully side by side. In spite of their multitudinousness, however, they may all be reduced to two formulas,—either the one: either "ος πριν το θεον ("in the same manner as of God," II. Clem. ad Cor., 1.).'

It was, however, not an anxiety with respect to the divine dignity of Christ, which, in the second century, was called for the first time. At the beginning of the second century, the Logos-christology: it was an anxiety with respect to monotheism. For was it not open atheism, when worship was claimed for two divine beings? Not only uneducated laymen were forced to think so, but also those theologians who knew nothing of the Platonic and Stoic philosophy, and who would hear nothing between 150 and 180 was based upon the short formula of Matt. xxviii. 19. The acknowledgment of the supernatural conception of Jesus, by which his pre-existence was vaguely but indubitably presupposed, was considered sufficient to distinguish the true Christian from the strict Jewish-Christians and those who in Christ admired only a second Socrates; while, on the other hand, the acknowledgment of a real birth by a woman, and a real human life in accordance with the prefigurements of the prophets, formed a bar against Gnosticism.

During this state of incipiency, a multitude of various christological views began to germinate, co-existing, at least for a time, peacefully side by side. In spite of their multitudinousness, however, they may all be reduced to two formulas,—either the one: either "ος πριν το θεον ("in the same manner as of God," II. Clem. ad Cor., 1.).'

It was, however, not an anxiety with respect to the divine dignity of Christ, which, in the second century, was called for the first time. At the beginning of the second century, the Logos-christology: it was an anxiety with respect to monotheism. For was it not open atheism, when worship was claimed for two divine beings? Not only uneducated laymen were forced to think so, but also those theologians who knew nothing of the Platonic and Stoic philosophy, and who would hear nothing between 150 and 180 was based upon the short formula of Matt. xxviii. 19. The acknowledgment of the supernatural conception of Jesus, by which his pre-existence was vaguely but indubitably presupposed, was considered sufficient to distinguish the true Christian from the strict Jewish-Christians and those who in Christ admired only a second Socrates; while, on the other hand, the acknowledgment of a real birth by a woman, and a real human life in accordance with the prefigurements of the prophets, formed a bar against Gnosticism.

During this state of incipiency, a multitude of various christological views began to germinate, co-existing, at least for a time, peacefully side by side. In spite of their multitudinousness, however, they may all be reduced to two formulas,—either the one: either "ος πριν το θεον ("in the same manner as of God," II. Clem. ad Cor., 1.).'
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modalistic Monarchianism cannot be carried through without straining the texts on which it is based.

I. THE ALOGIANS. — The first opponents to the Logos-christology, the so-called "Alogians" in Asia Minor, were undisputed members of the Church, and were treated as such by Hippolytus and Irenaeus. They only left their congregations with a later development of Catholicism, that Epiphanius found out they were heretics: it was also he who gave them their name. The starting-point of their opposition was the Montanist prophecy, which they rejected. They rejected, indeed, all prophecy as a still existing charisma; but in doing so they were only more catholic than the Church itself. Their disbelief, however, in an age of the Paraclete, led them into a criticism of the writings of St. John; and the result was, that they rejected both his Gospel and the Apocalypse, possibly, also, his Epistles. The Gospel, they ascribed to Cerinthus; the Apocalypse, they ridiculed. But, rejecting the Gospel of St. John, they did not condemn them.

Irenaeus, in his Against Heresies, described the Alogians as a sect which might be drawn from their tenets; but they did not condemn them.

Under Victor's successor, however, Zephyrinus (199-218), his pupil, Theodotus the money-broker, probably also a Greek, attempted, in connection with Asclepiadotus, to form an independent congregation, and found an independent church, in Rome. A certain Natalius, a native of Rome, and a confessor, was, for a monthly salary of a hundred and seventy ducats, induced to become the bishop of the new church; but he was afterwards, by visions of "holy angels," who whipped him while he was sleeping, forced back into the bosom of the great Church. Twenty or thirty years later on, a new attempt at reviving the old Monarchian christology was made by Artemas; but he seems not to have identified himself with the Theodotians. Very little is known of him, however. He was still living about 270, as proven by the decision of the synod of Antioch against Paulus of Samosata.

Generally speaking, the dynamic Monarchs of Rome present the same realistic character as their brethren, the Alogians of Asia Minor. They studied Aristotle and Theophrastus, Euclid and Galen; but they neglected Plato and Zeno. They substituted the grammatico-historical method for the allegorical in the interpretation of Scripture; and, as foundation for their Bible study, they employed a very sharp text-criticism. With respect to the canon they were perfectly orthodox. They accepted the writings of St. John, which, however, simply means that the canon of the New Testament in which those writings were contained had now been firmly and finally established. But they remained an army of officers, without any rank and file. For their text-criticism, their grammar, their historical researches, the mass had no sense. Their church in Rome waned away, leaving behind no trace of itself; and it took about seventy years before the school of Antioch was strong enough to throw the dogmatics of the church into one of the most violent crises it ever had to go through.

LIT. — The principal sources are the Syntagma of Hippolytus, represented by Epiphanius (54), Philastrius (50), and Ps.-Tertullian (28); his Philosophumena (71. 35, x. 23); his fragment against Noetus (c. 3); and, most important of all, the so-called Little Labyrinth, an excerpt preserved by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V. 28), dating back to the fourth decade of the third century, and by many ascribed to Hippolytus. See also Kapp: Hist. Arianiz. 1879, and the literature given at the end of the first division.

III. PAULUS OF SAMOSATA. — By the Alexandrian theology of the third century, the dogmatical use of such ideas as ἄγας, Ἐας, λόγος, etc., was not only made legitimate, but indispensable; and, at the same time, the view of the essential nature of the Saviour, as being not human, but divine, became more and more prevalent. Though Ebionitic elements were still found in the intricate christology of Origen, they were present only in a latent and ineffective state; and, though he himself taught a Godhead in Christ, to which he withheld the divinity of Christ was only a power communicated to him. It is not known how many adherents he found in Rome, but the number was probably small. Nevertheless, he was excommunicated by Victor between 189 and 199.
after his death, Paulus of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, that is, occupant of the most illustrious episcopal chair of the Orient, undertook once more to emphasize the old view of the human personality of the Saviour, in opposition to the prevailing doctrine. The next occasion of the controversy is not known, but was at that time, Antioch did not belong to the Roman Empire, but to Palmyra. Paulus was vicegerent of the realm of Zenobia. To reach such a man was no easy task. Through a common provincial synod, over which he presided himself, it could not be done. But, during the Novatian controversy, the experiment of a general Oriental council had been successfully tried, and it was now repeated. The two first councils, however, failed to accomplish the condemnation of Paulus: at the third, probably in 208, he was excommunicated, and Domnus chosen his successor. But, by the support of Zenobia, and the war that ensued, he had not at once destroyed his influence. On the contrary, under the three following bishops of Antioch, Lucian stood at the head of the rising Antiochian school of theology, and he taught in the spirit of Paulus. Yet, in the persons of the great Antiochian Fathers, Paulus may, indeed, be said to have been condemned a second time; and how long the dynamic Monarchianism lived on in Asia Minor may be seen from the christology of the author of the Acta Archelai.

The Christology of Paulus is characterized by the total absence of all metaphysical speculation, instead of which he employs only the historical research and the ethical reflection. Essentially it is simply a development of the christology of Hermes and Theodotus, only modified in its form by accommodation to the prevailing terminology. The object of the Antiochian party was to vindicate, not only to keep silent, but even to retract. A representation of the individual system of Praxeas cannot be given, on account of the scarcity of the sources. It is, nevertheless, evident that a development had taken place from the Noetians to those Monarchians against whom Hippolytus and Tertullian wrote. The former were stilled in extenso; out only fragments were extant in extenso; out only fragments have come down to us, in Eusebius: "Hist. Eccl., VII. 27-30; Justinian: Tract. e. Monophysit.; Contestatio ad Clerum C. P.; the acts of the Council of Ephesus; Leontius Byzanitis: Adv. Nestor et Eugych., etc.—all gathered together by Booth, in Red. Sacr., iii. Important are also the testimonies of the great Fathers of the fourth century,—Athanasius, Hilary, Epaenest, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, etc. See Feuerlin: De haeresi P. S., 1741; Ehrlich: De erroribus P. S., 1745; Schwab: Diss. de P. S., 1889.

IV. The Modalistic Monarchians in Rome and Carthage (217-250). Epigonus, Kleomenes, Praxeas, Victorinus, Zephyrinus, Kallistus. In the period between 180 and 240, the most dangerous opponents to the Logos-christology were not the dynamic, but the modalistic Monarchians, known in the West as Monarchiani or Patripassians; in the East, as Sabelliani; though the name Patripassian was used there too. They taught that Christ was God himself incarnate, the Father who had assumed flesh, a mere modus of the Godhead: hence their name. Tertullian, Origen, Novatian, and Hippolytus wrote against them.

Like the dynamic Monarchians, the modalistic arose in Asia Minor and brought the controversy to Rome, where, for a whole generation, their doctrines formed the official teachings of the Church. Noetus was the first of this group of Monarchians who attracted attention. He was a native of Smyrna, taught there, or in Ephesus, and was excommunicated about 210. Epigonus, a pupil of his, came to Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, about 200, and founded there a Patripassian party. At the head of that party stood, afterwards, Kleomenes, and then, after 215, Sabellius. The latter was vehemently attacked by Hippolytus, but had the sympathy of the great majority of the Christians in Rome: even among the clergy Hippolytus was in the minority. Bishop Zephyrinus tried to temporize, in order to prevent a schism from taking place: and his successor, Kallistus, or Callixtus (217-222), adopted the same policy. But the controversy grew so hot, that the Pope was compelled to interpose. Kallistus chose to excommunicate both Sabellius and Hippolytus, and draw up a formula of reconciliation, as the expression of the views of the true Catholic Church; and, indeed, the formula of Callixtus became the bridge across which the Roman congregation was led towards the hypothesis-christology.

It is a curious circumstance, that Tertullian, in his polemics against the Monarchians, never mentions the names of Noetus, Epigonus, Kleomenes, and Kallistus; while, on the other hand, the name of Praxeas, against whom he chiefly directs his attack, does not occur in the numerous writings of Hippolytus. The explanation seems to be, that, when the controversy was at its highest in Rome, Praxeas had been forgotten there, while Tertullian might still find it proper to start from him, because he had been the first to bring the controversy to Carthage. Praxeas was a confessor from Asia Minor. In Rome he met with no resistance; but when, in Carthage, he began to expound his Patripassian views, in opposition to the Logos-christology, he was by Tertullian compelled, not only to keep silent, but even to retract. A representation of the individual system of Praxeas cannot be given, on account of the scarcity of the sources. It is, nevertheless, evident that a development had taken place from the Noetians to those Monarchians against whom Hippolytus and Tertullian wrote. The Noetians said, "If Christ is God, he must certainly be the..."
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Father; for, if he is not the Father, he is not God." And this very same passionate vindication of pure monotheism is also found among the later Monarchians. But when the Nortians went further, and declared, that, if Christ had suffered, the Father also had suffered, the Father and Son were one Person, the Father, the later Monarchians avoided this Patri-passian proposition by recognizing a difference of subjectivity between the Father and the Son.

LIT.—HIPPOLYTIUS: Philosophumena; TERTULLIAN: Adv. Praxeum; PSEUDO-TERTULLIAN (30), Epiphanius (57), Philastrius (53-54), and the literature given after the art. CALIXTUS I. See also LANGEN: Geschichte der röm. Kirche, Bonn, 1881, pp. 192-216.

V. Sabellianism and the Later Monarchianism.—During the period between Hippolytus and Athanasius, Monarchianism certainly developed several different forms; but this whole various development was, by the writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, comprehended under the one term, "Sabellianism." The consequence is, that it would be very difficult to point out in details the propositions which actually made up the individual system. He was probably a Libyan by birth, and stood, even in the time of Zephyrinus, at the head of the Monarchian party in Rome. By Kallistus he was excommunicated, but the excommunication produced only a schism. His party was too strong to be communicated, but the excommunication produced only a schism. His party was too strong to be at once suppressed: it lived on in Rome until the time of Zephyrinus, and sided, as was natural, with Hippolytus. But that circumstance had, no doubt, something to do with his condemnation by Pontianus in 231 or 232; and the hints which he himself throws out, about bishops who can make no difference between the Father and the Son, are, no doubt, aimed at the bishops of Rome. It was, however, in another direction, Origen had to encounter the Monarchians. In Bostra in Arabia, Bishop Beryllus openly taught Monarchianism. His brother-bishops of the province remonstrated with him, but in vain. Then Origen was invited, in 244, to hold a public disputation with him in Bostra, and he succeeded in converting him. Unfortunately, the acts of that synod have perished.

The principal tenet of Sabellius says, that the Father is the same as the Son, and the Son the same as the Spirit: there are three names, but only one being. That being he of exercises designating as 

— an expression which he had no doubt chosen in order to prevent any misunderstanding with respect to the strict monothelism of the system. Nevertheless, Sabellius taught that God was not Father and Son at the same time; that he had been active under three successive forms of energy (προϊμα), — as the Father, from the creation of the world; as the Son, from the incarnation in Christ; and as the Spirit, from the day of the ascension. How far Sabellius was able to keep those three forms of energy distinct from each other cannot be ascertained. It is probable that he could not help ascribing a continuous energy (in nature) to God as the Father, even while the energy was active as the Son or as the Spirit. However that may be, the doctrine of three successive forms of energy was at all events a step towards that formula, the Athanasian formula, which was the mark of Monarchianism superfluous, and founded Trinitarianism.

LIT.—Besides some sporadic but very important notices in the works of Origen and Athanasius, the principal sources are HIPPOLYTIUS (Philosophumena), EPHESIUS (51), and PHILASTRIUS (54). See also ULLMANN: De Berbilo, 1836; FOCK: De Christol. Berbili, 1843; ZAHN: Marcellus, 1897. [See UNITARIANISM.]

ADOLF HARNACK.

MONASTERY and MONASTICISM. Monasteries, as the establishment of monasticism in the form of a social institution, or, in the plain sense of the word, as the abode of a community of monks, arose very early, and developed rapidly into one of the most prominent features of Christian life. The later history of the development is tolerably clear in all its movements, but the origins are rather obscure.

I. ORIGIN OF MONASTICISM.—According to a tradition based upon the statements of Jerome and Rufinus, and generally accepted, monasticism arose among the Christian ascetics in the third century. Now, we know the Christian ascetics of the second and third centuries very well,—their fastings and their abstinence from marriage (Athanas. Hspt. 28; Tertul. De cult. fem., 1. 9; Origen. Contra Celsum, VII. 48), their self-sacrificing care for all sick and destitute during the persecution of Diocletian (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 10, 11). But we know, also, that they lived in the world in close connection with the congregation; and when, towards the close of the third century, they attempted to select domicilia singulares, and insulate themselves from the congregation, the attempt produced much astonishment and dissatisfaction, as may be seen from the De singularitate clericorum 31, ascribed to Cyprian. Consequently, from the Christian asceticism pure and simple, monasticism has not directly developed: nor are there any traces of its existence in the third century.

Paulus of Thebes, "the first hermit," is said to have retired to a hidden grotto in the Lower Thebais, about the middle of the third century, and to have lived there for half a century, unknown to the world. Jerome wrote his life; but Jerome's book is simply an imitation of those novels so fashionable in Rome at his time,—an echo of Apuleius, a kind of religious Robinson Crusoe, well spiced with piquant devotion. To claim historical existence for the hero of that book is entirely out of the question; but it might be surmised that some such character, an anchorite from principle, might have existed at that time. Bishop Narcissus of Jerusalem, for instance, has been mentioned. But he left his congregation, simply because he felt indignant at some infamous calumny; and, when he returned, he was admired, not for his philosophy, or for the long seclusion he had endured, but for the miraculous punishment which had overtaken his calumniators (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VIII. 9). Those have been mentioned, who, according to a letter from Dionysius of Alexandria to Fabian of Antioch (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VIII. 92), fled into the desert in order
to save their life during the persecution of Decius. But Dionysius speaks only of such as actually saved their life, and returned, and of such as perished under the attempt, but of none who remained in the desert as anchorites. Still more confused is the word "martyr," which can be for the whole question of the origin of monasticism, if the existence could be proved, not of some single anchoret, but of whole monastic associations, during the third century. The Hierakites and the Therapeutae have been mentioned; but the former have not the character of monks, and the latter not the character of Christians. The Hierakites were simply the pupils or adherents of Hierakas; and the words of Epiphanius (Haer. 47) do by no means warrant a representation of them as a formally instituted union of ascetics. The Therapeutae are spoken of only in the book τοῦ Βιβλίου τῶν Ἐραναγῶν. They never existed. They are evidently a mere fiction. But the question is, whether that fiction mirrors some other real existence in the Christian world, a question which no doubt must be answered with "no." When the book on every occasion argues from an alleged discovery of all men and all things, it describes the existing inequality (as, for instance, that between master and slave) as the true cause of all evil, it flatly contradicts one of the fundamental ideas of the Christian Church of the first three centuries; and, when it describes the sacred rites of the Therapeutae, it often becomes half absurd and half offensive from a Christian point of view. The book, which probably was written shortly after the time of Philo, originated among the agitations of which the Judeo-Hellenic world at that time suffered, and has no reference to Christianity. See Keim: Urchristentum, 1878; Lucius: Die Therapeutae, 1879.

Descending from the third to the fourth century, in order to discover the first traces of Christian monasticism, the two first great authorities which must be consulted are Eusebius of Caesarea and the Life of St. Anthony (Vita Antonii). Eusebius finished his Church History in 324; but neither in that work, nor in his Life of Constantine, and Eulogy of Constantine, written between 337 and 340, is the subject ever mentioned. In his Demonstrationes Evangelicae, I. 8, he makes a distinction between a higher and lower form of Christian life; and the former is generally considered as referring to monasticism. But the distinction is simply that between "knowledge" and "faith" which formed one of the fundamental doctrines of the Alexandrian school. Eusebius knew nothing of a Christian monasticism, because there was as yet nothing to be known of it; and it was, indeed, not until after his death, after the middle of the fourth century, that a rumor of the Egyptian anchorites began to spread into Asia Minor, — as seen from the writings of Gregory Nazianzen and Basil of Caesarea, — while at the same time they entered into communication with Athanasius. The report that the latter, on his flight to Rome in 340, was accompanied by Egyptian monks, is a mere fiction. With respect to the Vita Antonii, first written in Greek, then translated into Latin by Eusmius, and very early incorporated with the works of Athanasius (in its Greek form), and ascribed to him, two questions present themselves: first, Is it history? next, Was it written by Athanasius? but both must be answered in the negative. Between the plain frame-work of the book, the biography of Anthony and its theoretical part, the speeches and conversations with which it is adorned, the discrepancies are irreconcilable. The Coptic monk must be for the whole Christian world, the Greek philosopher who quotes Plato and Origen, the coarse recluse who never washed himself, and the delicate saint who blushes when anybody sees him eating, will not harmonize in one character. The hero is a psychological impossibility. And when to this circumstance is added the absolute silence of Eusebius about the whole affair, the historical character of the book must be given up. Nor is the authorship of Athanasius better established; though it has been warmly defended by Bellarmin, Natalis Alexander, the Benedictines, Hase, and others. The wild and fantastic confusion of the book, when compared with the crystalline clearness and sublime mental repose of the author, such as he is known from his other works, produces an open self-contradiction. The whole doctrinal system of Athanasius would have to be modified in order to assimilate the demoniacal nature, and the demoniacal nature between the monks and the clergy is represented very differently in the Life of St. Anthony and in the inadmissible genuine works of Athanasius. In the former the monks profess the sincerest devotion to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and place themselves on a lower and humbler stage than the clergy; while from the latter we learn that the monks often were in opposition to the hierarchy, and generally looked down upon the clergy. Under such circumstances, the external evidences of the authorship of Athanasius must be perfectly irreproachable in order to be decisive; but they are not. In his Eulogy of Athanasius (380), Gregory Nazianzen directly ascribes the book to him; but in the very same year he happened, in his Eulogy of Cyprian of Carthage, to confound that great Christian Father with the heathen sorcerer, Cyprian of Antioch. In literary questions, Gregory Nazianzen is no great authority. Jerome also ascribes the book to Athanasius, but only in his later works: when he first mentions it, he does not seem to know the author. Now, of course, it is not the idea to deny the existence of St. Anthony altogether, but only to deny the historical accuracy of the representation given in the Vita Antoni. Indeed, the only legitimate inference which can be drawn from that book is, that monasticism originated in Upper Egypt, towards the middle of the fourth century, but nothing more. What else is told of monasticism and monasteries in the time of Constantine is later fiction.

Singularly enough, the genuine works of Athanasius give no information at all about the origin of monasticism; and when, after his second exile, in 346, he entered into closer communication with the Egyptian monks, his Historia Arianorum ad Monachos shows that monasticism has already spread through the whole country. Some information is found in the works of Rufinus and Palladius, both of whom had lived for some time among the second generation of Egyptian monks; but neither the one nor the other is reliable, when speaking of what he pretends to have seen with his own eyes, and heard with his own ears; and
the unreliability increases, of course, when investigation and research become necessary to the treatment of a subject. It is impossible, however, to pass from Eusebius and Athanasius to the Vita Antonii and the monks of Jerome, without being struck by the difference. It is an entirely new and strange world which opens up to the reader, and he seeks to know how much of this ascetic life is held forth to him; and when an attempt has been made to explain that ideal as a direct development of the asceticism which already existed in the primitive Christian Church, caused by such extraordinary circumstances as the persecutions of Decius and Diocletian, the attempt has been utterly baffled by the decisive circumstance, that not one of the numerous hermit lives from the fourth or fifth century can be put in any historically possible connection with the persecutions. Hence, already Mosheim was prepared to seek for the origin of Christian monasticism outside of Christianity. E. Meyer. Now we learn from Porphyry, and his extracts from Chairemon, that in the Egyptian temples, and wholly secluded from the people, there lived a kind of ascetics, who slept on palm-leaves, ate no meat, drank no wine, never laughed, etc. Furthermore, Philostorgus tells us that Apollinus of Tyana visited the Egyptian wise men in the mountains of the Upper Nile, where they lived naked, and always on the point of starvation. Finally, the recent decipherment of the Greek papyrus-rolls in the libraries of London, Paris, Leyden, and the Vatican, presents us with a full picture of those ascetics, or penitents, or monks, who belonged to the worship of Serapis. (See Letronne: Matériaux pour l'histoire du christianisme en Egypte, 1832; and Brunet de Prese: Mémoire sur le Sérapium de Memphis, in the Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions, i. ser. tom. ii., 1832, and Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits, etc., 1845.) Next to the worship of Isis, that of Serapis occupied the most prominent place in the Egyptian religion. We know of no less than forty-two Serapis temples in Egypt, of which the most celebrated seem to have been those of Heliopolis and Alexandria. In the Serapistyles, there lived, completely secluded from the world, whole congregations of monks. After giving away their property to the poor, they retired to the temple, where they lived upon the bread which their relatives brought to them. The purpose of this renunciation was wholly ethical,—the purification of the soul; and, as the whole form of the asceticism of the Serapis monks corresponded peculiarly well with the sombre character of the Egyptian worship of the dead and the graves, they were much revered by the Egyptian people; indeed, like the bulls of Apis, they were considered as incarnations of the deity. No wonder, then, that, when Christianity became the popular religion of Egypt, that peculiar form of Egyptian religious life, but one in which a deep popular instinct had found its adequate expression, silently glided into the Christian Church. Just as the Christian stylistsaints of the fifth century were a mere imitation of the stylistsaints of the Syrian Astarte, so the Christian monks of the fourth century were a simple imitation of the Egyptian monks of Serapis. It might be difficult to point out any thing specifically Egyptian in the original Christian monasticism; but it would be equally difficult to point out any thing specifically Christian in the phenomenon. The highest moral ideal of original Christian monasticism was complete dying away from the world of the senses, complete anāsīta. But that ideal has not one single Christian feature in its character, not one. (See, for the least trace of Christian life, which Christianity originally conquered the world, not the slightest connection with the Pauline doctrine of living and dying with Christ; and, when Gregory Nazianzen undertakes to praise the Christian monasticism at the expense of the asceticism of the Greek philosophy, he can, indeed, make none other distinction between them, theoretically or practically, than a quantitative one: there were a thousand monks, where there was one philosopher. Thus it becomes probable, that, in its origin, Christian monasticism is not a Christian product at all, but a direct development from the previously existing Egyptian monasticism.)

That the Christian monasticism in its first form was Coptic, and not Hellenistic, may be inferred from the very names of the first monks: Paphnutius means, in Coptic, "the divine;" Pachomius, "the eagle;" Sosennas, "agriculturists;" Remouch, "peasants." The organization of the anchorites into large communities is generally ascribed to Pachomius, who himself had been a Serapis monk. (See Revillout: Le reclus du Sérapium in Revue égyptologique, 1880.) The Greek designations of such an institution are, besides laïs (see Laura), paierung and savibion, of which the former refers to the house, the latter to the association (Cassian: Collat. xviii. 18): the Latin are monasterium, conobium, claustrum, consentium, etc. The organization seems to have been almost military in its regularity and severity. Nevertheless, its success was very great; though, of course, the stories of Rufinus and Palladius, about monastical paradies with ten thousand monks and twenty thousand virgins, are mere fables, utterly incompatible with the actual state of affairs in the country. H. WIEGARTEN.

II. HISTORY OF MONASTICISM. — From Egypt the institution spread to Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, and, with less success, to Northern Africa. In the Occident, Italy, with Milan and Rome, took the precedence; next followed the islands along the coast of Italy and Dalmatia; then Southern Gaul, with its celebrated monasteries at Turonum, Massilia, Pictavium, etc. An influence similar to that which Basil the Great exercised on Eastern monasticism, Western monasticism received from Monte Casino, founded in 529. From that time the movement pursues a double course, partly following the track of the Christian missionary among the heathen nations, partly endeavoring to keep alive and satisfy certain instincts within the Church itself. Monasteries were founded all along the frontier of Christendom, like fortresses, to defend the conquered territory, or like colonies, to bring fresh soil under cultivation; and monasteries were founded at the very centre of civilization in the great cities, forming an outlet for the strong impulses of asceticism and penitence. Never completely incorporated with the ecclesiastical organization, nor ever wholly absorbed by the civil organization, the monastery occupied a peculiar intermediate social position.
position, which must never be lost sight of during the study of its history. Its relation, however, to the Church, was the closest, and most intimate; and from the Church and her councils it received its constitution. The Council of Chalcedon, 451, decreed that the monastery and its abbot should be under the authority of the patriarchal bishop, who alone was allowed to perform the acts of ordination, consecration, and confirmation, or Pope, was that of Chalmy, 1063.

The monastery culminated together with the Papacy. Its development received a most powerful impulse from the foundation of monastic orders. Hitherto each single monastery had been a unit by itself; belonging, it is true, to a certain diocese, etc., but not, therefore, maintaining any kind of connection with any other monastery. Now, the Cluniacenses formed a union, not of monks, but of monasteries; and that arrangement was then adopted by the Cistercians, the Mendicants, etc. Thus arose huge organizations, which stretched their colonies across many countries, without weakening the connection between the members and the centre. The constitutions adopted by these orders were different, — sometimes more aristocratic, sometimes more monarchical. In the Cistercian order the mother-monastery enjoyed the precedence of age. There the chapter-general assembled; hence the visitors were sent forth; but, in the formation of a resolution, all abbots had equal votes. In the mendicant orders, the centre was not placed in the local starting-point, but in the elected general, who resided in Rome, and ruled through provincial and priors. At the same time that this change took place in the organization of the monastic institution, an equally important change took place in its functions. The mendicant orders received the most comprehensive ecclesiastical privileges. They were allowed to hear confessions, ordain priests, etc., and, above all, to take part in the organization of the Church. The Cistercian order, for instance, decreed that the monastery and its abbot should be under the authority of the parochial bishop.

On approaching the middle ages, all relations of the institution become more intricate. The Church became dependent on the State: even her bishops and synods succumbed to secular influences. Nor did the monasteries escape the danger. They increased in number and reputation, but were, nevertheless, dragged into the vortex of violent changes which characterized the age. They became rich. To the produce of their soil were added magnificent donations. But their very wealth made them a welcome prey to jealousy and avarice. In the sixth and seventh centuries, the bishops began to levy such exorbitant taxes on them for ordination and consecration, that the councils had to step in, and free them from such unjust burdens (Concil. Tolet., X. can. 3). Of course, the relation between episcopacy and monastery developed differently in the different countries. In England and France, the monks became independent: the hierarchy had grown strong before the monks came; and there it took a long time before the monasteries could begin to emancipate themselves. Some monasteries of great fame, such as those of St. Gall, Reichenau, St. Emmerau, etc., entered into open contest with their bishops, but in vain. National monasteries obtained real independence; they acquired only a certain measure through exemptions and privileges granted them by the princes or the popes. When a prince was the founder of a monastery, it was only natural that he should place it under his special protection. But, while he might be willing enough to defend it against any encroachments from the side of the bishop, he did, generally, not hesitate to utilize it for his own advantage, appointing some favorite or unruly vassal lay abbot of it, or even abandoning it to be plundered by some troublesome creditor. At what period the intimate connection between the monastery and the bishop of Rome began, it is difficult to decide. Gregory the Great was their warm friend; but the Privilegium S. Medardi, ascribed to him, is, like many other documents of the same kind, evidently a forgery of the monks. Even the grant of Pope Benedict the Ninth for the monastery of Fulda is very doubtful. The first reliable instance of a pope granting great immunities to a monastery is that of Pope John XV. and the abbey of Hereford and Corvey; and the first monastery which really became independent of the episcopal authority by placing itself immediately under the Pope was that of Clonard, 1063.

The monastic architecture; though a regard to the visions of all kinds had to t>eat hand. The constructions. Partly for the sake of perfect seclusion, but also as a means of defence, the whole structure was surrounded with a wall. On the ground-floor were the refectory, the guest and...
MONASTICISM. See Monastery.
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MONEY AMONG THE HEBREWS. From the earliest time the Hebrews used as money pieces of metal, to which a fixed weight was assigned, so as to make them suitable for the various articles presented in trade (Gen. xxiii. 16; cf. also 2 Kings xii. 4 sq.), and which were recognized as such, either in an unwrought form, or from certain characters inscribed upon them. The representative coinage was the shekel, originally meaning "weight.

There were also the half-shekel, the Maccabean part and fourth part of the shekel (1 Sam. ix. 8).

From Josh. vii. 21, Judg. xvii. 2-4, we may suppose that the shekel was not a weighed mass, but a certain piece of metal, used as a representative of property, and medium of exchange. That larger sums, the correct weight of which was of great importance, were weighed again, is but natural (Gen. xxxii. 16; Exod. xxi. 17; 2 Sam. xviii. 12; 1 Kings xx. 39; Jer. xxxix. 9). The shekel was of sliver: hence the word "shekel" is often omitted, and only the metal itself is mentioned (Gen. xx. 16, xxxvii. 28, xlv. 22; Judg. ix. 4, xvi. 5, xvi. 2-4, 10; 2 Sam. xviii. 12, 1 Kings x. 29; 2 Kings vi. 25). It was used in trade; e.g., in buying and selling of real estate (Gen. xxii. 15, 16; 2 Sam. xxiv. 24; Jer. xxxii. 7), of slaves (Gen. xxxvii. 28; Hos. iii. 2). It was used for various purposes; e.g. for payment of debts (1 Kings xv. 19; Neh. v. 15, x 32; Exod. xxxii. 18, xxxviii. 26; 1 Mac. x. 40, 42), as estimation of vows (Lev. xxxvii. 8-7; Num. iii. 47), as amount for damages and expiation (Gen. xvi. 16; Exod. xxxi. 32; Deut. xxxi. 19, 29), as reward for services rendered (Judg. ix. 4, xvi. 5, xvii. 10; 2 Sam. xviii. 11, 12; Zech. x. 12), as lease-money (Song of Sol. viii. 11), and as a present (Gen. xiv. 22). The value of certain articles was expressed by shekels (Lev. v. 15; 2 Kings vi. 25).

From the common shekel is distinguished "the shekel of the sanctuary." (Exod. xxxii. 24, xxxvii. 24-26; Lev. v. 15, xxxvii. 8; Num. iii. 50, vii. 13, 19 sq., 86): its weight was twenty gerahs (Exod. xxx. 13; Lev. xvi. 25; Num. iii. 47, xviii. 16; Ezek. xii. 14). The half of the "shekel of the sanctuary" was called bekah (Exod. xxxvi. 28), and was equal in weight to the common shekel.

There existed also the third part of a shekel (Neh. x. 32) and the fourth part of a shekel (1 Sam. ix. 8). [The value of the (silver) shekel was about forty-four cents of American money.]

For larger sums existed the manah, or pound (as in the Authorized Version, Ez. ii. 60; Neh. viii. 71, 72), which was equal to fifty sacred, or one hundred common, shekels; also talents, or kikkar (1 Kings xvi. 24; 2 Kings v. 5, 22, 23; xv. 19), equal to three thousand shekels. Both the manah and talent were weighed (1 Kings xxi. 39, 40; Esth. iii. 9). Another coin was the kiriath (Gen. xxxii. 10; Josh. xiv. 35; Job xli. 11), the meaning of which is obscure. Bertheau supposes it to be a signification for coins in general, whilst Gesenius values the same at four shekels.

During the exile the Jews undoubtedly made use of the monetary system then current in Babylonia; whilst after the exile they availed themselves of Persian coins, as may be seen from 1 Macc. xxvii. 27, ii. 69, Neh. vii. 70-72, where darics (rendered "drachms"), a Persian gold coin, is mentioned. [Their value corresponded to about five dollars of American money.]

Under the Seleucids, Greco-Syrian coins were used by the Jews, till the time of B.C. 143) of Simon the Maccabaeus, who received of Antiochus VII. (Sidetes), the son of Demetrius Nicanor, the right of coining money...
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(1 Macc. xv. 6). Of such Maccabean coins some are still extant, with inscriptions in ancient Hebrew characters. Besides these Asmonean coins, there also existed coins of bronze, made by Herod and his successors, and small coins of bronze in the first Roman emperors, from Augustus to Nero, which are regarded as having been stamped in Judea. Side by side with these genuine Jewish coins, Greek money was continually circulated. Thus, not only in the time of the Maccabees, but also in the time of Jesus, the drachma (about eightpence) was current (Luke xv. 8, 9). Later Jews valued the shekel at four didrachmas (Joseph., Antt. III. 8, 2): hence the didrachma, or double drachma, was asked as tribute-money, in place of the legal half-shekel (Matt. xxvii. 24; Joseph., Wars. VII. 6, 6). Another Greek coin was the stater of gold and silver, equal to a Hebrew shekel, and given as tribute-money for two persons (Matt. xvi. 27). The smallest Greek coin was the lepton, the sixteenth part of the denarius; and (3) the quadrans, the quarter of an assarion (Matt. v. 46). Abraham and Jacob buy from the few indications we have. Thus a ram valued the shekel at four didrachmas; the amount for services rendered was (according to Judg. xvii. 10; Mark xvi. 15). Its worth was about eightpence halfpenny. (2) The assarion, or farthing (Matt. xxv. 29; Luke xii. 6), a copper coin, the sixteenth part of the denarius; and (3) the quadrans, the quarter of an assarion (Matt. v. 26; Mark xii. 42; Luke xxii. 32). As to the worth of money among the ancient Hebrews, its standard was very high, judging from the few indications we have. Thus a ram was estimated two shekels of silver (Lev. v. 15); [or about one dollar and nine cents]. A fine Egyptian horse was bought for a hundred and fifty shekels (1 Kings x. 29; 2 Chron. i. 17). Two sparrows were bought at the time of Jesus for one assarion (Matt. x. 29), and five for two assaria (Luke ii. 6). Abraham and Jacob buy an acre of land for four hundred shekels (Gen. xxiii. 15, 16, xxiv. 34). David purchased Araunah’s threshing-floor at fifty shekels (2 Sam. xxv. 24); and Omri buys the hill Samaria for two talents of silver (1 Kings xvi. 24). A slave was redeemed at thirty shekels (Exod. xxi. 32), which seems to have been the usual price paid for slaves, and the Jews paid thirty pieces of silver for the betrayal of Jesus (Matt. xxvii. 15; cf. also Zech. xi. 12). The amount for services rendered was (according to Judg. xvii. 10) ten shekels of silver by the year, and a suit of apparel, and victuals. Tobit pays the servant of his son one drachma daily; and laborers were paid a drachma (denary) a day (penny in E. V., Matt. xx. 2).

LIT. — MIONNET: Description de médailles antiques, vol. 5 (1811), and suppl. vol. 8 (1837); BÖCKI: Meteorologische Untersuchungen über Geschichte, Monatsflächen und Masse des Alterthums, Berlin, 1838; BERTRAND: Zur Geschichte der Inschriften, Göttingen, 1842, pp. 5-49; CAVEDONI: Bibiliche Numismatik (trans. into German from the Italian by WERLHOF, Hanover, 1855); LEVY: Geschichte der jüdischen Münzen, 1862; MADDEN: History of Jewish Coinage and of Money in the Old and New Worlds, London, 1864 (new ed., 1884), and his art. in the Numismatic Chronicle, 1866, pp. 8 sq.; 1872, pp. 1 sq.; DE SAULEY, in the Revue numis-
The result was, that the Mohammedan fanaticism very soon could institute persecutions against the Christians, and the Roman-Catholic mission was brought to an end. Some missionary work was also done in the khanates of Kiptschak and Dshayatai, but without any effect. Most successful was the Christian mission among the Mongols in China. Nestorian congregations, numbering about 30,000 souls, existed from old times in the country; and, when the Mongolian dynasty ascended the throne, Roman-Catholic missionaries took up the work. John of Monte Corvin was sent to Peking by Pope Nicholas IV. He preached in the native tongue, converted about 6,000 people, and was in 1307 made archbishop of Peking by Clement V. But he did not succeed in converting the dynasty. The Mongolian princes, like most of their subject countrymen, became Buddhists in China. Finally, in 1370, the Mongolian dynasty was overthrown by the Ming dynasty; and, shortly after, the Roman-Catholic mission was expelled from China. W. HEYD.

MONHEIM, Johannes, b. at Clausen, near Elberfeld, 1509; d. at Düsseldorf, Sept. 20, 1584. He studied at Cologne, and was appointed rector of the school at Essen in 1532, and of that of Düsseldorf in 1545; which latter institution he brought into the most flourishing condition, so that it far surpassed most of the German universities in number of pupils. Originally Monheim belonged to the Erasmian camp, but gradually he completely adopted the doctrines of the Reformation. His Catechism (1580) is nothing but a condensation or abbreviation of Calvin's Institutiones, and was vehemently attacked by the Cologne Jesuits. They also accused him before the Pope, the emperor, the Council of Trent, etc.; and the great teacher spent the last years of his life under very trying circumstances. C. KRAFFT.

MONICA, or MONNICA, the mother of Augustine; b. about 332; d. at Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber, May 4, 387. Her parents are said to have been Christians. She was married at an early age to Patricius, a Pagan of Tagaste, to whom she bore three children,—Augustine, Navigius, and an unnamed daughter. Her husband was apparently coarse, unsympathetic, choleric, and unfaithful; but such was her beautiful Christian life, that she was the means of his conversion. He was baptized in 371, and shortly thereafter died. Monica shared Patricius' ambition respecting Augustine's career as a scholar, but was deeply grieved when he abandoned the Catholic faith. For many years she followed him with her prayers, and at last made the journey to Milan to be with him. There the one wish of her life was met. Augustine was converted 386, and was baptized by Ambrose, Easter (April 25), 387. Monica shared the society of the little company of friends Augustine had gathered around him immediately before and after his baptism, and added much to the spiritual value of their intercourse. After the purpose of their meeting was accomplished, viz., his conversion and baptism, they set out for Africa. On the way, Monica fell sick, and died. As the mother of the greatest of the Latin church Fathers, and as herself a wise, loving, and Christian woman, she will always be remembered. Many a mother will derive comfort from her life, and faith to believe that the sons of prayer will not perish.

In 1430 her remains were removed by Pope Martin V. from Ostia to Rome, and buried in the Church of St. Augustine. Her most imperishable monument, however, is the Confessions of her illustrious son, who has written of his unflagging conduct with a candor unsurpassed, and who ends his biography of his mother with an outburst of sorrow over her death, and a prayer for her eternal welfare. To be mourned by such a man was praise enough. There is, indeed, as Pressensé says, "no one in the ancient church more worthy of our affectionate veneration" than Monica. See BRAUNE: Monnici a. Augustinus, Grimma, 1848; SCHAFF: Life and Labors of St. Augustine, New York and London, 1854; BUTLER: Lives of the Saints, May 4; MRS. JAMIESON: Legends.

MONOD, Adolphe, beyond dispute the first pulpit orator of the Protestant Church of France in our century; was b. in Copenhagen, Jan. 31, 1802; d. in Paris, April 6, 1856. He was the fourth of the twelve children of Jean Monod, pastor of the French Church at Copenhagen, and, after 1808, in Paris. The son, after studying at the College Bonaparte in Paris, went to Geneva, where he graduated in theology in 1824. But he did not yet fully rest upon the great facts of the gospel. He became conscious of the revelation of divine grace to himself on a journey to Italy in 1825. He became founder, and remained pastor, of the Protestant Church in Naples till 1827. He was then called to Lyons; but his evangelical preaching, and especially a sermon upholding the necessity of a Christian faith and life to partake of the communion, (Qui doit communier?) aroused such opposition, that he was deposed by the Catholic minister of education, before whom he was accused by the consistory. Monod did not forsake Lyons, but began preaching in a hall, then went to a chapel, and labored so effectually, that the results of these labors remain in a large church (served by two pastors) and several chapels. In 1836 he followed a call to a professorship in the theological seminary of Montauban, and continued to labor there for eleven years, spending his vacations preaching to large audiences in the churches of Southern France. At the end of this period, he was called as pastor to Paris, where for nine years he preached to large and eager congregations in the Oratoire.

Adolphe Monod was distinguished for his eloquence, but especially for the purity and piety of his life. He was gifted with a clear intellect, vivid imagination, and a sympathetic nature. His theology was drawn from the Bible, of which he was a constant student, and which he read daily in the original. He was every inch a Christian. From the moment that he was apprehended of Christ, he devoted his whole heart and energies to his service. The purity of his Christian character was transparent. His conscientiousness was sometimes almost painfully exact, and his humility was apparent to all. He was, moreover, a man of prayer, to which he had constant recourse as a remedy against melancholy, to which he was somewhat inclined.

As a preacher, Monod's aim was to save men from destruction. His sermons were essentially biblical, and by the full treatment of the texts, and the earnestness, fervor, unctiousness, and modesty of the preacher, won and persuaded the hearts of
his hearers. His style was pure and classic; his voice melodious, full, and clear; so that one would have gone away with only an impression of beauty, had it not been for his earnestness. His first three printed sermons appeared in 1830; and in 1844 a volume appeared, the first sermon of which, entitled *La crédulité de l'incrédule*, covering sixty-eight pages, is a masterpiece of apologetical sermonizing. Many more of his sermons appeared; but the finest of all were two on the vocation of woman, and five on the apostle Paul. In his last sickness, two volumes of his sermons appeared (1855), and since then two more.

Monod's last days were days of much pain on a sick-bed. He knew his hour was at hand; but brighter shone forth his Christian character, and stronger was the hold his faith took on Christ. Every Sunday afternoon he gathered his friends about him; and, after listening to the reading of Scripture, he uttered short homilies of great power, which were afterwards collected in the volume, *Adieux d'Adolphe Monod à ses amis et à l'Eglise*. He passed away on a Sunday. Well knew Professor De Félice said, "Adolphe Monod was twice over the first of the Protestant preachers of France in our day,—first for the excellency of his oratorical genius, and then for the holiness of his life. In the midst of the instability of religious life, every one looked to him, as the sailor in the storm, at the lighthouse." L. BONNET.

The following translations into English have been made of Monod's writings: *Saint Paul, Five Discourses*, Andover, 1861; *Woman, her Mission*, etc., London, 1870; *The Parting Words of Adolphe Monod to his Friends and the Church*, New York, 1873.

**MONOD, Frédéric**, elder brother of Adolphe Monod; a devoted and distinguished pastor in France; was b. May 17, 1794, at Monnáz, Canton de Vaud, Switzerland; d. Dec. 30, 1893, in Paris. He studied theology in Geneva (1815-18), and came under the influence of Robert Haldane. In 1820 he became an associate pastor in Paris, where he edited, with great talent, the *Archives du Christianisme*. In 1848, when the synod refused to make an explicit affirmation of the faith of the Church, he withdrew from the State Church, resigned his position at Paris, and founded, with Count Gasparin, the Union of the Evangelical Churches of France (l'union des églises évangéliques de France). He made a trip to the United States in 1855, to collect money for a church-building in Paris, and returned to France, having accomplished the object of his mission. During the American civil war he was a staunch friend of the Union cause. He was one of the chief instruments in the religious awakening of France, and left behind him an example worthy of imitation.

**MONOPHYSITES.** See Christ, MONOPHYSITES.

**MONOPHYSITES,** those who held the doctrine that Christ had but one composite nature. The christological statement of the Chalcedonian synod of 451, based upon the famous letter of Pope Leo I., and pursuing an intermediate course between Nestorianism and Eutychianism, was intended to be a compromise between the two. In 455, the bishops of the East in council at Constantinople to announce his accession, they carried with them grave admonitions to the Emperor Zeno,
and severe reproaches to the Patriarch Acacius. But, before they reached Constantinople, they were seized, deprived of their papers, and frightened into abject compliance with the schemes of Anastasius. On the contrary, the hostility became ever more pronounced, when, in 491, Anastasius succeeded Zeno as emperor. Before his accession to the throne, he had committed himself to the Monophysites; and his partiality to them finally caused riots and bloodshed in Constantinople. In order to appease the orthodox party, the emperor promised to convocate an ecumenical council, which should settle the whole question, and resolve the dispute, which had completely broken up in 517. (See Mansi: Concil. Coll., viii. 324, 388, 524; and Jaffé: Reg. Pontif., 101.) A great change took place, however, when Justin I. ascended the throne, in 518. He was a mere tool in the hands of his nephew, Justinian; and Justinian belonged to the orthodox party. In Constantinople, in Jerusalem, in Tyre, and in many other places in the East, the friends of the synod of Chalcedon once more came to the front. The negotiations with Rome were reopened; and, without great difficulties, the Patriarch Johannes of Constantinople was induced to erase the name of Acacius from the diptychs,— the chief condition of a reconciliation. The Henotikon was not mentioned at all in those negotiations. It was quietly buried; and thus community was re-established between the churches of Rome and Constantinople. Rome had conquered, and she used her victory with energy: she immediately set to work to have orthodoxy re-established in Antioch and Alexandria.

It proved impossible, however, to eradicate Monophysitism. Especially in its home, Egypt, it was too powerful to be subdued: it had to be managed. Such was also the plan of Justinian, who in 527 succeeded Justin on the imperial throne. But, in the mean time, the arrogance of Rome had everywhere called forth a re-action; and at the imperial court the Monophysite party formed once more, under the protection of Theodora, the wife of Justinian. Petrus of Apamea, Zaraas, Anthimus of Trebizond, and other Monophysite leaders, lived in Constantinople; and, by the intrigues of Theodora, Anthimus was even made patriarch after the death of Epiphanius, in 535. For a moment, the wrath of the emperor was once more turned against the Monophysites by the visit of Pope Agapetus II; but Anthimus was deposed, and Meonas appointed his successor. But Agapetus died in Constantinople, 538; and his successor, Vigilius, placed on the pontifical throne by Theodora, and kept there by Belisarius, was himself a Monophysite. Though he publicly professed submission to the decrees of the synod of Chalcedon, he sent a secret confession of faith to Anthimus and other Monophysites, in which he rejected the doctrine of two natures in Christ, etc. (See Liberatus: Breviarium, 22.) In the last year of his life, the emperor was even induced by Theodora to sanction the extreme Monophysite views of the Aphthartodocetae; and he was prepared to force those ideas on the Church, when he suddenly died, 565. Justin II. his successor, dropped the matter, and took up a somewhat different attitude in the controversy. In the sixth year of his reign, when the Monophysites had lived for about forty years in and about the capital, un molested, and even recognized, persecutions were instituted against them. Their churches were closed; their bishops and priests were imprisoned, their monasteries inspected, and the inmates compelled to take the sacrament in the churches of the orthodox. The persecutions were at no period so severe, but they lasted till the time of the Emperor Mauritius and the Patriarch John Jejunator. Meanwhile, the Monophysite party had itself split into several fractions. The above-mentioned Aphthartodocetae held that the body of Christ was made incorruptible by its union with his divine nature; while another fraction went still farther, and declared that the body of Christ had not been created, but had existed from eternity. Thus the contest with the Orthodox Church had lost much in interest, and consequently in ardor; and the result was, that the Monophysites gradually and quietly separated from the Orthodox Church,— the State Church,— and formed independent churches,— the Armenian, Jacobite, Coptic, Abyssinian, etc. (For the dogmatical development of the controversy and the pertaining literature, see article on Christology.) W. MöLLER: MONOPHYSITES, those who held that Christ had but one will, as he had but one nature. Monothelism was the simple and natural consequence of Monophysitism, and originated from the endeavors which the State Church made, in the seventh century, of conciliating the Monophysites. The Emperor Heraclius (610-641), pressed as he was on the one side by the Persians and on the other by Islam, had a vital political interest in the reconciliation; and in the Constantinopolitan patriarch Sergius, a Syrian by birth, and probably of Jacobite descent, he found an eager ally. The principal objection of the Monophysites to the Chalcedonian Confession it seemed possible to meet, without infringing upon the doctrine of two natures in Christ, by an adroit development of the idea of one divine-human energy in Christ, in which the two natures melted together; and it was with that tool in their hands the emperor and the patriarch Sergius, during his stay in Armenia, in 622, Heraclius opened negotiations with Paulus; and, though the latter hesitated, some years later a union between the State Church and the Armenian Church was actually brought about at the synod of Charrnium. In 628, during his visit to the Lazians, Heraclius succeeded in gaining Bishop Cyrus of Phasis for the new doctrine and the
union; and when, in 628, he returned from a victorious campaign against the Persians, bringing back the true cross to Jerusalem, he entered into communication with the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, Anthanasius. The Orthodox patriarch of Antioch, Anthanasius II., had died in 609 or 610, and his chair had remained vacant since that time. The emperor now proposed to elevate Anthanasius to that see, on the condition of his recognizing the Chalcedonian Confession, such as explained by the new doctrine. Anthanasius accepted. Shortly after, in 630 or 631, Cyrus of Phasis was appointed bishop of Alexandria; and in 633 he reported to Constantinople that thousands of Monophysites were by the new doctrine won for the union. In Alexandria, however, the first opposition arose. A monk, Sophronius, a native of Damascus, who had lived for some time in Rome, came to Alexandria, and was much startled by the new doctrine, which he designated as rank Apollinarianism. He immediately repaired to Constantinople; but Sergius and Pope Honorius succeeded in appeasing him for a time. The remarkable letter which the pope on that occasion wrote to Sergius is still extant in a Greek translation (Mansi: Con. Coll., xi. 537), and proves, beyond doubt, that he was a Monothelite; that is, a heretic. Shortly after Sophronius was elected bishop of Jerusalem; and the official announcement of that event he accompanied with a confession, the so-called Syllogos (Mansi: Con. Coll., xi. 537), and the expression of a double will in Christ. In order to prevent any further discussion of the subject, the emperor issued in 638 a kind of encyclical letter, which it should be permitted to speak both of a single and of a double will in Christ. A true peace, however, was not obtained; and when, in 678, the Emperor Constantine Fugonatus invited Pope Agatho to participate in a great oecumenical council, which should settle the whole question, he received for a long time no answer at all. Finally, Honorius, finding that he was unable to accomplish anything, was opened in the imperial palace, Trullus, in Constantinople: it lasted till Sept. 16, 681. The Monothelite views were defended by Macarius of Antioch, who derived his chief arguments from the writings of Honorius, Sergius, and Cyrus: the dyothelite views were defended by the Roman legates, and they finally conquered. March 28, 681, Monothelism was formally condemned by the council; and Honorius, Sergius, Cyrus, and others were anathematized. From that day, dyothelism became the official doctrine of the Orthodox Church, both in the East and in the West; and in the eighth century it found a most subtle exponent in John of Damascus. Monothelism continued, however, to be professed by all the Monophysite churches; but all the attempts which afterwards were made of introducing it in the Orthodox Church failed. [For the dogmatical development of the controversy and the pertinent literature, see art. CHRISTOLOGY.] W. MOLLER.

MONSTRANCE (Latin, monstrantium, monstrum, ostensorium, espositurium) denoted originally any receptacle in which relics were shown off to the people. From the thirteenth century, however, when the doctrine of transubstantiation had been defined, the elevation of the host introduced as a part of the mass, and the festival of Corpus Christi established, the name was restricted for the receptacle of the consecrated host. The form was first that of a Gothic tower; afterwards, during the period of the renaissance, that of a radiant sun; in the Greek Church, that of a coffin. The materials were gold or silver, or some costly stuff. The place of the monstrance was the high-altar of the church. No one but an ordained priest was allowed to touch it. To steal it was punished with death.

MONTAIGNE, Michel Eyquem de, b. at the Château Montaigne, in the department of Dordogne, France, Feb. 28, 1533; d. there Sept. 13, 1592. He studied law, and was in 1554 appointed councillor to the Parliament of Bordeaux, but retired in 1569, after the death of his father, to his estate, and devoted himself to the study of philosophy. Once more, however, he was called
Montalembert. Charles Forbes René, Count de, b. in London, April 15, 1810; d. in Paris, March 12, 1870. He was educated in England by his grandfather, James Forbes; and the great Irishman O'Connell seems to have exercised considerable influence on his development. In 1828 he accompanied his father to Stockholm; and while there he made his literary debut by a remarkable article on Sweden, in the Revue Françoise. In 1830 he joined Lamennais as contributor to the Avenir; and a campaign was opened against the educational monopoly of the state and the university, for the purpose of bringing the whole popular education into the hands of the Roman-Catholic clergy. In connection with Lamennais and Lacordaire, he founded a free school, in which he himself taught; but the school was immediately closed by the police. As peer of France, he was cited before the Chamber of Peers; and Sept. 19, 1831, he defended his cause in a most brilliant speech. He was sentenced, however, to pay a fine; and the school remained closed. A still heavier blow was struck at him by the papal encyclical of Aug. 15, 1832. He stood as one of the leaders of that peculiar movement which endeavored to unite ultramontanism in the Church with radicalism in the State; but the encyclical disapproved in very severe terms of the whole movement. Dec. 8, 1834, Montalembert gave in his profession of unconditional submission, retired from public life, and went travelling. During his stay in Germany, he became deeply engaged in the study of medieval literature and art, the results of which were Du Vandalisme et du Catholicisme dans l'Art et Vie de Ste. Elisabeth. After his return to France, he again took a very active part in political life. The reforms of Pius IX. he hailed with great enthusiasm, also the revolution of 1848. But he was soon disenchanted both by the Pope and the emperor, and the last part of his life he devoted to literary pursuits. In 1854 his Histoire des Montanistes d'Occident (6 vols.) began to appear, translated into English by Mrs. Oliphant (Monks of the West, Edinburgh, 1861-67, 3 vols.); but it was never completed. It is a plea in a case, rather than an historical representation; for as an historian the author lacked the critical faculty, as, in practical politics, he lacked judgment. He had eloquence and enthusiasm. Among the interests which called forth his sympathies was the civil war in the United States; and "his last pamphlet was a hymn of triumph over the success of the Union arms" (La victoire du Nord aux États-Unis, Paris, 1865, Eng. trans., Boston, 1866). He earnestly opposed the papal-infallibility dogma, and, by so doing, won only abuse from the church which he had so faithfully served. He submitted, however, when the dogma was promulgated. An edition of his complete works appeared in 9 vols., Paris, 1861-65. His last work was written by Augustin Cochin (1870), A. Perraud (1870), and Ch. Foisset (1877). See also Mrs. Oliphant: Memoirs of Count de Montalembert, Edinburgh and London, 1872, 2 vols.

Montanism. About the middle of the second century (in 166, according to Epiphanius: Hier., c. vii, 1) Montanus appeared as a new prophet in Phrygia, at Ardaban on the frontier of Mesia, and found many adherents, among whom were Alcibiades and Theodotus. Under him, also, prophetesses appeared,— Priscilla and Maximilla. Prophecy was, indeed, the most prominent feature of the new movement. Ecstatic visions, announcing the approach of the second advent of Christ, and the establishment of the heavenly Jerusalem and the consummation of the prophetic gift of the apostolic age. In spite of the sensation it created and the discussion it caused, the movement remained for a long time within the pale of the Church; but as it grew in strength, penetrating from Asia Minor into Thrace, it naturally roused a stronger opposition, and, in several places, synods were convened against it. Some persons considered it to have been caused by a demon, and employed exorcism against it, such as Sophocles of Anchialus, Zoticus of Comane, and Julian of Apamea. Others attacked it in a literary way, such as Claudius Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and Miltiades. Gradually the very contrast to it developed,—a party which rejected all Christian prophecy, and even denied the authenticity of the Gospel according to John on account of the Paraclete therein promised. At last, towards the close of the eighth century, it became necessary for the Montanists to separate from the Orthodox Church in Phrygia, and form a schismatic congregation, organized by Montanus himself, which, however, did not stop the vehement literary polemics carried on against them by Serapion, Theodotus, and the Anonymous.
The first time the Montanists are spoken of in Western Europe is in those letters, which, during the persecution of Marcus Aurelius, the confessors of the congregations of Lugdunum and Vienna sent from their prisons to Asia Minor and Rome. Between Asia Minor and the Gallic congregations there existed very intimate relations. Among the martyrs of Lugdunum and Vienna were several Praxepans. The principal object of the letters was, consequently, simply to inform the Christians of Asia Minor and Prysigia of the sufferings which their brethren in Gaul had endured. But, according to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V. 1), a kind of statement was added to the letters, of the view which the Gallic congregations took of the Montanist prophecy; and the presbyter Irenaeus, who carried the letters to Rome, was enjoined to beg the Roman pope, Eleutherus, to continue in peaceful communication with the Asiatic congregations. Characteristically enough, Eusebius omits the statement; but every thing seems to indicate that the view it contained was very kind and mild. Now, in his book Adversus Praxepum, Tertullian speaks of a Roman pope, who, in contradiction to his predecessors, felt inclined to make peace with the Phrygian and Asiatic congregations, and recognize the prophecy of the Montanists, but was persuaded by the calumnies of the Monarchians and Montanists to change his mind, and condemn Montanism. That Roman pope was probably the very same Eleutherus (174-189) to whom Irenaeus was sent; and a condemnation of Montanism by Eleutherus would go far to explain the harsh measures which his successor, Victor, chose to employ in the paschal controversy. A Montanist congregation was at all events not formed in Rome; but the Montanist views of church discipline took, nevertheless, root there, and came more than once in conflict with the somewhat laxer practice of the Roman popes.

Condemned in Rome and in its native country, Montanism found a new home in North Africa, and its most prominent representative in Tertullian. He adopted all its views, and further developed them. The speedy advent of Christ, and the establishment of the millennium, are the fundamental ideas of his theology. A Christian church, which governs the world by slowly penetrating it, he does not understand. The living gift of prophecy, according to the divine plan of salvation, constitutes the true mediator between the times that are and the coming millennium; and the true preparation from the side of the Church is the establishment of a moral discipline which forces her members away from the whole merely natural side of human life. Science and art, all worldly education, every ornamental or gay form of life, should be avoided, because they are tainted by Paganism. The crown of human life is martyrdom. Fasts were multiplied, and rendered more severe. The second marriage was rejected, and the first was not encouraged.

Against a mortal sin the Church should defend itself by rigidly excluding him who committed it, for the holiness of the Church was simply the holiness of its members. With such principles, Tertullian could not help coming into conflict with the Catholic Church. To him the establishment of the millennium, are the fundamental ideas of his theology. A Christian church, which governs the world by slowly penetrating it, he does not understand. The living gift of prophecy, according to the divine plan of salvation, constitutes the true mediator between the times that are and the coming millennium; and the true preparation from the side of the Church is the establishment of a moral discipline which forces her members away from the whole merely natural side of human life. Science and art, all worldly education, every ornamental or gay form of life, should be avoided, because they are tainted by Paganism. The crown of human life is martyrdom. Fasts were multiplied, and rendered more severe. The second marriage was rejected, and the first was not encouraged.

Against a mortal sin the Church should defend itself by rigidly excluding him who committed it, for the holiness of the Church was simply the holiness of its members. With such principles, Tertullian could not help coming into conflict with the Catholic Church. To him the establishment of the millennium, are the fundamental ideas of his theology. A Christian church, which governs the world by slowly penetrating it, he does not understand. The living gift of prophecy, according to the divine plan of salvation, constitutes the true mediator between the times that are and the coming millennium; and the true preparation from the side of the Church is the establishment of a moral discipline which forces her members away from the whole merely natural side of human life. Science and art, all worldly education, every ornamental or gay form of life, should be avoided, because they are tainted by Paganism. The crown of human life is martyrdom. Fasts were multiplied, and rendered more severe. The second marriage was rejected, and the first was not encouraged.
MONTES PIETATIS

MONTES PIETATIS (Italian, Monte di Pietà; French, Mont de Piété, Table de Prêts) were a kind of charitable institutions where poor people could obtain small loans, on the security of pledges, without paying any interest. The first institution of this kind was founded by the Minorite Barnabas at Perugia, in 1484, for the purpose of rescuing poor people from the claws of the usurpers: it was confirmed by Paul III., not, as often said, by Leo X. From the States of the Church it was extended to France, Germany, Engeland, and Spain. Where the State has taken the control of the institution, a small interest is generally paid, sufficient to defray working expenses.

MONTESQUIEU, Charles de Secondat, Baron de, b. at the Château La Brède, near Bordeaux, Jan. 18, 1689; d. in Paris, Feb. 10, 1755. He studied law; was appointed councillor to the Parliament of Bordeaux in 1714, and became its president in 1716, but resigned his office in 1726, and devoted himself wholly to study and literature. After travelling for several years in Germany, Italy, and England, in order to make himself acquainted with the state of social and political development in those countries, he settled at La Brède, from which he only made occasional visits to Paris. In 1721 appeared his Lettres persanes; in 1734, his Considerations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et leur décadence; and in 1748, after twenty years' preparation, his Esprit des Lois (of which twenty-two editions were sold in eighteen months), Eng. trans. by Thomas Nugent, new ed., Cincinnati, 1873, London, 1878, 2 vols.; and of all his works, London, 1777, 4 vols. The best collected edition of his works are those of Lefèvre (Paris, 1816, 6 vols.) and Lequieu (Paris, 1819, 8 vols.). Montesquieu is generally mentioned among the so-called "Encyclopédistes," and he was, indeed, a contributor to the Encyclopédie Française, but spiritually he differed very much from that coterie. Though not a theologian, he was a student of religion, and well aware of its decisive influence on the character and history of a people. He accepted the doctrines of the immortality of the soul and of a divine revelation in Scripture, and his contempt of atheism was as pronounced as his contempt of superstition. His principal influence, however, he exercised, not on the science of religion or morals, but on social and political science.

MONTFAUCON (Montfaliconius), Bernard de, b. at Soulages, a village of Southern France, Jan. 15, 1655; d. in Paris, Dec. 31, 1741. He entered the army in 1672, and made two campaigns in Germany under Turenne, but joined the Congregation of St. Maur in 1675, after the death of his parents, and took the vows, May 18, 1676, in the monastery La Daurade in Toulouse. Having resided for some time at Sorèze (where he studied Greek), at La Grasse, and Bordeaux, he went in 1687 in St. Germain-des-Près, the literary centre of the order. In 1688 he published his Analecta Graeca; in 1690, his La vérité de l'histoire de Judith; and in 1698, his excellent edition of Athanasii Opera Omnia, 8 vols. fol., with biography and critical notes. He then went to Rome, where he stayed for three years; and while there he published with brilliant success his Vindiciae editionis S. Augustini a Benedictinis adornata against the attacks of the Jesuits. As shown by his Diarium Italicum (Paris, 1702), his visit to Italy considerably widened his studies, drawing also the monuments of antiquity within their range. The results thereof were, Palaeographia Graeca, 1708 (a masterpiece, by which he at once founded and perfected a new department of science); Bibliotheca Cistianae, 1715; L'Antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures, 1719, 10 vols. fol. (with about 40,000 illustrations): Les Monumens de la monarchie françoise, 1729-33, 5 vols. fol. (unfinished). Meanwhile he did not neglect his work as an editor, publishing his Collectio nova Patr. Græc., 1709, 2 vols. fol.; Hexaexplorum Origenis qua super, 1713, 2 vols. fol.; and J. Chrysostomi Opera Omnia, 1718-38, 13 vols. fol. See Tasseux: Hist. litt. de la cong. de St.-Maur, 685-616. GEORG LAUBMANN.

MONTFORT, Simon de, one of the leaders of the fourth crusade; protested against the employment by the Venetians of the crusading army in their war with the Byzantine Empire; and finally separated from the crusaders, and went on his own hook as a pilgrim to the Holy Land. By Innocent III. he was made leader of the crusade against the Albigenses; beginning his career with the capture of Béziers (July 22, 1209), where every living soul was slaughtered, and ending it by the siege of Toulouse (June 25, 1218), where he was struck by a stone, and killed. He was one of the most cruel and unscrupulous soldiers known to history; but he was daring and dashing, and fanatically attached to Romanism. He has, consequently, by Roman-Catholic writers been exalted as the true champion of Christ; and his followers even reproached God with his death. See his biography in Guizot: Mémoires relatifs à l'Histoire de France.

MONTGOMERY, James, an English religious poet and hymn-writer; b. at Irvine, Ayrshire, Nov. 4, 1771; d. at Sheffield, April 30, 1854. His father was a Moravian missionary; and both he and Mrs. Montgomery died at Barbadoes in 1793, while the son was at school in Fulneck, the chief Moravian settlement in England. He resisted the thought of becoming a clergyman, and was apprenticed to a grocer in Mirfield. Running away, he became a shop-boy at Wath, Yorkshire; from there went to London, and, after returning to Wath, finally settled at Sheffield (1792), where he became proprietor and editor of a paper,—The Iris. In 1789 he was sentenced to prison for three months, and to pay a fine of twenty pounds, for having printed a poem,—The Bastille,—surrounded by a woodcut representing Liberty and
the British Lion. He was soon after again sent to prison for six months, on account of reflections upon a colonel of militia, published in his paper. In spite of these exhibitions of judicial condemnation, when he retired from the editorial care of his paper, in 1826, he was entertained at a public banquet, and at his death received the honors of a public funeral. In 1830-31 he delivered a series of lectures, on poetry and literature, before the Royal Institution. In 1846 a life pension was settled upon him, of a hundred and fifty pounds. Like Cowper, he was never married. He made no public profession of religion till his forty-third year, when he united with the Moravians, but ever afterwards prominently advocated the work of missionary societies and other Christian institutions. He was eminent for his piety; a character in whom was as much of the beauty of holiness as it is given to any one mortal to attain and exhibit. (Dr. A. P. Peabody, in North-American Review, 1887.)

Mr. Montgomery was one of the best sacred poets of his day; and although Jeffrey, in 1807 (Edinburgh Review), condemned the shallow taste which read his poems, and prophesied speedy oblivion for their author, Southey, Professor Wilson, and others, spoke enthusiastically of the blending of piety and a fine imagination in his productions. Professor Wilson, in Blackwood's Magazine, said, "His poetry will live, for he has heart and imagination profound. . . . Montgomery, of all the poets of this age,— and we believe, also, out of Moravian missions, 1819, etc. Mr. Montgomery is now known chiefly by his hymns, which have passed into all collections. Many of them first appeared in newspapers, and were collected in The Songs of Zion, being Imitations of the Psalms, 1822; The Christian Psalmist, or Hymns, Selected and Original, Glasgow, 1825; and Original Hymns for Public, Private, and Social Devotion, London, 1853. Among his best are the missionary hymns, "O Spirit of the living God," "Hail to the Lord's Anointed" (read by the poet at the close of a speech at a missionary meeting in the Wesleyan Chapel, Liverpool, April 14, 1822, and put by Dr. Adam Clarke, who was presiding, in his Commentary on Ps. lix.), the fine advent hymn, "Angels from the realms of glory," "Forever with the Lord," etc.

Editions of Mr. Montgomery's works were published between 1818 (3 vols.) and 1855 (4 vols.); a Memoir, with extracts from his writings and journals, by Holland and Everett, London, 1855-56, 7 vols.; and an abridgment of this work, by Mrs. Knight, Boston, 1857.

MONTGOMERY, Robert, an English religious poet; b. in Bath, 1807; d. at Brighton, Dec. 3, 1855. In 1828 appeared his poem, The Omniscience of the Deity (25th ed. 1856), which gained a rapid popularity; which was soon followed by other poems, as Satan (1829). In 1830 he entered Lincoln College, Oxford; took orders; was appointed curate of Whittingham, 1835; preacher at Percy Chapel, London, 1836, where his preaching was very popular, and preacher of St. Jude's Chapel, Glasgow, 1838. Among Montgomery's other numerous poetical works are, A Universal Prayer; Death; A Vision of Heaven; A Vision of Hell (1828, 4th ed., 1829); The Messiah (1832, 5th ed., 1842). His poems were the subject of a withering criticism by Macaulay (see Essays), but received the commendation of Southey. Collected edition of his Poetical Works, London, 1841-43, 3 vols. Mr. Montgomery also assisted in the translation of Nietzsche’s System of Christian Doctrine, 1849.

MONUMENTAL THEOLOGY denotes the study of artistic monuments of various descriptions,— inscriptions, coins, medals, staturies, paintings, architectural constructions, etc., so far as they are expressive of theological ideas. A mere glance at the mediaeval cathedral of Europe and the modern meeting-houses of America shows, that though, in the congregations which built those houses of worship, the piety may have been the same, the theology was certainly not; and a further comparison cannot fail to lead to a definite conception of the theological differences, since the very outlines of the structures show that they were made to meet different wants, built to realize different ideas. Thus, the study of the literary monuments of theology may at every point be aided by the study of the corresponding artistic monuments. In some cases it will be supplemented (a great portion of the history of the Church of Rome during its first centuries has been dug out of the Catacombs): in others it will be strikingly illustrated. It is impossible to visit, for instance, a royal burial-place in a Protestant country in Europe without being struck at the glaring difference between the tomb of the last Roman-Catholic prince and the tomb of the first Protestant prince; and an impression of what the Reformation was and meant will, like a stream of living blood, gush, with its vivifying power, through the shadowy ideas derived from the reading of the literary documents of the event. Intuition is the one great spiritual fertilizer. Two plain tombs in some out-of-the-way village cemetery—one from 1738, and one from 1888—may tell more impressively than any heavy volume could do, what rationalism and evangelicism really are, and how they affect human life.

It was the great excavations and comprehensive archaeological researches which were undertaken in Rome during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and more especially the works of Onufrio Panvinio (De praecipuis urbis Romae sanctioribus basilicis, 1554), and Antonio Bosio (Roma soterrae, 1692), which first drew attention to the theological importance of many artistic monuments: and already Baronius, in his Annales (1588-1607), not unfrequently derives his proofs from coins, paintings, etc. The enthusiasm with which classical archæology was studied from the very first days of the renaissance benefited also the study of ecclesiastical archæology. The great works of
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Montfaucon — *Antiquité expliquée*, 1719 (reaching down to the fifth century of our era), and *Les Monuments de tous les monarches francçois*, 1739—contain much of specific theological interest. Special art subjects of distinctive theological character, such as sacred painting, attracted general attention, and were frequently treated. (See Rohr: *Pictor errans*, Leipzig, 1679; and Ayala: *Pictor christianus*, Madrid, 1790.) When illuminated manuscripts were printed, the miniature pictures were reproduced. (See the Greek *Menologium*, edited by Cardinal Alboni, Rome, 1727, the Syrian *Evangelarium*, edited by Assemani, Florence, 1742, etc.) Indeed, in the second half of the eighteenth century, the artistic monuments of the Church become not only a recognized, but also a highly-valued portion, of the materials employed by the theologian, especially the church historian. (See Pelliccia: *De ecclesiapolilia*, 1777.) In the nineteenth century the study has been developed into an independent branch of the theological system. (See Piper: *Einleitung in die Monumentale Theologie*, Gotha, 1867.) Museums have been formed in Berlin, 1854, at Cologne, 1860, etc., and, though very rarely taught as a peculiar department, monumental theology everywhere receives great attention, both in lectures and textbooks. See J. F. Lundy: *Monumental Theology*, New York, 1876, new edition, 1881; J. N. Dietzfelder: *Theologie u. Kunst im Urchristenthum*, Augsburg, 1882; cf. art. by F. Piper, *Theologie, monumentale*, in the first edition of Herzog, vol. xv. pp. 752-807.

MONUMENTS are found among all peoples and in all ages. They are generally very simple, — a stone set up, or a heap of stones. Many such reminders of important events are mentioned in the Bible. Thus Jacob and Laban made a heap of stones to "witness" their covenant (Gen. xxxi. 45-46). Moses ordered the elders to set up stones on Mount Ebal, upon which the "law" was inscribed (Deut. xxxii. 2-4). Joshua fulfilled the request (Josh. viii. 32). Twelve stones out of the midst of Jordan, and twelve stones in the midst of Jordan, commemorated the passage (Josh. iv. 3, 9). Samuel and Saul erected stones in memory of victories (1 Sam. xxvii. 12; xxviii. 15). They were also erected in memory of the dead (Gen. xxxv. 20; 2 Kings xxi. 17). In old times, as now in the East, stones were thrown upon the graves of enemies (Josh. vii. 20, viii. 28); 2 Sam. xviii. 17). Heaps of stones also marked the way (Jeh. xxx. 2). (See Schrader: *Der babylonische Ursprung der siebenlagigen Woche*, in Studien und Kritiken, 1874.) But it is certain that their year was made up of twelve moon-months of twenty-nine and a half days. Some passages, however, as, for instance, the account of the age of Enoch (Gen. v. 23), indicate, that, at a very early time, the Hebrews were acquainted with the solar year; and it cannot have been a long time before they observed that the seasons depended on the revolution of the sun (according to old parlance), and not on that of the moon. The discrepancy between the solar and the lunar year they then smoothed over by means of an intercalary month. (See the art. YEAR.) The day of the return of the new moon was always, from the oldest times, a day of note, and is mentioned along with the sabbath in Amos viii. 5, 2 Kings iv. 23; but only the seventh new moon was celebrated as a special day of festival (Lev. xxviii. 34; Num. xxix. 1). All the great annual festivals, however, — Passover, Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles, the Day of Atonement, etc. — were celebrated on fixed days of the month.

Of the idea, so very common among the peoples of antiquity, that the moon was the cause of the dew, and generally exercised a mysterious influence on vegetation, there is no direct trace in the Old Testament; but passages like Ps. cxxi. 6, Matt. iv. 24, xvii. 15, show that the Jews and the Christians also possessed a connection between the moon and certain diseases. With respect to the worship of the moon, very old among the Shemitic peoples, — according to some, even older than the worship of the sun, — it was forbidden in Deut. iv. 18, xvii. 3. Nevertheless, Josiah put down a number of idolatrous priests who burnt incense to the sun and the moon and the planets (2 Kings xxii. 5); and Jeremiah complains (viii. 2) that there were people in Jerusalem who worshipped both the sun and the moon. Job xxxi. 27 speaks of another form of the moon-worship, — throwing kisses at her, instead of burning incense to her, which chimes well in with the general Shemitic idea of the goddess of the moon.

MOORE, Clement Clarke, LL.D., b. in New York, July 16, 1779; d. in Newport, R.I., July 10, 1863. His father was Benjamin Moore, of the diocese of New York (1748-1818). He was graduated from Columbia College, 1798; and from December, 1821, to June, 1856, he was professor in the General Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, New York City, — first of Hebrew and Greek, afterwards of Oriental and Greek, literature. The ground upon which the seminary now stands was his gift. He was the author of the first Hebrew lexicon published in the United States (*Hebrew and Greek Lexicon*, New York, 1809, 2 vols.), and of the famous ballad, familiar to American children, called the "Visit from St. Nicholas," beginning, "Twas the night before Christmas, when all through the house." He also edited a collection of his father's sermons, 1824, 2 vols.

MOORE, Henry, an early Wesleyan minister; b. in Dublin, Dec. 21, 1751; d. in London, April 27, 1844. He joined the Wesleyan movement, and in 1780 was an itinerant upon the Londonerry circuit; but later in London, as the constant companion of John Wesley, he did most efficient service. After Wesley's death, he figured promi-
nently in the discussions from 1791 to 1797 upon a permanent ecclesiastical organization, and personally favored the episcopal form. "He also defended the itinerant system, and the right of Wesleyan ministers to administer the sacraments. He was the last survivor of those whom John Wesley had ordained." He wrote, in connection with Dr. Coke, a Life of John Wesley (London, 1792), and alone, Life of John and Charles Wesley, and Memoirs of the Family (London, 1825, 2 vols.), Memoir of John Fletcher (New York, 1836), and of Mary Fletcher (London, 1817, 2 vols., New York, 1837, 1 vol.), and an Autobiography (1830). See Mrs. Richard Smith: The Life of Rev. Henry Moore, including his Autobiography, London and New York, 1844.

**MOORS.** See Spain.

**MORALITIES.** See Religious Dramas.

**MORAL LAW.** The meaning of the word "law," when applied to the sphere of moral action, is by no means identical with the juridical sense of the term. On the contrary, whenever an attempt has been made, theoretically or practically, at establishing perfect congruity between morality and legality, the results have proved disastrous; for the word "law" changes its sense as it moves from one sphere into another.

In nature and natural science, law means simply a formula expressing the invariable recurrence of the same effect from the same cause. It involves a necessity which admits of no exceptions,—a must which cannot be resisted. When rising from the realm of natural forces to the sphere of social agencies, the law may still be said to involve necessity, but only so far as, on the principle of justice, it is enforced by the state. The difference is apparent. While the laws of nature accomplish themselves, as inherent, constitutive elements of the very forces in action, the laws of the state can be accomplished only by the free will of man. Their necessity depends upon the power of compulsion and punishment which the state is possessed of,—upon something outside themselves. Their must is in reality simply a shall.

What law means stands the moral law; and yet it differs more widely from juridical law than does the latter from natural law. Juridical law recognizes the free will of man, but only as it recognizes any other natural fact. In principle it rejects it, being willing, under all circumstances, to transform its shall into a must, and, by compulsion and punishment, to enforce itself in spite of the freedom of the human will. Moral law, on the contrary, recognizes the free will of man, not only as a fact in nature, but as the very condition of its own realization. Under no circumstances can it dream of transforming its shall into a must; for where the shall begins there morality ends. Compulsion, punishment, and other means of enforcing a law, can reach the act only in its external manifestation, not in its inner motive and purpose; and there lies its morality. Even when moral law demands with absolute authoritative necessity obedience, it demands it in the same voice that obedience to it shall be the very manifestation of the freedom of the will.

But whence does this shall come? Is not its very existence an inextricable enigma? A feeling of compulsion is quite comprehensible when produced by external forces which affect the soul in a certain way. All our sensations come to us under this form. We are impressed from without; we become conscious of the impression; we feel that the act of consciousness is a necessary result of the impression: but that feeling of compulsion has nothing strange about it. Quite otherwise with the moral shall. It does not come to us from without; it cannot be reduced to an impression from some external object; and, what is still more extraordinary, in spite of its authoritative and obligatory character, it does not impress us with a feeling of compulsion. From the very depths of the soul it seems to rise; and it sounds like an appeal to our freedom, or, rather, like a hint at the right use of the freedom, accompanying its hints, as it were, with light shadows of pleasure and pain. How is it, then, to be explained?

Every creature has a purpose for which it was created, and which is expressed in its organization, and shall be realized in its life; and from the very purpose of man's existence and life, inherent in his organization, bodily and spiritual, the moral shall arises. It is the spark produced when the soul is touched by her own purpose. Representing the cost of all human movements, so far as that goal can be reached by free human activity, the moral shall indicates at every point what we have to do, or not to do, in order to develop in consistency with our own nature, and accomplish the purpose of our being; and, as we accept or neglect its hints, the shadows of pleasure and pain enter our conscience, and fill it with light or darkness. The sceptic, the sensualist, the materialist, may ask, How can such a thing as the purpose of human nature and of human life—that is, a thing which is not, but only shall be—produce a feeling, and make felt its own existence, though it is not existing? The answer cannot be given directly. But all those wants and cravings and impulses, on which organized life in general, the whole activity of plants, animals, and men, depends — what are they but movements of the inherent purpose of the organization towards realization?

**MORAL PHILOSOPHY** is a term generally used to designate philosophical ethics, in contradistinction from theological or Christian ethics. Its object is to find an absolute rule of conduct outside of religion, independent of divine revelation, in the very nature of man. The problem arose in Greece, when the Greek mythology (that is, the Greek religion) had lost its hold on the civilized portion of the people; and the Greek philosophy produced two typical solutions,—the Epicurean and the Stoic,—which, in the course of time, have exercised an incalculable influence, not only on ethical speculation, but on the practical morals of individuals, classes, and ages.

Both these systems agree in determining the happiness of the individual as the final goal of moral conduct; but, in the definition of what individual happiness is, they differ widely from each other. To the Epicurean, happiness is enjoyment, the greatest possible amount, consequently prudent, and even calculating; while to the Stoic, happiness consists in an inner self-sufficiency, which not only can afford to despise enjoyment, but which also enables to endure sufferings. Epi-
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Epicureanism (most easily accessible to the student through the works of Horace Lucretius, and Cicero, who, however, was not an Epicurean, but an eclectic) has always exercised its greatest attraction on men of a light and sanguine temperament, and found the most adherents among rich and artistic people. It is, however, not only the elegance and comfort of life which are deeply indebted to Epicureanism: also art, poetry, and science owe much to it. On the other hand, it has been the father of unspeakable debaucheries, and the cause of great ruin. Stoicism (most easily accessible through the works of Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius) attracts chiefly characters of a more serious and sombre hue, and has found its most eminent disciples among practical people, men of power, statesmen. Its influence on art, and even on science, has been comparatively small; but it has produced not a few great ideas, political, social, and moral, which Christendom has recognized and adopted.

In the history of Greek philosophy, the Epicurean and Stoic schools, respectively founded by Epicurus and Zeno, were preceded, the former by the Cybelean and, of the latter, by the cynic school (founded by Antisthenes). The centre of the whole development, however, is occupied by Plato and Aristotle; and especially the latter is of paramount importance in the history of moral philosophy. He also determines the highest moral end as happiness: he is, indeed, the father of the happiness-principle. But he defines happiness as activity, not as enjoyment or self-sufficiency,— as an activity which at every point hits the mean between two opposite excesses, such as is determined by the intellect. To him, man is principally a political being, and can realize his highest moral aims only in the state. Thus the individual becomes absorbed by the family, and the family again by the state; that is, morals become absorbed by politics. Though the direct influence of Aristotle on practical life may be rather small, all ethical speculation borrowed materials, from him.

The middle ages had, properly speaking, no moral philosophy. Though the forms, and, with some modifications, also the ideas, of the Aristotelian ethics, were retained by the schoolmen, the subject was generally treated as an appendix to dogmatics. (See ETHICS.) But the renewal of the study of antiquity, and the enthusiasm which the classical literatures, and more especially their philosophy, produced, soon called forth a desire to construct an independent philosophical foundation for the ruling moral code; and in the seventeenth century modern moral philosophy was fairly started by Hugo Grotius and Hobbes, though in an indirect way, and from a rather political point of view. The gross and outspoken materialism of Hobbes, amounting almost to a formal denial of all morals, gave rise to a vehement opposition; and, in the treatises of Cumberland and G. Cudworth, the idea of Grotius, that natural law as a part of divine law may be deduced a priori from the conception of human nature, and a posteriori from the fact of its universal acceptance, appeared in a more definite shape and with a more direct moral bearing. The moral law, they protest, is an inherent part of human nature; and it is inscrutable and authoritative, because, as a part of human nature, it is a creation of God. With Hobbes there began in England a very lively debate on moral philosophy, which has not yet ended, and which, especially in the eighteenth century, produced a very rich and varied literature. It is characteristic of this debate, that the question is not so much about the end of morals as about its sources,— Whence comes the feeling of duty? what is duty? Answered in various ways, the question generally leads to the assumption of a special moral organ,—a moral sense (Francis Hutcheson), a conscience. The existence of a moral sense, a conscience, cannot be doubted: but, unfortunately, the question is not thereby fully answered, because, irrespective of the different degrees of development, the moral sense is never perfectly alike in any two individuals; and when a longer interval, for instance, a period of some centuries, is allowed to intervene, conscience may give, and has given, completely contradictory decisions.

With Kant's "categorical imperative," moral philosophy made a great conquest. That principle broke the back of Aristotelianism, and utterly destroyed the reigning deism. It demonstrated obedience to duty, regardless of happiness, as a peremptory demand of reason. It determined, once for all, the whole subjective or formal side of duty; but of the objective side of the idea, of the contents of duty, it tells us nothing. One may learn from Kant to obey his duty: but he cannot learn what his duty may be, if he happens to be uncertain on that score. A principle was still wanting from which positive duty could be deduced with the same authority to reason as divine revelation exercises over faith. After the time of Kant, however, two remarkable attempts have been made of demonstrating such a principle, and establishing moral philosophy on a basis independent of religion; namely, Utilitarianism, and the application of the theory of Evolution to ethics: which two articles see.


MORAL THEOLOGY. See CASUISTRY.

MORAVIAN CHURCH, the name by which the United Brethren (Unitas Fratrum) are generally known.

I. HISTORY.—This church, which must not, as is often done, be confounded with the United Brethren in Christ, is a resurrection, in a new
form, of the Bohemian Brethren (q. v.), who flourished from 1457 to 1627 in Bohemia and Moravia, and from 1549 to 1700 in Poland. At the beginning of Luther's Reformation, they numbered about 400 parishes and 200,000 members, were using their own Hymnal and Catechism, and employing two printing-presses for the spread of evangelical literature. In the same of frequent persecution on the part of the Roman Catholics and Utraquists, they increased in number, and grew in influence, until they obtained legal recognition (1609). One of the ends for which they labored was a closer fellowship among Protestants. They succeeded in effecting an alliance, based on the Consensus Sendomiriensis, among those of Poland (1570). This alliance, however, bore no abiding fruits. The anti-Reformation, inaugurated by Ferdinand II., overthrew the Brethren as a visible organization in Bohemia and Moravia (1627); but they continued in Poland and Hungary to the end of the seventeenth century. At the same time there was preserved in their original seats a "hidden seed," which kept up, as far as possible, the tenets and usages of the fathers, held religious services in secret, and prayed for a resuscitation of the church. Such prayers were heard. In 1722 two families named Neisser, led by Christian David, "the servant of the Lord," fled from Moravia, and, by invitation of Count Zinzendorf (q. v.), settled on his domain of Berthelsdorf in Saxony. About three hundred Brethren, in the course of the next seven years, emigrated from Moravia and Bohemia to the same place. They built a town called Herrnhut, or "The Watch of the Lord," and were joined by a number of other Protestants from various parts of Germany. This settlement became the centre of the Renewed Brethren's Church. In addition to the fact that its nucleus consisted of descendants of the Bohemian Brethren, such a renewal was brought about by the adoption of the leading features of their constitution; by the introduction of their discipline, as set forth in the Ratio Disciplinae of Amos Comenius, and of much of their liturgy as found in their German hymnals; by appropriating their discipline in its form, but modifying it in its execution, so as to apply it to the requirements of their time; and, finally, by the transfer of their episcopate, which had been carefully continued in the hope of a resuscitation. On the 16th of March, 1735, David Nitschmann was consecrated the first bishop of the Moravian Church by Bishop Daniel Ernst Jablonsky, with the concurrence of Christian Sittkovius, these two being the survivors of the old succession. As concerns the doctrinal tendency, the noteworthy fact may be added, that the Lord's Supper is the concurrence of Christians, not exclusively descended from the Bohemian fathers, but representing a union of the Slavonic element of the Ancient Brethren's Church with the German element of Pietism. In the very nature of the case, therefore, a new and different development began. It was shaped by Zinzendorf. He had, indeed, declared that he would do all in his power to fulfill those hopes of a renewal of the Brethren's Church which filled the heart of its aged bishop Comenius; but at the same time he was by conviction a Lutheran, and had adopted Spener's idea in its deepest import,—of establishing ecclesiae in ecclesia. This idea he carried out to ends of which its originator had never thought. The Moravian refugees and Zinzendorf to recognize that the Brethren were to constitute an independent church; and yet, on the other, they were not to interfere with the State churches, but to set forth within the same a union of believers representing the old Brethren's, the Lutheran, and the Reformed elements,—or roiroimitdeiac, as he called them,—in one Unitas Fratrum. Accordingly he did not allow the Brethren to expand as they had expanded in their original seats; but exclusive Moravian towns were founded, where no one but a member owned real estate, and the Church controlled, not only their spiritual concerns, but also their industrial pursuits. In such towns a high type of piety was developed. They fostered a missionary spirit, which sent messengers of the gospel to the most distant parts of the heathen world, and found fields at home, through the so-called "Diaspora," on the continent of Europe, and, through domestic missions, in Great Britain and America. They educated in their boarding-schools thousands of young people not connected with the Moravian Church; and, during the long and dreary period of rationalism, they afforded a sanctuary for the old gospel, with its blessed promises and glorious hopes. At the same time, they found a way to appease a self-satisfied spirit, which, on the one hand, looked upon the Moravians as "a peculiar people" in an extraordinary sense, and, on the other, took acceptance with God for granted, as belonging of necessity to all the members of a church in which the Saviour was pre-eminently made the central figure of theology and of practical religion, and his name literally constituted a household word. For a brief period (1745-49), known as "the time of sitting," and in a few of the settlements, a far greater evil manifested itself. Fanaticism broke out among ministers and people. It did not lead them into gross sins, but gave rise to the most extravagant conceptions, especially as regarded the atonement in general, and Christ's wounded side in particular; to the most seneuous, puerile, and objectionable phraseology and hymns; and to religious services of the most reprehensible character. Such fanaticism Zinzendorf himself unwittingly originated by the fanciful and unwarranted ways in which he expressed the believer's joy and the love which the pardoned sinner bears to the Saviour. But, when he and his coadjutors began to realize the magni-
tude of the evil, they earnestly labored to bring back the erring ones to the sober faith and reverent love taught by the Scriptures. Such efforts were crowned with success; and the entire restoration of the church to spiritual health formed the best answer to the many attacks made upon it at that time and for a long period afterward, in part by well-meaning theologians, and in part by sanguine enemies.

Zinzendorf was consecrated a bishop in 1737, and during his lifetime practically stood at the head of the church, although he had many assistants; and synods, of which he had the principal control, were often held. After his death, the synods assumed their proper position, and the executive power was vested in elective boards. The polity which he had introduced kept the Unitas Fratrum numerically small; but it was gradually established in Saxony, Prussia, Denmark, Baden, Switzerland, and Russia. In all these countries, except Switzerland, the exclusive system was introduced: on the part of their governments, liberal concessions were granted. There are fifteen exclusive settlements on the continent of Europe, and nine other Moravian churches.

Turning to Great Britain, we find that the Moravians established themselves in that kingdom in 1733, chiefly through the labors of Peter Boehler, who became God's instrument in leading John Wesley to a knowledge of the truth. In 1779 they were acknowledged, by an act of Parliament, as "an ancient Episcopal Church." Four exclusive settlements were founded; but the rest of their churches, thirty-four in number, never introduced the German polity.

Georgia was the colony in which the Moravians began their work in North America (1733); but they soon relinquished that field, and came to Pennsylvania (1740), where they built Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Lititz, in which three towns the exclusive system was introduced. Subsequently, they established, on the same plan, Hope in New Jersey (which entered a bankrupt state), and Salem in North Carolina. Their other churches were free from the trammels of this polity. It was totally relinquished in 1844 and the subsequent years. During the century in which it continued, it necessarily kept the church small in this country also: since its relinquishment, the Moravians have increased rapidly, and during the last twenty years have doubled their membership. The number of their churches is seventy-eight.

II. GERMAN MORAVIAN TOWNS. — Although the exclusive system on the continent of Europe has undergone modifications which seem to point to its eventual abolition, its essential features are still maintained. The membership, "according to difference of age, sex, and station in life," is divided into classes, called "choirs," from 2000. At the head of each choir stands an elder, or, in the case of a female class, a deaconess, charged with its spiritual interests. Special religious services are held, and an annual day of covenanted and praise is observed. Such classes, or choirs, are maintained in other Moravian churches also. Every settlement has a Brethren's, a Sisters', and a Widows' House, which supply the inmates with comfortable homes. The Sisters' House is inhabited by unmarried women, who maintain themselves by work suited to their sex; and a Brethren's House, by unmarried men, who carry on various trades. There are two superintendents for each house,— the one looking after the religious concerns of the inmates, who are bound by a vow, and can leave at option the other managing the temporal affairs. The financial and municipal interests of a settlement in general are directed by the Board of Overseers, with the warden as its president; while spiritual matters are looked after by the Elders' Conference, with the senior pastor as its president. Religious services for all the inhabitants are held every evening in the church.

III. THE CONSTITUTION, MINISTRY, RITUAL, AND USAGES. — (a) In 1857 the entire constitution of the Unitas Fratrum was remodelled. It embraces three provinces,— the German, the British, and the American. They are locally independent, but together constitute one organic whole in regard to doctrine, the fundamental principles of discipline and ritual, and the foreign missionary work. Hence there is a general and a provincial government. The former consists of the General Synod (meeting every ten years at Herrnhut, and attended by delegates from all the provinces, as also from the foreign mission-field) and of an Executive Board. This Board is called the "Unity's Elders' Conference," and has four departments, two of which (the Departments of Missions and of the Unity) are elected by the General Synod; and, as this conference is at the same time the executive board of the German province, the other two by its Provincial Synod. The Department of Missions superintends the foreign missionary work; and the Department of the Unity, the British and American provinces, in all such matters as come within the legislative scope of the General Synod. In the British and American provinces, provincial concerns are managed by their own synods and executive boards, known as Provincial Elders' Conferences.

(b) The ministry consists of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Unmarried assistants, whether men or women, are formally constituted acolytes. The Moravian episcopacy is not diocesan, but represents the entire Unitas Fratrum. Hence bishops have an official seat, both in the synods of the provinces in which they reside, and in the General Synod, and can be appointed only by this body, or by the Unity's Elders' Conference. In the bishops is vested exclusively the power of ordaining. They constitute a body whose duty it is to look to the welfare, and maintain the integrity, of the Unitas Fratrum in all its parts, and especially to bear it on their hearts in unceasing prayer before God; and although they are not, ex officio, connected with the government, they are, as a rule, elected to the governing boards over which they preside.

(c) The ritual is liturgical in its character. A litany is prayed every Sunday morning. Special services, at which offices of worship are used, distinguish the festivals of the ecclesiastical year, certain "memorial days" in the history of the Moravian Church, and the annual days of covenanted of the choirs. The hymnology is rich, and church music very fully developed. Some of the most celebrated are: A Sister's Hymn; A Brothers Hymn; The Zinzendorf, Countess Zinzendorf, Spangenberg, Louise von Hayn, Gregor, James Montgomery,
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Garve, Albertini, etc. Love-feasts, in imitation of the agape of apostolic times, are celebrated. The pedilavium, or foot-washing, was formerly practised within limited circles, but has long since been abolished. At one time the lot was employed in the appointment of all ministers, and marriages were contracted in the same way. Its use in the former case has been greatly restricted; the rule with regard to marriages was abolished in 1818.

IV. Doctrine. — The Moravian Church does not set forth its doctrines in a formal confession of faith, as was done by its Bohemian fathers; but the cardinal points are found in its Catechism, in its Easter Morning Litany (Schaff's Creeds, iii. p. 799), and in its Synodical Results, or code of statutes drawn up by the General Synod. The doctrines of the total depravity of human nature, of the love of God the Father, of the real Godhead and real humanity of Jesus Christ, of our reconciliation to God and our justification by faith through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, of the Holy Ghost and his operations, of good works as the fruit of the Spirit, of the fellowship of believers, of the second coming of the Lord, and of the resurrection of the dead unto life or unto condemnation, are deemed to be essential. (Span- genberg: Expositio of Doctrine, London, 1784; Plitt: Glaubenslehre, Gotha, 1863; Plitt: Zin- zendorf's Theologie, Gotha, 1850-74, 5 vols.)

V. Enterprises of the Church. (a) Schools. — There are in the three provinces 47 boarding-schools for young people not connected with the Moravian Church, at which schools about 2,500 pupils of both sexes are annually educated. Each province has a theological seminary.

(b) Foreign Missions. — Although three Protestant missions existed prior to the Moravian missionary work, such enterprises were all undertaken in connection with the planting of colonies. The Moravians were the first Protestants who went among the heathen with no other purpose in view than that of saving souls. In 1732 Leonard Dober and David Nischmann (q. v.) inaugurated on the Island of St. Thomas that work to which the church still chiefly devotes itself, and which God has wonderfully blessed. At various times, missions — in the service of which large amounts of money were spent, and many lives sacrificed, but which eventually proved unsuccessful — were undertaken in the following countries: Lapland (1774-95), shores of the Arctic Ocean (1757-66), Ceylon (1785-91), Algiers (1760), Guinea (1754-55 and 1767-70), Persia (1747-50), Egypt (1762-69), East Indies (1769-70), and the Caimuck territory (1765-1732). This field, at the present day, embraces the following seventeen mission provinces: Greenland (1738), Labrador (1771), Indian Country of North America (1794), St. Thomas and St. John (1732), St. Croix (1792), Jamaica (1764), Antigua (1756), St. Kitts (1775), Barbados (1785), Tobago (1750, renewed 1827), Demarara (1771), Surinam (1790), Mosquito Coast (1848), Surinam (1795), South African Western Province (1736, renewed, 1792), South African Eastern Province (1828), Australia (1849), and West Himalaya (1853). The annual cost of this extensive work is about $290,000. This amount is made up by the contributions of the members of the church, by gifts from friends of the cause, by grants from missionary societies in the three provinces, by the interest of funded legacies, and by the missions themselves through voluntary donations and the profits of trade. The London Association in aid of the Missions of the United Brethren, founded in 1817, is composed of members of various churches, not of Moravians, and contributes about $25,000 a year. The Brethren's Society for the Furtherance of the Gospel among the Heathen, founded in England in 1741, supports the mission in Labrador, and owns a missionary vessel, which has now been annually sailing to that distant coast for a hundred and thirteen years without encountering a serious accident. The converts are divided into four classes, — new people (or applicants for religious instruction), candidates for baptism, baptized adults, and communicants. In the year 1889 the extensive field in the West Indies will cease, in consequence of an enactment of the General Synod of 1878, to be a mission, and will be constituted the fourth self-supporting province of the Unitas Fratrum. According to the latest statistics the seventeen missions comprise 115 stations and 307 additional preaching-places; 7 normal schools, with 70 scholars; 215 day schools, with 16,616 pupils, 215 teachers, and 634 monitors; 94 Sunday schools, with 13,555 pupils and 884 teachers; 312 missionaries, male and female; 1,471 native assistants; and 78,846 converts.

(c) Bohemian Mission. — This work was begun in 1870. At first it advanced very slowly, on account of the restrictions imposed through the Austrian laws. In 1880 these restrictions were removed, and the Unitas Fratrum was legally acknowledged by that same government at whose hands it received its death-blow in the anti-Reformation. This mission embraces 4 stations, an orphan-house, 4 missionaries, and 246 members.

(d) Leper Hospital. — In 1851 the Moravians took charge, in Jerusalem, of a hospital, previously established, for lepers. This institution is supported by contributions from the three provinces.

(e) Diaspora (from δαίσπορος, in 1 Pet. i. 1), a work carried on by the German Province, and having for its object the evangelization of the State churches on the continent of Europe, without depriving them of their members. Evangelists itinerate through the various countries of Germany, through Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Poland, Livonia, Estonia, and other parts of Russia, visiting, preaching, and organizing "societies." This mission embraces 61 central stations, 62 laborers, and about 80,000 "society members."

VI. Statistics. — The Three Home Provinces: 269 bishops, presbyters, and deacons; 97 ordained assistants, male and female, in various departments of church-work, not counting teachers; 30,741 souls. Foreign and Bohemian Missions: 145 bishops, presbyters, and deacons; 29 ordained assistants; 149, 1,471 native assistants; 78,892 souls. The Unitas Fratrum, therefore, numbers in all 414 bishops, presbyters, and deacons; 1,739 male and female assistants (together, 2,153 laborers); and 107,833 souls; and has, besides, about 90,000 souls in its Diaspora societies.

Lit. — Cramz: History of the Brethren, London,
MORE. 1971

Hannah More was in every way a remarkable woman. She was considered one of the great reformers of contemporary manners and morals. Her philanthropic labors were abundant and successful. In conjunction with her equally devoted sisters, she "devoted various schemes of benevolence and usefulness; and the least of which was the erection of schools, which, though at first confined to the children of their immediate surroundings, soon extended their operations over no less than ten parishes where there were no resident clergymen, and in which upwards of twelve hundred children were thus provided with the benefits of moral and religious education." The More sisters, aided by their friends, also distributed Bibles and prayer-books. Hannah More received, it is said, upwards of thirty thousand pounds sterling for her writings, and bequeathed ten thousand pounds sterling for charitable purposes. A writer in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (8th ed.) thus speaks of Hannah More as a writer:

"The works of Hannah More have always been highly esteemed by the religious world; and she is generally considered as one of the most distinguished of that class of writers who unite great piety with considerable literary talent, and dedicate the creation of fancy, as well as the deduction of reason, to the service of religion. Her poetry is not much praised. Her prose is justly admired for its sententious wisdom, its practical good sense, its masculine vigor, and the dignified religious and moral fervor which pervades it."


MORE, Henry, the Cambridge Platonist, b. at Grantham, Lincolnshire, Oct. 12, 1614; d. at Cambridge, Sept. 1, 1687. He was educated at Eton, whence he passed (1631) to Christ's College, Cambridge, where he took his B.A., 1635, and M.A., 1639, followed immediately by a fellowship. He spent the remainder of his life in the university, acting as private tutor, frequently to persons of rank. From his father he inherited the adoration of a young princess, to have for a little time held this living for himself, but speedily appointed a successor. He was offered the mastership of his college in 1654, but refused it, as he did the provostship of Trinity College, Dublin, and the deanship of St. Patrick's. He also declined to be a college, which his friends had obtained for him. For a very short time in 1675 he held a prebend's stall in Gloucester's cathedral, and this was his single preferment.

A great charm attaches to this modest and devoted man. He passed through a remarkable religious experience — from strict Calvinism to theology and mysticism, — yet without injury to his profoundly pious nature. He lived a very secluded life, but by no means a selfish or lazy one. "His very chamber-door was a hospital to the needy;" and "work after work sprang with the easy luxuriant from his pen." He was very learned, although much was merely curious and really worthless lore. He delighted in Cabalism, and in discovering secrets and mysteries where...
none existed. But, withal, he made real progress in things divine, and was by more than one holy man considered as the holiest person upon the face of the earth." Principal Tulloch calls him the "most poetic and transcendental, and, on the whole, the most spiritual, looking, of all the Cambridge divines." Like some other geniuses, e.g., Calvin, he formed his system of thought in early manhood, and maintained his loyalty to it through life. More's Philosophical Poems, published in 1666; Divine Dialogues, 1668; Exposition Propheticæ apud septem Epistolæm ad septem Ecclesias Asiaeas, una cum Antidoto adversus Idolatriam (explanation of the Epistles to the seven churches in Asia, and criticism of the Roman Church), 1689; Philosophia Teutonica Censura (criticism of Jacob Böhme's philosophy); Enchiridium Metaphysicum (manual of metaphysics), 1671. His works in Latin appeared at Liége, 1664; Enchiridium Ethicum, or Manual of Ethics, 1665; Encyclriuum Ethicum, or Manual of Ethics, 1667; Divine Dialogues, 1668; Expositio Propheticæ, 1673; Theologica, 1675; Philosophica, 1678. A collected edition of his philosophical works in English appeared in 1662, 4th ed., 1712. In 1708 appeared his Theological Works, according to the Author's improvements in his Latin edition. In 1892 appeared his Discourses on Several Texts of Scripture. His Life was written by Rev. Richard Ward, London, 1710. See particularly the exhaustive study of Henry More by Principal Tulloch,— Rational Theology in England in the Seventeenth Century, vol. ii., 361-465.— and President Porter, in Ueberweg as above; also Mullinger: Cambridge Characteristics in the Seventeenth Century, London, 1867, chap. iv.

MORE, Sir Thomas, the author of the Utopia, and martyr of the old faith; the son of a judge of the King's Bench; was b. in London about 1480; suffered on the block July 6, 1535. He was educated, in part, in the house of Cardinal Morton, who sent him to Oxford. He became closely identified with the advocates of the new culture, — Gocyn, Linacre, and Colet, — and entered into intimate relations with Erasmus. At his father's solicitation, he studied law at New Inn and Lincoln's Inn, and in 1508 became a member of the House of Commons; but, drawing upon himself the anger of Henry VII., he retired for the time from political life. Erasmus found him translating sayings of Lucian, writing biting epigrams, engaged in ascetic exercises, and contemplating the assumption of the cowl. But his healthy nature led him to marry in 1507, and resume the practice of law. He translated the works and life of Pico of Mirandula, defended Erasmus and his New Testament against the attacks of the Louvain professor Dorpius, and secured a royal order for the establishment of a college obligatory at Oxford (1518). Henry VII., whose accession he had welcomed in a poem, attached him to his court in 1518.

In 1516 More wrote his famous work, the Utopia, the type of many national romances. In the form of a dialogue with one Raphael, who has visited the Island of Utopia in the South Seas, he criticized the national and social state of England, and promulgated a new system. Plato's republic was in his mind. He affirms perfect freedom in his island, the equal obligation of work, and a communion of goods. The marriage relation he left untouched, but women were to have the equal privilege of exercising the functions of the priesthood and arms. Religious freedom also existed in his island, and differences in religious forms; and the only condition of citizenship was a belief in immortality and God. The Utopia, written at a time when Luther had already been urged by Wolsey to enter the service of the king, was a programme of political and social reforms.

Luther appeared between the completion of
displayed a strange admixture of clear reasoning, refused to give a judgment on its lawfulness, and the larger part of the nation was on the king's side; critical acumen, and narrow religious prejudice.

He referred him to the theologians. He, however, of our Lord. His character was above reproach. He was of a noble and amiable nature; but he preferred; but he was not by any means a sacrificial

murder. In his trial, abnormal charges were put forward, and he was exonerated. He employed his time in the Tower with the composition of ascetic works (Quod pro fide mors fugienda non sit, etc.) and a work on the passion of our Lord. His character was above reproach. He was of a noble and amiable nature; but he displayed a strange admixture of clear reasoning, critical acumen, and narrow religious prejudice. His execution made a great stir all over Europe.

It was, in spite of the legal process, a legal murder. In his trial, abnormal charges were preferred; but he was not by any means a sacrificial victim to the personal hatred of the sovereign. The larger part of the nation was on the king's side; and, after the parliamentary decree favoring the transfer of the succession to Elizabeth, but not be decided by a more or less hierarchically organized consistory or presbytery, but by the congregation itself, by the application of universal suffrage. Calvin, to whom he presented the manuscript, declined to read "so long an exposition of a subject already decided by the word of God;" and Morelli, who realized the danger of publishing the book in Geneva, went to Lyons, and had it printed there. It produced an immense sensation, and was immediately rejected and condemned by the national synod of Orléans, 1562. Having returned to Geneva, Morelli was summoned before the consistory, convicted of heresy, and excommunicated; after which the case was handed over to the civil authorities. His book was publicly burned by the hangman; and any one who owned a copy of it was ordered to deliver it up immediately, under penalty of the severest punishment. Meanwhile the author himself had been prudent enough to leave the city, but he did not altogether escape the wrath of Calvin and Beza. He obtained a position at the court of Navarre as tutor to the son of Jeanne d'Albret; but the remonstrances of Beza induced him to dismiss him, 1563. The synods of Paris (1569) and Nîmes (1572) also condemned the book, but at the same time it evidently began to arouse the interest of the laity.

appointed librarian at St. Germain-des-Prés in 1680, and afterwards prior of the convent of Meulan, but retired to St. Denis in 1699, having become completely anathematized. Some of his devotional books are still read, — Effusion de cœur, 1710; Entretiens spirituels (three collections), 1720-22; Imitation de Jésus Christ, 1722, etc.

MORIELSHIKI (self-immolators), a fanatical sect of Siberia and other portions of Russia, so called from the practice of voluntary suicide in a pit filled with combustibles on fire. Such a death is believed to insure a happy immortality. The ceremony of self-immolation takes place once a year in a retired spot.

MOREFI, Louis, b. at Bargemon, in Provence, March 25, 1645; d. in Paris, July 10, 1690; studied literature under the Jesuits at Aix, and theology at Lyons, in which latter city he was ordained a priest, and preached for several years with success. He published a collection of poems, a translation of Rodriguez's Christian Perfection, a new edition of the Lives of Saints, etc.; but his great work, which at once made him a literary server, and regent of the world, and combats atheism, distinguishes him from the other deists is, that proof of the divinity of a doctrine,—its moral truth and inherent reasonableness. That which he finds a great gulf between the Old and New Testament. The Mosaic religion is a very low type of religion; and the Mosaic law a narrow limitation, and exalted the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch in Le Jay's polyglot.

MORILSHIKI. MORLEY.

MORGAN, Thomas, one of the exponents of the Old-English deism; d. at London, Jan. 14, 1743. Little is known of his life. He was for a time pastor of a Presbyterian church, but lost his position in 1726, on adopting Arian views. He published a collection of poems, a translation of Rodriguez's Christian Perfection, a new edition of the Lives of Saints, etc.; but his great work, which at once made him a literary server, and regent of the world, and combats atheism, distinguishes him from the other deists is, that proof of the divinity of a doctrine,—its moral truth and inherent reasonableness. That which he finds a great gulf between the Old and New Testament. The Mosaic religion is a very low type of religion; and the Mosaic law a narrow limitation, and exalted the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch in Le Jay's polyglot.

MORIRI, Etienne, b. at Caen, Jan. 1, 1625; d. in Amsterdam, May 5, 1700; studied theology and Oriental languages at Sedan and Geneva; was pastor of the Reformed Congregation of St. Pierre sur Dive, near Lisieux, afterwards at Caen; and became, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, when he sought refuge in Holland, professor of Oriental languages in Amsterdam. Of his numerous writings, the principal are Dissertationes (Geneva, 1683), Exercitationes de lingua priscae (Utrecht, 1694), Explanations sacrae (Leiden, 1699), a life of Bochart, in the Opera Bocharti, etc.

MORIN, Jean, b. at Blois, 1591; d. in Paris, 1630; belonged to a Reformed family, and studied theology at Leyden, but was disgusted at the controversies between the Calvinists and Arminians; embraced Romanism, and entered the Congregation of the Oratory. He was for many years employed by Urban VIII. in his negotiations with the Greek Church, but acquired his greatest fame as a writer; though the violence with which he attacked the Masoretic text of the Old Testament, and exalted the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch, caused much opposition. His principal works are Exercitationes in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum (1631), Exercitationes de hebraicis graecis textus sinceritate (1635), Antiquitates Ecclesiae Orientalis (1682), with his life, etc. He also edited and translated the Samaritan Pentateuch in Le Jay's polyglot.

MORISONIANS. See Evangelical Union.

MORLEY, George, D.D., b. in London, 1597; d. at Chelsea, Oct. 29, 1684. He was graduated M.A. at Oxford, 1621; was chaplain to the Earl of Carnarvon, 1628-40, then to Charles I., who made him a canon of Christ Church, Oxford. He remained with the king through his troubles, and declined to sit in the Westminster Assembly. He was imprisoned in 1648, left England the gift”), a kind of dowry paid on the morning before or after the marriage.

MORNAS (appearance of Jehovah), the hill upon which Abraham offered Isaac, according to divine direction (Gen. xxii. 2), and on which, later, the temple was built (2 Chron. iii. 1). By "the land of Moriah," in the first passage, is meant the "land in which Mount Moriah was" (cf. "the land of Jazer, Num. xxxii. 1"). Moriah was probably not the usual designation of the temple-hill, because it does not occur in the pre-exilic books. See Temple.

MORIGIA, Jacobo Antonio de. See Barnabites.
following year, nor returned until he was sent by the Royalists, during the protectorate of Richard Cromwell, to win over the Presbyterians to the episcopal form of government and to the use of a liturgy. This mission was all the more congenial to him, as he believed Charles II., whose chaplain he had been at The Hague, to be a sincere Churchman. He had also to employ all his dexterity in keeping the Royalists, naturally impatient and restless on the eve of the Restoration, from ruining his design by injudicious actions. Dr. Morley was rewarded by Charles II. with the successive appointments, in the same year, to the deanery of Christ Church and the bishopric of Worcester. In 1661 he sat in the Savoy Conference, and led on the bishops’ side in the debates.

Dr. Morley was also to employ all his dexterity in keeping the Royalists, naturally impatient and restless on the eve of the Restoration, from ruining his design by injudicious actions. Dr. Morley was rewarded by Charles II. with the successive appointments, in the same year, to the deanery of Christ Church and the bishopric of Worcester. In 1661 he sat in the Savoy Conference, and led on the bishops’ side in the debates. In 1662 he was appointed dean of the chapel royal, and was transferred to the see of Winchester. He laid himself open to the charge of intolerance by his advocacy of such a modification of the Test Act as should compel sworn allegiance to the Church of England. He had, indeed, two hatreds,—Romanism and Dissent. His benefactions were very large. His writings, although numerous, are controversial and of little interest. His benefactions were very large. His writings, although numerous, are controversial and of little interest.

MÖRLIN (Mörl, Möhrlein, Morlins, Morus), Joachim, b. at Wittenberg, April 6, 1514; d. in Konigsegberg, May 23, 1571. He studied theology at Marburg, Constance, and Wittenberg, and was in 1540 appointed superintendent of Arnstadt; but the combative and vehemence of his temper soon brought him into violent conflict with the burgomaster of the place, and in 1543 he was discharged. Next year he received a call as superintendent of Göttingen; but when, after the end of the Smalcaulic war, the Interim was to be established in that city, he offered so virulent and indiscriminating an opposition to the imperial order, that he was not only expelled, but actually had to flee for his life (1550). Appointed preacher at the cathedral of Köpinsegberg, he was at first on terms of great intimacy with Osiander, but afterwards turned against him in the rudest manner from the pulpit, the result of which was that the Duke of Prussia dismissed him, and ordered him to leave the country. As superintendent of Brunswick (1553-67) he labored with great success, though he continued to participate in all the theological controversies of the day in the Gnesio-Lutheran party, but he became more conspicuous as one of the coarsest and most passionate theological controversialists of his age. A list of his works (controversial pamphlets, sermons, letters, etc.) is found in his biography by Walther, Arnstadt, 1856 and 1863 (two dissertations).

WAGENMANN.

MORMONS. Mormonism is the name given to the religious belief of the Mormons, a sect having their headquarters in Utah, one of the Territories of the United States. These people call themselves “Latter-Day Saints,” and their organization, “The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints;” but by the rest of the world they are known as “Mormons.” The word “mormon,” in their etymology, is a hybrid term, from the word “Egyptian,” “monarch,” and the English “more,” and means more good. The man Mormon, in their ecclesiastical history, was the last of the sacred prophets of ancient America, who, a leader of the Nephites, perished, in a battle between them and the Lamanites, in A.D. 420. Both Nephites and Lamanites were descendants from the family of Lehi, an Israelite of the tribe of Manasseh, who emigrated from Jerusalem to America in B.C. 600, during the reign of King Zedekiah. In the battle alluded to, the Nephites were exterminated, with the exception of a few individuals. The descendants of the victorious Lamanites are the North American Indians. The Book of Mormon is claimed to be the condensed record, made on golden plates by the prophet Mormon, of the history, faith, and prophecies of the ancient inhabitants of America. These plates he intrusted to Moroni his son. Moroni survived the awful battle of extermination. He died the last of the Nephites, but, before dying, “hid up” the golden plates in the hill Cumorah, the very site of the final battle between the Nephites and Lamanites, where two hundred thousand of the former had been slain. Among the records of the Book of Mormon are accounts of three migrations to the American continent, and the discovery, by Joseph Smith, Sept. 22, 1823; and on Sept. 22, 1827, he secured them, took them to his home, translated their contents, which were said to be in “reformed Egyptian,” and printed and published them as the Book of Mormon. In discovering and securing the treasures, it is claimed he was guided and helped by an angel, perhaps by the spirit of Moroni himself, who had died fourteen hundred years before. And, after the translation was completed, it is understood that the angel resumed the custody of the original plates. Joseph Smith, the founder of the Mormon sect, was born in Sharon, Windsor County, Vt., Dec. 23, 1805. He had six brothers and three sisters. In 1815 his father moved to Palmyra, and afterward to Manchester, contiguous towns in Ontario (now Wayne) County, N.Y. In 1820 an unusual religious excitement prevailed in Manchester and the region round about. Five of the Smith family were awakened, and united with the Presbyterians. Joseph, in his own account of his early life, says he “became somewhat partial to the Methodist sect.” He says he prayed to be guided aright; and that finally two heavenly messengers bade him not to join any sect, and three years afterwards, another celestial visitant outlined to him the golden plates he was to find, and the prophet he was to be. This was on Sept. 22, 1823; and from this time on, he averse, his days and nights were filled, and his life was guided, by “visions,” “voices,” and “angels.”

The hill Cumorah was about four miles from
Palmyra, between that town and Manchester. Here, in the fall of 1827, he claimed the golden plates. For more than two years, by the aid of the “Urim and Thummim” found with them, he was engaged in translating their contents into English. In March, 1830, the translation was given into the printer’s hands. This is the original form in which the Book of Mormon appeared. In what light he appeared to others may be gathered from the following extract, never before published, from the records of the proceedings before a justice of the peace of Bainbridge, Chenango County, N.Y.:—

“People of State of New York vs. Joseph Smith. Warrant issued upon oath of Peter G. Bridgman, who informed that one Joseph Smith of Bainbridge was examined. Says that he came from town of Palmyra, Stowel had been engaged in digging for them; that stone, where coined money was buried in Pennsylvania, and going to school; that he had a certain stone, records of the proceedings before a justice of the peace of Bainbridge, Chenango County, N.Y.:

“Mr. Arad Stowel sworn. Says he went with Arad Stowel to be convinced of prisoner’s skill, and likewise came away disgusted, finding the deception so palpable. Prisoner pretended to him that he could discern objects at a distance by holding this white stone to the sun or candle; that prisoner looked into a hat at his dark-colored stone, as he said that it hurt his eyes. Jonathan Thompson says that prisoner was requested to look Yeomans for chest of money; did look, and pretended to know where it was, and that prisoner, Thompson, and Yeomans went in search of it; that Smith arrived at spot first (was in night); that Smith looked in hat while there, and when very dark, and told how the chest was situated. After digging several feet, struck upon something sounding like a board or plank. Prisoner would not look again, pretending that he was alarmed the last time that he looked, on account of the circumstances relating to the trunk being buried came all fresh to his mind; that the last time that he looked, he discovered distinctly the two Indians who buried the trunk, and had a quarrel ensued between them, and that one of said Indians was killed by the other, and thrown into the hole beside of the trunk, to guard against looking for Mr. Stowel several times, and informed him where he could find these treasures, and Mr. Stowel had been engaged in digging for them; that he found the digging part at Bend and Monument Hill as prisoner represented it; that prisoner pretended to him that he could discern objects at a distance by holding this white stone to the sun or candle; that prisoner looked into his hat; that, as evidence of fact, prisoner looked into his hat to tell him about some money witness lost sixteen years ago, and that he described the man that witness supposed had taken it, and disposition of money. And thereupon the Court finds the defendant guilty.”

While digging for treasure at Harmony, Penn., he boarded in the house of Mr. Isaac Hale. On the 18th of January, 1827, he married the daughter, Emma Hale, much against her father’s wishes, having been compelled to take her away from her home for the wedding. In 1828 Martin Harris, a farmer of Palmyra, was married. In 1829 Oliver Cowdery, a school-teacher of the neighborhood, filled the same office. On May 15, 1828, by command of an angelic messenger calling himself John the Baptist, Smith baptized Cowdery, and then Cowdery baptized him. Afterwards he ordained Cowdery to the Aaronic priesthood, and Cowdery ordained him. And, in process of time, it is claimed, Smith received the Melchizedec priesthood at the hands of the apostles Peter, James, and John. Some of the prophet’s family, and some of a family named Whitmer, in Fayette, Seneca County, N.Y., became convert; and on April 6, 1830, in Whitmer’s house, the Mormon “Church” began its history. That day it was organized, with a membership of six, — the prophet and two of his brothers, two Whittmers, and Oliver Cowdery. Within a week or two the first miracle of the “new dispensation” was wrought; the prophet casting out evil from Newell Knight of Colesville, Broome County, N.Y., whose visage and limbs were frightfully distorted by the demoniacal possession. In December, 1830, Sidney Rigdon, a Campbellite preacher in Ohio, became a convert. Rigdon was erratic, but eloquent; self-opinionated, but well
versed in the Scriptures; and in literary culture and intellectual force was the greatest man among the early Mormons. He was born in Pennsylvania, and was twelve years older than Smith. Thereafter the new sect strengthened and spread. Joseph was a veritable Numa Pompilius in the frequency and Stress of the "revelations" he received for the guidance of his people in things great and small. Kirtland, O., two miles from Rigdon's previous cure, was the first "gathering-place" of the saints. In 1831 the settlement was made there; and in the same year Jackson County, Mo., became the seat of another rendezvous. But, wherever the Mormons "gathered," in no long time quarrels ensued between them and the surrounding Gentiles. These arose, for the most part, from the claims of the Mormons to be a chosen people and under special divine direction. They shrank not from urging such pretensions, and laid hold upon the saints, and all other people "Gentiles," in euphony for "heathen." They were the Lord's saints, and the earth is the Lord's. They were led by an inspired prophet. Therefore, whenever the day of election for civil officers came, they must vote solidly the Whig or the Democratic ticket, as the leader should indicate. It is obvious to any one knowing of the fierce zeal of partisan politics, how this course on the part of the Mormons would subject them to constant embroilments with surrounding citizens. In 1843 the Saints carried their arrogance so far as to nominate Joseph Smith for President of the United States. And everywhere the outcome was the same,—expulsion and banishment, with more or less of outrageous violence. Those that had settled in Jackson County were driven out (1200 of them) into Clay County, in 1839; thence, after three years, into Caldwell County; and in 1839 from Missouri entirely. Meanwhile those that settled at Kirtland were also driven from Ohio in 1838; then all fled, and gathered at Nauvoo, a place built by them, on the Mississippi River, in Illinois.

Here they remained for five years, and built up a considerable town, and erected a spacious temple. But the animosities engendered and perpetuated by the theocratic claims of the Saints culminated in the cruel murder of their prophet Joseph and his brother Hyrum, by a mob, in the jail at Carthage, near Nauvoo, June 27, 1844. The two were defenseless prisoners, and the governor of the State had pledged to them safe conduct to the jail and before the court; and their murder was a most foul assassination.

The martyr-like death of Joseph Smith threw the magnificence of dignity over his person. They saw the consecration around his character, that could in no other way have been secured. And it is reasonable to believe, that, had Smith lived on, his own many weaknesses, the vulgarizing of "revelation" at his hands, the growing suspicions and disaffections of the faithful, and the fierce rancor and dissensions of the factions, would have shivered Mormonism into pieces, and sunk the fragments into depths too obscure for the searching of further history.

The people, leaders and led, with a rare self-control, sought not to take into their own hands any measures of vengeance for the murder of their chief. After recovery from the first consternation over the awful tragedy, they began to ask themselves, Who shall rule the church?

The "First Presidency" had been Joseph Smith, with Hyrum Smith and Sidney Rigdon his counselors. Rigdon alone was left. Of the "twelve apostles," Brigham Young was one, and their president. Young hurried to Nauvoo from a "mission" that he was conducting in the Eastern States. By his shrewd sense, firm will, and practical ability he carried all before him. Rigdon, who had been charged with disaffection, even in Joseph's day, was put down, and cut off. The quorum of the twelve was pronounced to be the earthly guide of the church, and Brigham came at once the acknowledged leader.

Brigham Young was born in Whitingham, Windham County, Vt., June 1, 1801, and was one of a family of eleven children,—five sons and six daughters. His father moved to Sherburne, Chenango County, N.Y., in 1804, and the family grew up in the latter State. In his twenty-second year, Brigham became a Methodist. In 1831 and 1832 all the members of the family joined the Latter-Day Saints. On the 14th of February, 1835, at Kirtland, Brigham was made one of the newly organized quorum of the apostles. In 1844, when forty-three years old, he became the Mormon chief. He was strong where Smith was weak; viz., in prudence, sagacity, common sense, practical energy. These natural Cromwellian qualities he brought to the front, and put and kept in force. He wasted no time in getting and giving "revelations." Only one "revelation" proper is on record as promulgated by him.

After the prophet's death, the Gentiles were not a whit more willing for the Mormons to sojourn among them. Contentions, existing and threatened, waxed rather than waned. Brigham's practical sense promptly decided that his people must flee away to some remote region, where collisions and conflicts should cease; and his sturdy will and untiring energy bent themselves to carry out the decision. Early in 1846 he and his people began to leave Nauvoo. Gradually they were massed on the Missouri River, near what is now Council Bluffs. Their chief encampment there they called "Winter-Quarters." And in 1847 Brigham and a hundred and forty-two "pioneers" pushed resolutely westward over a wilderness track of eleven hundred miles, and arrived in the Great Salt Lake Valley on July 24. Ever since, that day is the great day for celebration to Utah Mormons, quite eclipsing July 4. A few wintered in the valley: most, including Brigham, returned to "Winter-Quarters." In 1848 he led four thousand of the faithful to Utah; and there he lived and ruled in right kingly manner for thirty years, dying Aug. 29, 1877.

At his death the quorum of the twelve apostles became the ruling body of the church. Brigham Young, as "president," had two counselors, or vice-presidents, who with him constituted the "First Presidency." But it is now an understood thing, that, when a president dies, the First Presidency falls, and rulership devolves upon the quorum of the twelve. John Taylor, who was in jail with the Smiths when they were killed, and who was himself wounded, was president of this quorum, and as such was chief of the church.
from Brigham's death until Oct. 10, 1880. At this last date he was chosen president of the church, and there was no vacancy in the Twelve, which his counsellors. The present (1881) quorum of the twelve consists of the following, with one vacancy: —

Wilford Woodruff (president), Orson Pratt (made one of the first quorum at Kirtland, Feb. 14, 1835), Thomas G. Gammon and Joseph F. Smith his counsellors. The Book of Mormon, and Book of Doctrine and Covenants, to the Saints what the class-leader is to the Methodists, and the deacon is to help him.

In practical administration the president of the church, with his two counsellors, forming the First Presidency, is the sovereign authority. They are anthropomorphists, teaching that God exists in the form of a man. Brigham Young once boldly preached, "Adam is our Father and our God, and the church is his organization of another apostolate, and establishment of another church, and his reiteration and enlargement of his wishes, doctrines, and commandments.

The Book of Doctrine and Covenants is the collection of all the multifarious "revelations" that Joseph Smith claimed to have received, and promulgated, together with the one only written "revelation" put forth by Brigham Young, viz., at "Winter-Quarters" in 1847, to inspire and guide the Saints in their projected western pilgrimage through the wilderness.

The Book of Mormon, and Book of Doctrine and Covenants, to the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints." But practically, authority and guidance for them emanate from their living leaders; and few of either chiefs or masses read any of the four sacred books in order to know and ponder and follow by recorded precept. Hence it is a work of great benevolence to promote the pre-existence of human spirits. Multitudes of these spirits are now in a waiting-place, desiring to come to earth; for it is only through the way of fleshly embodiments that they can reach the final bliss of their perfected being; hence it is a work of great benevolence to promote
The gospel of the last dispensation may know of faith may be saved by it unto the perfection of bliss, if only some kinsman or friend yet in the spirit-world, and by repentance and tism for the dead. The disembodied spirits of those who were not privileged to know on earth it now in the spirit-world, and by repentance and increase to the building of the temples, and insuring the progress of the church.

SCHISMS. — One only that is of any considerable importance now exists, known as the "Josephite." The Josephites are so called after Joseph Smith, the son of the prophet, their chief. They call themselves the "Re-organized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints." They have headquarters at Plano, Ill., and maintain a few preachers in Utah, who do not, however, make much headway. They repudiate polygamy (say that the prophet never taught it), brand Brigham as a usurper, and claim that Smith the son is the rightful successor of the father in the leadership of the church. Just after the prophet's death there were Rigdonites and Strangites, resisting Brigham's assumption of the succession. And in Utah there have been Morrisites, reproaching Brigham that he was so barren of "revelations," and Godbeites, refusing to submit to Brigham's dictation in the domain of matters civil and commercial. But the Josephites alone, as an organized body, have been able to withstand dissolution.

STATISTICS. — When the Mormons entered the Valley of the Salt Lake, in 1847, the region belonged to Mexico. By the Treaty of Guadaloupe Hidalgo, in March, 1848, it and a good deal of territory was ceded to the United States; but no civil government was provided by Congress until the Organic Act, of Sept. 9, 1850, created the Territory of Utah. More than a year before this, the Mormons organized for themselves the "State of Deseret" (a word meaning honey-bee in reformed Egyptian), elected Brigham governor, and sent a delegate to Washington to ask admission into the Union.

Utah has an area of 84,476 square miles. By the United States census of 1880, its population is 74,470 males, and 66,436 females; total, 143,906. Of these, perhaps 18,000 are Gentiles. Then, besides the 125,000 Mormons in Utah, probably there are 25,000 more in the Territories of Idaho, Arizona, and Wyoming, and in the States of California, Nevada, Iowa, and Illinois. And, in addition to the 150,000 in America, doubtless as many more of the Saints are to be found in the Kingdom and Colonies of Great Britain, and in Scandinavia, Germany, Switzerland, and the Sandwich Islands, making about 800,000 of them in all.

Mormonism was first preached in Great Britain from the first, the British mission, and of late the Scandinavian mission, have been most vigorous for not avenging the death of Joseph Smith, or righting the persecution of the Saints. The drama is continued for nearly a whole day, and these Mormon "mysteries" are well calculated to impress themselves deeply and sternly upon the fanatic persons admitted to them. It is not too much to claim the secret "endowment" ceremonies as a powerful agency in weeding around the participants an iron band of awe and dread, of aversive obedience and compulsory brotherhood, and in ministering an unprofitio, if not intolerable, to the Mormon system.

The Deity and Satan, Adam and Eve, and others are persons of the drama. In its course there is a jumble of washings and anointings, of grips and key-words and new names, and of the investiture of each of the initiated in an endowment robe; which sacred undergarment is always thereafter to be worn next to the person, carefully shrouding it at the last for its burial. There are also prayers and solemn promises, and awful oaths, with penalties more awful appended. And only by taking their "endowments" is the marriage of man and wife so consecrated as to be fully authorized. The faithful Mormon is made to seem precious initiatory rites, whereby he is advanced in his knowledge of the true faith, and exalted by the possession of new privileges: in reality, they are a sort of crudely acted productions of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

The Deity and Satan, Adam and Eve, and others are persons of the drama. In its course there is a jumble of washings and anointings, of grips and key-words and new names, and of the investiture of each of the initiated in an endowment robe; which sacred undergarment is always thereafter to be worn next to the person, carefully shrouding it at the last for its burial. There are also prayers and solemn promises, and awful oaths, with penalties more awful appended. And only by taking their "endowments" is the marriage of man and wife so consecrated as to be fully authorized. The faithful Mormon is made to seem precious initiatory rites, whereby he is advanced in his knowledge of the true faith, and exalted by the possession of new privileges: in reality, they are a sort of crudely acted productions of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.
The corner-stone of the great temple at Salt Lake, to be built of splendid granite, and with foundation-walls twenty feet thick, was laid April 6, 1853. It is about half finished, and has already cost more than $1,500,000. The Mormons pay nearly $1,000,000 of tithing yearly. A perpetual emigration fund is managed by the authorities of their church. As early as 1858, there were in it $34,000. From this fund loans are made to the poorer Saints abroad to make possible their emigration. When they get to Utah, they are obligated to pay back the loan into the fund as promptly as possible.

Present Sources of the Strength of Mormonism. — It may suffice to mention three principal ones.

1. Religious Earnestness. — It is a mistake to count the Mormons a mere horde of sensualized barbarians. Sidney Rigdon was a type of the fervent religious enthusiasm which pervaded the belief and obedience of the early converts. And the British mission especially has always had, and now has, in a large number of devout, God-fearing women, that firm belief in the heart of the masses, that these are the "latter days," and they are the chosen saints thereof, wielding the powers, and holding forth the knowledge, of the true faith and obedience of the early converts. And the same "obedience" fired the whole people, in 1857, to the fierce resolves not to allow their governor, Brigham Young, to be superseded by his lawfully appointed successor, Cumming, and not to suffer the United States troops, under Col. Sidney Johnston, to enter their territory. And witness the atrocious massacre, in the fall of 1857, at Mountain Meadows, of a hundred and twenty men and women, emigrants of Arkansas en route to California, and one of the dastardly murder of Dr. K. Robinson in Salt Lake City, in October, 1866. So fanaticism outweighs frenzy and cruelty. And yet, without doubt, the element most promotive of vigorous unity among the Mormons, making them strong to bear, and tenacious to hold, and powerful to act, is the firm belief in the hearts of the masses, that these are the "latter days," and they are the chosen saints thereof, wielding the powers, and holding forth the knowledge, of the true faith for this world, and getting ready for a no distant supreme exaltation in the next.

2. Organization. — One need not study long to note how thoroughly and skilfully organized for power the Mormons are. One will direct. (In Brigham's time this was pre-eminent true.) And by ecclesiastical communications and telegraphic wires the direction is speedily known unto the utmost limit of the land of their habitation, and promptly the entire massed body moves in the line directed. Meetings of the high councils, quorums, bishop's courts, teachers, etc., are everywhere held with great frequency. So a vivid and intelligent interest in the "church" is perpetuated throughout all the valleys and outlying districts. Petty offices abound in the system: greater offices are rewards. Twice every year, on the 6th of October, general conferences of the whole body are held. At each and every one of these, the people, by a show of hands, vote to sustain the principal officers: their organization; but the "quorums," in private sessions, have arranged all these names beforehand. At each conference, also, scores of names are nominated of those called as missionaries to go abroad to preach the "gospel." And within a month or two all these go, largely without purse or scrip; and they do preach fervently, and successfully make converts. And the income from tithes builds meeting-houses and tabernacles and temples, and furnishes supplies to fill up gaps, and tide over difficulties in working the system.

The Perpetual Emigration Fund is of most practical efficiency to swell their numbers, and increase their strength.

There is no organization on earth, unless it be that founded by Ignatius Loyola, that is so well fitted as the Mormon to interest and keep loyal its members, to combine their faculties and forces, and to move that combination with efficiency and power whithersoever one master will dictates.

3. Polygamy. — In one sense, polygamy is a weakness to Mormonism. It arranges woman's nature in rebellion to the system, and arouses the detestation of Christian civilization. And since 1862 it has put the Mormons in the attitude of disobedience and defiance to the laws of their country. There are no laws of Utah Territory against polygamy, and, indeed, no territorial laws whatever about marriage anyway. All the members of the territorial Legislature being Mormons, this is to be expected. From 1847 to 1862, therefore, it may be said that the Mormons in Utah violated no statute law in practising polygamy. But in 1862 Congress enacted a statute prohibiting polygamy in the Territories of the United States. Since then, at least, all who have contracted plural marriages in Utah are plain violators of law. With decency, civilization, Christianity, and statute law arrayed against polygamy, it may seem strange that it can be made an element of weakness in the Mormon institution, and destined one day to draw destruction upon the system. And yet there are senses in which polygamy contributes unity and strength to Mormonism. Because, first, it ostracises the Mormons from all the rest of civilized mankind; and the forces of repulsion from "the world" drive the Saints in upon themselves, to be welded closer together, and to stay each other up for countenance and protection. And again: the unfortunate women committed to the practice of polygamy, and the children begotten from it, even if they become, as often they do, malcontent and fiercely hating, know themselves to be caught in a net from which they see no escape; and they remain in their place and practice, because, though their hearts are broken, their homes are saved by a religious sanction from foul disgrace. And once more: the thousands who are not polygamists (for be it remarked that not more than one Mormon married man out of six Mormon married men in Utah is a polygamist) will uphold polygamy heartily,
because some near kinsfolk, as sisters or daughters, are practisers of it. Such as these, therefore, though not in polygamy (and many of them disliking it, and some detesting it), will yet stand up for it; and for them, too, with the actual practisers, it becomes a bond, binding all together into a unity amazingly compact and unbreaking.

(1) The Mormons and the United States: Gov. Buchanan, being a strong Jeffersonian, and avowedly the nominee of Mr. Thomas L. Kane, an under-secretary for state, had neither time to read them, nor to recommend their cases to God in prayer: it was therefore agreed, by some London divines, to separate and, after the Revolution, in a modified form; the sermons taking a few hundred Spanish Roman Catholics and converts. In 1882 the Edmunds Bill to legislate against polygamy out of existence passed Congress.]
Morris, Thomas Asbury, b. in Kanawha County, Va., April 28, 1794; d. in Springfield, O., Sept. 2, 1874. He was brought up in the Baptist faith, but joined the Methodists, and was licensed 1814, and received as a travelling preacher into the Ohio Conference, 1816. He travelled as an itinerant over Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee until 1834, when he became the first editor of the Western Christian Advocate. In 1836 he was elected bishop, and labored successfully until 1888, when he retired in old age and weak health. He issued from the Methodist Book Concern a volume of Sermons, of which fifteen hundred copies had been sold up to 1852 (Allibone), Miscellany, 1837, and Church Polity, 1859. Marlay says, "As a presiding officer he was the beau ideal of a Methodist bishop. He had rare practical wisdom, quick and accurate judgment, and inflexible decision." See MARILLY: Life of Bishop Morris, New York, 1875.

Morrison, Robert, the father of Protestant missions in China; b. at Buller's Green, Morpeth, Northumberland, Jan. 5, 1782; d. at Canton, Aug. 1, 1884. His father was an elder in the United Presbyterian Church, and, after giving his son a primary-school education, took him into his shop, his business being last-making. Robert, however, had a decided inclination for study; took up Latin, Hebrew, and theology, under a Presbyterian minister, and afterwards attended Hoxton Academy in England. His mother died in 1822. In 1804 he offered himself to the London Missionary Society; was appointed the first missionary to China; entered their training-institution at Gosport; took up the study of Chinese under a Chinaman resident there; and on Jan. 31, 1807, sailed, by way of New York, for Canton, where he arrived Sept. 8. He at first dressed in Chinese costume, but subsequently removed it. He became interpreter for the East-India Company, and engaged in the translation of the Bible into Chinese, the preparation of Chinese tracts and a dictionary. In 1808 he was married to Miss Morton, who died in 1821. He revised and published a Chinese version of the Acts in 1811; issued an original Chinese catechism, and engaged in the translation of the Bible; was printed by the Serampore press in India. In 1813 he completed, with the assistance of Rev. Mr. Milne, the translation of the entire New Testament. The Gospels, the closing Epistles from Hebrews, and Revelation, were the work of Mr. Morrison's hand. In conjunction with the same fellow-missionary, he made a version of the Old Testament; so that the entire Bible was printed in 1819. He also made a translation of The Morning and Evening Prayers of the Church of England. His most laborious literary work was his Chinese Dictionary, published by the East-India Company, at Malacca, which was never very successful, and was removed in 1845 to Hong Kong. In 1817 he was made doctor of divinity by Giasgow University, and in 1824 paid a visit to England, returning, two years later, to China, having married a second time. Mr. Morrison added to his literary and civil labors private efforts to spread the gospel. The public proclamation of the gospel was forbidden. In 1814, "at a spring of water issuing from the foot of a lofty hill by the seaside in Macao, away from human observation, he baptized his first Chinese convert, Tsai-Asz, a man twenty-seven years of age." In 1830 he welcomed Messrs. Bridgman and Abed as his first fellow-missionaries from the American churches. After his death, his remains were taken to Macao, where they still rest; the site being marked by an appropriate inscription: "Perhaps something more could have been expected; but God will make out of that which has been done a way to something better." See Frick, in Schelhorn's Americanitates literariorum, vol. 12; MUNCH: Vermischte historische Schriften, ii. C. SCHMIDT.
he returned to England. In 1488 he was made archbishop of Canterbury, and in 1490 a cardinal. He was a man of great practical ability, and a shrewd politician. Nor was he reign as archbishop of Canterbury without influence on the history of the English Church, though his investigations of its then corrupted state led to no actual reforms. See Williams: Lives of the English Cardinals, London, 1862; 2 vols.

MORTON, Nathaniel, b. in England, 1612; d. at Plymouth, June 28, 1685; came to America in 1628; and was in 1645 appointed secretary of the Plymouth Colony. He wrote, besides an Ecclesiastical History of the Plymouth Church, in its records, New England's Memorial, or a Brief Relation of the Providence of God manifested to the Planters of New England (1620-46), Cambridge, 1669, edited with notes by Judge Davis, 1826, and with notes by the Congregational Board, 1855.

MORTON, Thomas, b. at York, March 20, 1564; d. at Easton Maudit, Northamptonshire, Sept. 22, 1659; studied theology in St. John's College, Cambridge, and was appointed chaplain to the Earl of Huntingdon, 1659, and to James I., 1606. In 1615 he was made bishop of Chester, in 1618 of Lichfield, and in 1632 of Durham; but from this last position he was dismissed by the dissolution of the episcopate, and lived afterwards in retirement. He was a learned man, and an ardent champion of Protestantism against Romanism. Of his writings, the principal ones are Apologia Catholica, 1605; An exact Discovery of Romish Doctrine in the Case of Conspiracy and Rebellion, 1605; A Catholicke Appeal for Protestants, 1610; Causa Regia, 1620 (against Bellarmine), etc. His life was written by John Barwick, 1660, and by Richard Baddily and John Naylor, 1669.

MORTUARY, in the ecclesiastical law of England, denotes a present offered by a parishioner to his minister upon the death of some member of his household. In the time of Henry III. it was brought into the church together with the corpse, whence it was called "corps-present." Having afterwards become the occasion of much exaction from the side of the clergy, the whole matter was finally settled by a statute of 1161-1173, which fixed a scale for mortuaries.

MORUS, Samuel Friedrich Nathanael, b. at Laubau in Upper Lusatia, Nov. 30, 1736; d. at Leipzig, Nov. 11, 1792; studied theology and philology at Leipzig, and was appointed professor there in classical languages, 1765, and in theology, 1782. He was a pupil of Ernesti, and one of the most prominent representatives of the historico-grammatical method of exegesis inaugurated by him. He published a volume of sermons (1786), an Épitome Theologie Christiane (1791), a number of Dissertationes, i., 1757; ii., 1784, etc. See Beck: Recitatio de Moro, Leipzig, 1788; and Höpffer: Über das Leben des Morus, Leipzig, 1793.
Innate of the laura of St. Sabas. Driven away by the invading Persians, he visited Egypt, where he flourished for some time in Alexandria, which, and Rome, where he died, 619 or 620. His book (Kaphor, pratum spirituale) is a description of the lives and exploits of pious monks, hermits, and ecclesiastics, and was for centuries the favorite reading in all monasteries, both in the East and the West. It is written in Greek and Latin, and without the least trace of critical sense, but contains, nevertheless, much valuable information concerning the history of the Church. According to Photius, it comprised 304 chapters: the editions now extant contain only 219. The best edition is that in Migne: Patr. Graec., 87. There is an Italian translation (1488), a Latin (1422), French, Arabic, etc. (See Fabricius, ix. p. 168.) An old life of his is found in Migne.

Moses (Moses, "drawn out"), the liberator of Israel from the bondage of Egypt, and the founder to whom history, without a dissenting voice, ascribes the religious institutions of the Israelites. He received the name Moses, or "Moscheh," on account of his wonderful deliverance in infancy (Exod. ii. 10). It is probable, from the fact that no other biblical character bears this name, that it was of Egyptian origin. The old derivation, still followed by many scholars, is the Egyptian mo ("to draw from water") and shi ("to take"); hence the spelling of the LXX., Moishe ("Mouses"). All modern Egyptologists, however, declare themselves against this combination, and prefer the derivation mes, mersu ("child"). Born of the tribe of Levi, at a time when the Egyptian oppression was most severe, and an ordinance had gone out to destroy all the male children of the Israelites, he was placed by his mother, Jochebed (Exod. vi. 20), when he was three months old, in an ark in the Nile, where he was found by an Egyptian princess. It is probable that she was Bint-antha or Meri, daughter of Rameses II., whose residence seems at first to have been Tanis (Zoan), where he was constructing large public works; or perhaps Thermut. According to Eusebius, the deliverer of Moses was called Morris; according to Josephus, Theos Ephesu ("god of Ephesus"); but the name Ephesu, or Ebers, and the daughter of Setis I., who was at the same time the sister and wife of Rameses II. It was while the princess was bathing in the sacred Nile, to which the Egyptians attached much efficacy, that she found the child. By a happy combination of circumstances, her mother was appointed its nurse. This deliverance may be compared with the legendary deliverances of Semiramis, Cyrus, Romulus, etc., in infancy; but the circumstances of it accord exactly with the national customs and history of Egypt (Ebers), and it is not improbable that the legends of Moses were formed upon the basis of it (Ewald).

The deliverance and training of Moses were a providential preparation for his future work. He was "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts vii. 22). Philo (Vita Mosiae) exaggerates this statement when he says he was schooled in all the learning of Greece and the Orient. It is, however, altogether probable that he came into intimate relations with the priesthood, the patron of all learning; and Manetho.

(see Josephus: Contra Apion., i., 26, 9; 26, 12) affirms that he was at first priest of Osiris, and bore the name Osiris, which was subsequently exchanged for Moses. The Bible knows nothing of the military career and the successful campaign against the Ethiopians, of which he was the leader, which Josephus ascribes to him (Antiq., II. 10). This historian even speaks of his marriage with an Egyptian princess. Tharis, and the Egyptologist Lauth finds a confirmation of this statement in a romantic episode related in the papyrus of Anastasi I. The fable, as Ebers has shown, may have come from confusing Moses with a certain Mestis, "prince of Cush." The only circumstance which the Bible relates of this period is his murder of an Egyptian task-master (Exod. ii. 11 sq.), which forced him to flee to Midian in order to escape the wrath of the Pharaoh. In Midian—that is, the south-eastern portion of the Sinaitic peninsula—he acted as herdsman, and married the daughter of a priest called Reuel ("friend of God," Exod. ii. 18), or Jethro ("excellency," iv. 18, xviii. 1); one of which names was probably a title of honor.

The forced sojourn in the solitude of the wilderness was, like his life at court, adapted to prepare Moses for his work. He was taught his own impotence. The voice from the burning bush, which typified the continuance of Israel in spite of the oppressions of Egypt, but the condescension and indwelling of the Holy God in mercy among his sinful people without consuming them (Hofmann, Kurtz, Lange), announces to him his mission, and the deliverance of the children of Israel, who should go forth from Egypt with a rich booty and many honors. Exod. iii. 21, xi. 2, xii., 55 do not at all refer to a mere borrowing of precious things. Moses, resisting at first, ultimately yields to the divine word of command, and receives signs attesting his mission, in the transformation of the rod into a serpent, and covering his hand with the marks of leprosy. Moses' last scruple on the score of his want of eloquence was met with the assurance that his brother Aaron should supply this defect (iv. 11 sq.). Returning to Egypt with Aaron, they deliver their Thersites: on the rod and the monuments, and is identified by Ebers with the daughter of Setis I., who was at the same time the sister and wife of Rameses II. It was while the princess was bathing in the sacred Nile, to which the Egyptians attached much efficacy, that she found the child. By a happy combination of circumstances, her mother was appointed its nurse. This deliverance may be compared with the legendary deliverances of Semiramis, Cyrus, Romulus, etc., in infancy; but the circumstances of it accord exactly with the national customs and history of Egypt (Ebers), and it is not improbable that the legends of Moses were formed upon the basis of it (Ewald).

The deliverance and training of Moses were a providential preparation for his future work. He was "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts vii. 22). Philo (Vita Mosiae) exaggerates this statement when he says he was schooled in all the learning of Greece and the Orient. It is, however, altogether probable that he came into intimate relations with the priesthood, the patron of all learning; and Manetho...
pursued after them, and followed into the open channel the waters had left. A panic, however, ensued in the darkness. A strong east wind suddenly started up, bringing the water down again with tremendous speed, and ingulphing chariots and riders. Thus wonderful delivery at the Red Sea, Moses commemorated in the “Song on the Sea” (Exod. xv. 1 sqq.), whose authenticity ought not to be an occasion of dispute. This, the first national Hebrew song, has an unsurpassed majesty. It sings of the arm of the Lord and his mighty power as having accomplished the marvellous rescue.

The wanderings in the wilderness that followed were peculiarly well adapted to educate the people by forcing them to trust in God. They murmured incessantly; and only the divine care and provision of the pillar of cloud, the manna, the water from the rock, the quails, the victory over Amalek, through the mighty intercession of Moses and the sublime manifestation of God on Mount Sinai, could preserve and quiet the people. Arrived at Sinai, the people had a wonderful manifestation of the divine voice. The covenant was established between Jehovah and his people through the mediation of Moses, and the law was given. The people fell away to the worship of the golden calf; but Moses found an occasion of showing the greatness of his nature, and, without regard to personal consequences, placed himself in the breach, offered himself as an expiation (Exod. xxxii. 30 sqq.), and rested not till the Lord had promised to lead the people on (Exod. xxxiii. 14 sqq.). The people left Sinai after a year’s encampment (comp. Num. x. 11 with Exod. xix. 1); but their murmuring against their leader continued, and they finally refused to go farther northwards towards Canaan, made timid by the report of the spies. Moses’ earnest prayer now continued, and they finally refused to go farther northwards towards Canaan, made timid by the report of the spies. Moses’ earnest prayer now continued, and they finally refused to go farther northwards towards Canaan, made timid by the report of the spies. The people fell away to the worship of the golden calf; but Moses found an occasion of showing the greatness of his nature, and, without regard to personal consequences, placed himself in the breach, offered himself as an expiation (Exod. xxxii. 30 sqq.), and rested not till the Lord had promised to lead the people on (Exod. xxxiii. 14 sqq.). The people left Sinai after a year’s encampment (comp. Num. x. 11 with Exod. xix. 1); but their murmuring against their leader continued, and they finally refused to go farther northwards towards Canaan, made timid by the report of the spies. Moses’ earnest prayer now continued, and they finally refused to go farther northwards towards Canaan, made timid by the report of the spies. The people fell away to the worship of the golden calf; but Moses found an occasion of showing the greatness of his nature, and, without regard to personal consequences, placed himself in the breach, offered himself as an expiation (Exod. xxxii. 30 sqq.), and rested not till the Lord had promised to lead the people on (Exod. xxxiii. 14 sqq.). The people left Sinai after a year’s encampment (comp. Num. x. 11 with Exod. xix. 1); but their murmuring against their leader continued, and they finally refused to go farther northwards towards Canaan, made timid by the report of the spies. Moses’ earnest prayer now continued, and they finally refused to go farther northwards towards Canaan, made timid by the report of the spies. The people fell away to the worship of the golden calf; but Moses found an occasion of showing the greatness of his nature, and, without regard to personal consequences, placed himself in the breach, offered himself as an expiation (Exod. xxxii. 30 sqq.), and rested not till the Lord had promised to lead the people on (Exod. xxxiii. 14 sqq.).

The other years of the fruitless wanderings are almost entirely passed over by the sacred writer. In the first month of the fortieth year the Israelites were in Kadesh. They were still to meet with opposition from the Moabites and Edomites before crossing the Jordan. Both Aaron and Moses lost courage. The people’s discontent was again punished by the visitation of the fiery serpents (Num. xxi. 6), the terrible destruction of whose bite was counteracted by the contemplation of a brazen serpent set up on a pole by Moses. But the life of Moses also came to a close with the conclusion of the forty years of the wandering. After dividing the transjordanic country, which had been conquered, amongst Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, and, according to Deuteronomy, once again repeating the precepts of the law, he prophesied to them in a song their ways and the ways of God (Deut. xxxii.). He was permitted to look down from Mount Nebo over the promised land, the goal of his hopes, but not to enter into it. He died there as he had lived,—in communion with God. His grave remained unknown, but the children of Israel bewailed him for thirty days as the greatest of their race.

Josephus follows the biblical account in his life of Moses (Antiq. II. 9–19) 8, but adds new traditions. Philo, in his Life of Moses (Vita Moses), contemplates him from the four aspects of king, lawgiver, high priest, and prophet. He draws his master from the Fontaneuoh, and interprets the details allegorically. In a pre-biblical age the life was furnished with legends, especially upon his childhood and death. The Assumption of Moses contains revelations purporting to have been given by Moses to Joshua before his death. The rabbinical book Perirot Mosche (edited by Ganlinym, 1627, and Fabricius, 1714) dwells especially upon the latter point. Fantastic details are narrated in the Koran, and current among the Mohammedans, which were derived from rabbinical sources.

Looking at his personality as he is portrayed in the Bible, Moses appears before us animated, from his youth up, with a sense of justice and burning love for his people, educated in the school of God to become the “servant of the Lord” as there was none other in the Old Testament, and learning to check his own violent temper, and submit his will entirely to the Lord. Great was the burden he had to bear as the leader and father of a thankless and obstinate people. The fact that he was able to lead them for forty years without possessing any human power is an undying witness at once to his great intellectual ability and his patience and goodness of heart. He gave himself up without reserve to the welfare of his people; but he received little thanks, and sparse human co-operation in his work. He who was so wonderfully illumined of God, did not hesitate to take the counsel of his father-in-law (Exod. xviii. 18 sqq.), and magnanimously wished that all the people might receive the divine spirit (Num. xi. 29), found only a small hearing for his simplest revelations among the people. His brother Aaron proved unreliable (Exod. xxxxi.), and, with his sister Miriam, intrigued against him (Num. xii.); but he did not become angry. Most properly is he, therefore, called the meekest of all men (Num. xii. 3). This humility, however, was not weakness; and, where the divine honor was in the balances, he could be intensely severe (Exod. xxxxi. 27). His office and mission were the greatest, Christ excepted, ever intrusted to the Hebrews.

Moses was prophet, a mouthpiece of the living God. The sublimity of the divine spirit is noticeable in all his words and acts. This spiritual and moral greatness elevates him far above Mohammed. Of him it is said more frequently than of all other mortals together, that God spoke with him. More often than any other is he called by the name “servant of Jehovah.” He was incomparably the prophet (Num. xii. 6 sqq.; Deut. xxxiv. 10), great alike in word and deed. With him the Lord spake face to face. The divine glory beamed from his face (Exod. xxxiv. 28 sqq.). He, however, like other mortals, did not look upon the face of God (Exod. xxxiii. 17 sqq.); and Spinoza properly says, “If Moses spoke face to face as a man does with his friend, Christ communed directly through the mind with God.” But to Moses was accorded a plainer knowledge of the divine will and more constant communion with God, than to any of the other prophets of the Old Testament.
It is impossible to exaggerate the historical importance of Moses. He not only brought to Israel deliverance, and helped it to a national existence; according to the uniform tradition, he was the human founder of the theocracy, the mediator between Jehovah and Israel. From his time on, Israel's God was Jehovah, and the law also presupposes the sojourn of Israel in the wilderness. There is nowhere evidence of the trunk, however, of the law of the code. The trunk, however, of the law of the code. The trunk, however, of the law of the code. The trunk, however, of the law of the code. The trunk, however, of the law of the code. The trunk, however, of the law of the code. The trunk, however, of the law of the code. The trunk, however, of the law of the code. The trunk, however, of the law of the code. The trunk, however, of the law of the code.
Mosheim was not only the most learned theologian in the Lutheran Church of his day, but was also one of the first German authors and scholars of his age. There was no one who wrote such a pure style, with such elegant fluency, and so much felicity of expression, as he. He was also master of an elegant Latin style. This aesthetic quality was ministered to by his early acquaintance with the literature of England, France, and Italy. As a theologian he occupied an intermediate position between the extremes of Pietism and deism. He was opposed to the confessional orthodoxy on the ground that the theology would thus be excluded from scientific culture. He occupied a position similar to that occupied by Calixtus.

Among his many writings, those on historical subjects display best the range of his learning and his general view, as well as the particularity of his observations and the reproduction of the smallest details, his art of terse delineation, and his faithful representation of the lights and shades, with a partiality, however, for the former. His work on universal church history [written in Latin under the title, Institutiones Hist. Eccl. N. T., Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1728–55; Eng. trans. by Maclaine, 1785–68] was not finished till the year of his death. In his preface to the revised edition [eighth] of the earlier volumes (1755), he stated that he thought seriously of entirely settling aside the arrangement according to the subject-matter which he had chosen in the first place, and making the arrangement to conform solely to chronological divisions, as his friends had urged him, on the ground of its convenience for teaching purposes. Church history had usually been written in the interests of the orthodox party as against the heretical sects. Arnold, on the other hand, had reversed this method. Mosheim, in his work, took the standpoint of an impartial observer and critic. He was specially prepared to write the sections on the history of doctrines by his previous studies in Greek philosophy, and his Latin translation (with notes, Jens, 1738) of Cudworth’s Intellectual System. He also wrote a larger work on the first three Christian centuries, under the title, De rebus Christianorum ante Constantium Magnum Commentariori., Helmstädt, 1758 [Eng. trans. by Murdock, New York, 1852, 2 vols., 5th ed., New York, 1854, 3 vols.], and a history of heresies, under the title, Ketzer-Geschichte, 2d ed., 2 vols., Helmstädt, 1749. Mosheim left no school of church history behind him: Schröckh, however, was an admiring disciple of his. Mosheim’s inquisitive mind reached to nearly every branch of theological science. His most important work in the department of systematic theology was his Sittenlehre d. heil. Schrift., 5 vols., Helmstädt, 1735–58, etc., in which he considers the matter under two heads: (1) “The internal holiness of the soul,” and (2) “The external holiness of conduct which the law of Christ requires from a Christian.” As a preacher Mosheim was much admired by his contemporaries; and his sermons, published in 7 vols. (1725 and often), were highly esteemed as models of sermonic method. For other writings of Mosheim, see Baur: Epochen d. Kirchengeschichtsschreibung, pp. 128 sqq. Compare Lücke: Narratio de Moschumio, Göttingen, 1887.

Mosque (from Arabic masjed, “a house of prayer”) is the Mohammedan place of worship. The first one was built by Mohammed himself at Medina, in a graveyard opposite to the spot where his camel knelt on his public entrance into that city. The most famous mosques are Masjed el Nabi (“the Mosque of the Prophet”) at Medina, replacing the original one; El-Hamram at Mecca, enclosing the Ka‘bah; Santa Sophia in Constantinople, originally a Greek basilica; the Mosque of Omar, in the Haram enclosure at Jerusalem; the Great Mosque, at Damascus; the mosque at Hebron; and the alabaster mosque of Mehemet Ali, at Cairo. The most elaborate mosque is the Great Mosque at Delhi, built by Shah Jehan (1681–57). Mosques are found, of course, in every Mohammedan settlement, and vary as much in cost and beauty as do our churches; but in general features they are alike, and consist of a domed building, a court with a fountain, in which ablutions are performed prior to entering (and often several of these), a minaret or tower, from which the muezzin calls the faithful to prayer. Inside they are open spaces, devoid of pictorial ornamentation, except by quotations from the Koran, often beautifully done, upon the walls. They contain the mihrab (a niche surmounted by a vaulted arch), towards which the faithful pray, because it is placed in the direction of Mecca; and the minbar, or platform-pulpit, upon which the ministers stand during service. Frequently, if not always, one sees a number of ostrich-eggs suspended from the ceiling directly before the mihrab: these symbolize immortality. The bareness of a mosque — no seats, no pictures, no statues — is in striking contrast with the ornate though tawdry ornamentation of the Roman and Greek churches; for instance, as they exist side by side in Jerusalem. The mosque is a composite building, in that its dome is Byzantine, its minaret is the Christian campanile, without its bell, forbidden in Mohammedan worship (see art. Bells), while the court is like a khann. Women are occasionally seen in the fore part of mosques. The Mohammedan removes his slippers before entering: the Christian puts on huge slippers over his shoes. Formerly only Mohammedans were allowed in them; but now the “infidel dog” enters them with much impunity, although liable to curses, and sometimes to opposition. In connection with them are schools where the Koran is taught. In the Mosque El-Azhar at Cairo is the great university of the Mohammedans, whither students come from all parts of their world; as many as ten thousand, it is said, being congregated there at one time. Other establishments, benevolent in character, are also connected with mosques.
MOUNT HOLYOKE FEMALE SEMINARY is situated in South Hadley, Mass., amid the charming
scenery of the Connecticut Valley. It was opened in 1837, and during the forty-five years
ending in June, 1852, has sent forth 1,780 graduates. At a period when there existed no per-
nmanent school of a high order for girls in the United States, it was founded by the personal
efforts of one far-seeing and large-hearted Chri-
tian woman. In those days there were no prince-
ly gifts from millionaires to educate the daugh-
ters: it was by small offerings from many slender
purses that the enterprise was begun. There was
in it, however, a hidden vitality, which has kept
it growing ever since. The first edifice, a four-
story brick building ninety-four feet by fifty, now
forms part of a quadrangle, whose buildings placed
in line would extend some 575 feet. In 1870
there was added to these a fire-proof library build-
ing, now containing 11,000 volumes; in 1876, the
Lyman Williston Hall, for science and art; and
in 1881, an astronomical observatory, completely
equipped with new instruments of the best make.
The grounds, also, have been much enlarged, and
now include fifty acres.
To establish a permanent institution offering
the best educational advantages at a moderate
expense was but a part of Miss Lyon's design.
It was to be so planned and carried on, that its
entire culture should result, not merely in thor-
ough and extensive intellectual attainments, but
also in symmetrical and efficient Christian lives.
The course of study, being solid rather than showy,
has always required some maturity, and considera-
able advancement, in order to enter upon it. There
is no preparatory department. In addition to the
regular curriculum, extensive courses in French,
German, or Greek, may be pursued; and instruc-
tion is also provided in drawing, painting, and
music. Thoroughness has marked the school from
the first. Classes are subdivided, so that the
number reciting together is not large. Text-
books are made bite the student, not the limit of research; the library being a constant
and indispensable resort. The natural sciences
are amply illustrated by extensive cabinets and
superior apparatus; the history of art, by paint-
ings, casts, photographs, and engravings.
A marked feature of the family life, that the ordinary housework is done by the young
ladies, with the supervision of the teachers and
matrons. About one hour a day is thus employed.
Each pupil has her own definite duties, and re-
tains the position assigned her for a term or
more, unless some personal reason requires a
change. If ill, she is excused; and her place is supplied, for the time, from a reserve corps.
Several considerations had weight in deciding upon
this plan. It promised to be at once more eco-
nomical and more independent than to employ
scores of servants; it would give healthful exer-
cise; it would tend to preserve and increase an
taste for home duties; and its practical testimony
to the dignity of useful labor would do good.
Thus it has proved; and time has shown other
advantages not so clearly foreseen. Observing
how smoothly the domestic affairs of this family
of three hundred are carried on without servants,
the pupil is strongly impressed with the value of
system, co-operation, and prompt activity. She
learns how to take responsibility, and to enjoy it.
She sees how the comfort of all comes from the
fidelity of each to her brief task; and by degrees
it becomes her habit to look out for the general
good rather than her own ease.
"Our whole system," remarked one of the ear-
er teachers, "is really an arrangement for gain-
ing and applying moral power." The shaping
of character may, indeed, be considered its special
work. The impress of the Holyoke training is
clearly visible upon a large majority of the wo-
men educated here. Favored by the retired loca-
tion, as well as by the family life, with its con-
stant and familiar intercourse between teachers
and pupils, more work of this kind can be done
than would be possible under other conditions.
Much is effected by regulations tending to insure
habits of promptness and diligence, of order and
system, of self-control and thoughtfulness for
others; while religious influences, unsectarian yet
positive and strong, underlie and crown all the
rest. Pupils soon observe, that, while it is not
asked what church they are wont to attend at
home, it is considered a question of the utmost
consequence whether their talents shall be given
to selfish aims, or consecrated to Christ. They
hear much of the various benevolent enterprises
of the day, and learn to look forward to an active
and useful life. The sabbath Bible lessons, and
those studies of the prescribed course which may
be termed religious, make a good basis in prepa-
ring for the Christian activities of future years.
Fully three-fourths of the whole number of stu-
dents have subsequently taught more or less, and
many have done missionary work in foreign lands
or at home.
The seminary is not yet endowed. Its ordinary
expenses are usually covered by the receipts for
board and tuition, moderate as are the terms;
and, for needful improvements, it never looks in
vain to its numerous friends. A small annual
income from funds bequeathed for the purpose is
used in assisting, to some extent, deserving pupils
who need such aid.
See Life of Mary Lyon, American Tract Socie-
ty; Historical Sketch of Mount Holyoke Seminary,
1875.

MOURNING. It is characteristic of all Oriental people, that while they freely vent their vehemem feelings, more
especially that of grief, in violent though wholly
involuntary gesticulations, they at the same time
try to express those feelings by means of sym-
bolic and often merely conventional signs. In
Scripture, where the act of mourning such as per-
formed by the Hebrews is often described, the
same double mode of expressing a feeling also
occurs: now the involuntary and purely patholo-

gical utterance of the sorrow, such as crying,
wringing the hands, etc.; and then the similarly
and merely conventional sign, such as dressing in
sackcloth, sprinkling ashes on the head, etc. It
must be noticed, however, that in many cases, as,
for instance, in that of rending the clothes, the
conventional symbol evidently originated as a sim-
ple and natural expression.

Among the most conspicuous purely pathologi-
cal utterances of sorrow, such as occur among the

---

1 See article on Mary Lyon.
Hebrews are tearing off the hair, and plucking out the beard (Ex. ix. 9; Job i. 20; Josephus, Ant., 13, 3; 9, 36). The custom of shaving off the head and the hair, which was a sign of mourning (Jer. iv. 3), was also performed during the time of the Bible. In the New Testament, the shaving of the head is mentioned in the story of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 19, 20), and the beard was considered a sign of mourning (Matt. xxvi. 67; John xix. 22, 30).

Among the Rabbis, the custom of shaving the head was more widespread. Shaving the head and the beard was considered a sign of mourning and was performed during the time of the Bnei Zid (Job ii. 12). Shaving the head was also performed during the time of the Roman Empire, when the death of a parent was mourned by the family for a period of seven days (Num. xx. 29; Deut. xxxiv. 8). The shaving of the head was also performed during the time of the Bnei Zid (Job ii. 12). Shaving the head was also performed during the time of the Roman Empire, when the death of a parent was mourned by the family for a period of seven days (Num. xx. 29; Deut. xxxiv. 8).

The shaving of the head was also performed during the time of the Roman Empire, when the death of a parent was mourned by the family for a period of seven days (Num. xx. 29; Deut. xxxiv. 8). The shaving of the head was also performed during the time of the Bnei Zid (Job ii. 12). Shaving the head was also performed during the time of the Roman Empire, when the death of a parent was mourned by the family for a period of seven days (Num. xx. 29; Deut. xxxiv. 8).
for the main service from the Epistles and Gospels, it has three lessons from the Epistles, Gospels, and prophets. (3) It gives prominence to homiletical matter, and in this respect it stands alone. After each of the three readings, there is a short homiletical discourse to the people, in which the hortatory element predominates. (4) The use of the Agios three times after the Benedictus, the breaking of the host into nine parts, each of which has a special name and meaning, etc., recall the custom of the Greek Church. (5) The Mozarabic Chant differs from the Gregorian by being more melodious, etc. It is called the "Eugenian," after a certain archbishop of Toledo, Eugenius. In general, we may say that this Liturgy is one of the most venerable products of Christian antiquity, that it draws largely upon the Scriptures, and is equal to any other Liturgy in the purity, dignity, and warmth of its tone and language. See Migne: Patrology, vol. lxxxvi.

(The "Church of Jesus" in Mexico has adopted the Mozarabic Liturgy.)

Palmers.

MOZLEY, James Bowling, D.D., canon of Worcester, regius professor of divinity,—an officewhich he held, in conjunction with his vicarage, until his death. He was appointed Bampton Lecturer for 1855; and his work on the Miracles, which was the outcome of that lecturership, attracted great attention. While Mozley was a student at Oxford, the influence of Newman, Hurrell Froude, Keble, and Pusey, was in the ascendant; and he was an enthusiastic yet independent follower of those early leaders in the Tractarian movement. But, when Newman entered the Church of Rome, Mozley kept firm in his allegiance to the Anglican Church. As the bishop of his diocese named him the "forlorn hope," he was at once recognized as one of the best theological thinkers of his day. Besides the works already referred to, there were published, after his death, Essays, Historical and Theological, London and New York, 1878, 2 vols.; Practical and Parochial Sermons, 1878; and Lectures and Other Theological Papers, 1883.

W. M. TAYLOR.

MUEDDIN, or MUEZZIN, an official attached to a Mohammedan mosque, whose business it is to call the faithful to prayer five times in the twenty-four hours. He chants these words each time, as he walks around the little balcony outside the minaret: "Allah is most great. I testify that there is no God but Allah I testify that Mohammed is the apostle of Allah Come to prayer. Come to security." "Prayer is better than sleep" is added in the morning.

MUFTI (Arabic, "expounder of the law"), a Turkish official of half-ecclesiastical, half-civil, character. As the Koran is not only the spirit, but also the material, foundation of all law among Mohammedans, the expounder of the law, the mufti, is at once priest and judge. There is a mufti in every large town in the Turkish Empire.

MUGGLETONIANS, the followers of Ludowick Muggleton (b. 1609; d. March 14, 1697) and
John Reeve, journeyman tailors. These two professed to be the "two witnesses" of Rev. xi. 3–6, and announced that the last days had come, and they were divinely commissioned to prophesy, and had also authority to curse all who opposed them. Muggleton declared that he stood in the same relation to Reeve that Aaron did to Moses, i.e., he was his "mouth." They gathered a large following; and the Muggletonians, as the sect was called, existed in England down to one day, Mr. Joseph Gander, who died in 1866, being, it is said, the last adherent. Their doctrines are thus stated in Blunt's Dict. of Sects, s. v.: "Earth and water were not created, but self-originated; the Evil One became incarnate in Eve; the Father was the sufferer upon the cross, having left Elijah to govern heaven while he came to earth to die." They also taught that God has a human body, and that there is no Trinity, properly speaking. See A Complete Collection of the Works of Reeve and Muggleton, London, 1756, reprinted, 1832, 3 vols.

MÜHLENBERG, Heinrich Melchior, D.D., the patriarch of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania and adjacent States; b. Sept. 6, 1711, at Eimbeck, near Halle, Eastphalia, Germany, and was the patriarch of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania, as the name of H. M. Mühlenberg is most honorably connected. Three imperfectly organized congregations in Pennsylvania (New Hanover, New Providence, and Philadelphia) sent (1733) three delegates to England, Holland, and Germany, to solicit donations for the erection of churches and schoolhouses, and to petition for the sending of a suitable pastor for themselves, and of missionaries for the German Lutherans, in considerable numbers settled in diverse places of the eastern portion of Pennsylvania. Those delegates met with much sympathy, especially from the Rev. Fr. Mich. Ziegenhagen (1722–76, chaplain of the royal St. James Chapel at London), and from the directors of the benevolent institutions founded by the Rev. Dr. Aug. Herm. Francke at Halle (and after his death, 1727, continued by his son Dr. G. A. Francke), Dr. Freylinghausen, and other representatives of the Pietism of Philipp Jacob Spener, who were also professors of Halle University, and took a lively interest in the work of missions. That delegation and subsequent correspondence resulted (1742) in the sending of H. M. Mühlenberg to Pennsylvania, where he at once came into collision with Count Zinzendorf, who, having arrived in the fall of the preceding year, had assumed the character of a superintendent of the Lutheran congregations, but now began to establish Moravian churches. H. M. Mühlenberg, assisted by other missionaries sent from Halle, and by a number of suitable men whom he met with in the Colonies, founded during his lifetime a large number of congregations in Pennsylvania and beyond its boundaries. The German Evangelical Lutheran ministerium of Pennsylvania and adjacent States, organized 1748, became the mother-synod of a considerable number of synods in the United States. H. M. Mühlenberg had devoted himself to the study of theology, 1737 and 1738, at Göttingen; identified himself with the Spenerian Pietism; began as a student the instruction of poor and neglected children; enjoyed the respect of some young men of the same turn of mind, but to aristocratic families (Counts Reuss and Henkel); continued his studies at Halle, where he at the same time was employed as a teacher in the Orphan Home of Francke; served, after having been ordained at Leipzig, from 1739 to 1741 as pastor of Grossmühlendorf, Lusatia; published there a defence of Pietism, which occasioned a number of controversial writings; and followed, 1742, the call offered to him by Dr. Francke in behalf of the German Lutherans in Pennsylvania. On his voyage he spent two months in England; took, in crossing the ocean, much interest in the spiritual welfare of his fellow-passengers; preached to them in the English language (he was able to proclaim the gospel in four languages); arrived, Sept. 22, 1742, at Charleston, S.C., and paid a visit to the Lutherans, who, on account of cruel persecution, had left Roman-Catholic Salzburg and its neighborhood, colonized at Ebenezer, near Savannah, Ga. On the 26th of November, after a perilous voyage, he arrived at Philadelphia; entered at once upon his work; administered, under great difficulties, to the three congregations which had petitioned for a pastor, and extended his usefulness to other localities, receiving, 1745 and in later years, additional strength, especially through colaborers sent from Halle (P. Brunnholtz, Nic. Kurtz, J. H. Schaub, J. F. HANDSCHUCH, J. D. M. Heinzelmann, W. Kurtz, J. L. Voigt, J. A. Krug, Fred. Schultz, J. H. Chr. HELMUTH, Chr. Em. Schulzke, J. Chr. Kunze, J. Fr. SCHMIDT). April 23, 1745, H. M. Mühlenberg married a daughter of Col. Conrad Weiser of Tulpehocken, a man well known in the colonial history of Pennsylvania. With H. M. Mühlenberg, and the other missionaries sent from Halle, a number of other Lutheran pastors, laboring at diverse localities in the North-American provinces (J. Chr. Hartwich, B. M. Haule, J. S. Gerock, etc.), connected themselves in the course of time, and the field of labor was extended. Shortly after the middle of the last century, that field extended from Frederick, Md., through Pennsylvania and New York, and thence to the Hudson and to New-York City. It must be admitted that this result was eminently owing to the practical tact and persevering energy of H. M. Mühlenberg, who for a long time had more or less the supervision of the Lutheran congregations of that large territory, and, when attached to Lutheran doctrines, maintained a friendly relation to representatives of other Protestant denominations, among those particularly to the Rev. M. Schlatter, the patriarch of the German Reformed Church in the United States. A.D. 1748, the first Lutheran synod was organized, which proved a blessing for the proper foundation, organization, and discipline of congregations. This synod stood in very friendly relations to the Swedish Lutheran ministers, who, under a superintendent appointed by the higher authorities in Sweden, served a considerable number of congregations in the present states of Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

H. M. Mühlenberg resided during the years 1748–61 at New Providence, Montgomery County, Penn. In 1751 and 1762 he was, during the sum-
mer months, active in the city of New York and its vicinity. He repeated his visit there in 1759 and 1760, at the same paying attention to a number of congregations in New Jersey. Difficulties in the rapidly increasing congregation at Philadelphia moved him to take charge of this important field. He introduced there a new constitution, under which the congregation still is ruled, and which formed the model for the constitution of many Lutheran congregations. In Philadelphia the second house of worship for the German many Lutheran congregations. In Philadelphia to 1769, and for a long period admitted to be the finest and largest church-edifice in Pennsylvania. The winter 1774-75 H. M. Muhlenberg spent in Ebenezer, Ga., where he succeeded in re-establishing peace and order in that congregation, in settling some legal difficulties concerning its property, and in introducing an improved constitution. In July, 1776, he, with the permission of the Philadelphia Synod, again took up his residence at New Providence. Having, with his whole family, pronouced in favor of American independence, he was exposed to many inconveniences. He continued to preach, as circumstances demanded his services, and to assist the congregation with his influence. He then visited various congregations in New Jersey. Difficulties in the Lutheran Church at Lawn, Penn., numbered twenty-four clerical members. The synod, as well as the congregations, were established on the unaltered Augsburg Confession and on all the other symbolical books of the Lutheran Church. The rigor of the doctrinal position was modified by Pietism as it prevailed at Halle. Halle ceased, after the death of H. M. Muhlenberg, to exercise its specific influence on the Lutheran Church in the United States.

Of three sons of Dr. Muhlenberg who received their preliminary education for the sacred service in Germany, the most renowned is J. Peter C., major-general of the United-States army; b. Oct. 1, 1751, in Bavaria, now at Nordheim, Sachsen-Meiningen, Allentown, Penn. 1786; the University of Pennsylvania honored him with the title D.D. In his latter years he suffered from various bodily ailments. At his death the Lutheran synod of Pennsylvania numbered twenty-four clerical members. The synod, as well as the congregations, were established on the unaltered Augsburg Confession and on all the other symbolical books of the Lutheran Church. The rigor of the doctrinal position was modified by Pietism as it prevailed at Halle. Halle ceased, after the death of H. M. Muhlenberg, to exercise its specific influence on the Lutheran Church in the United States.
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Among his multifarious labors the most important may be classed as follows: (1) The Christianizing of education; (2) Church unity, or his lifelong aim and desire for the union, in some practical form, of the evangelical bodies of Christendom; (3) Christian brotherhood, exemplifying itself in institutions of charity and beneficence for the poor and oppressed. He gave himself predominantly to Christian education from the time of his leaving Lancaster (1826) till he entered the pastorate of the Free Church of the Holy Communion, New York, in 1846. Bishops, doctors, judges, and merchant-princes are among his scholars; and his methods are perpetuated in a multitude of schools throughout the land, patterned after his. In the early years of the Church of the Holy Communion, many noble charities had their birth. Scarcely an important movement in the Episcopal Church did not originate with him. It was during his ministry in the Church of the Holy Communion, that he enunciated most emphatically those "Evangelical Catholic" principles which he believed to be the true theory of the Christian Church. His most signal expression of these principles is found in what is known as The Muhlenberg Memorial. See Evangelical Catholic Papers, New York, T. Whittaker, 1879.

His grandest exemplifications of Christian brotherhood are the institutions of St. Luke's Hospital in New York, and the Church Village of St. Johnland on Long Island, N.Y. St. Luke's Hospital was begun, as to the foundation-stone, in 1854, completed for occupancy in 1858. St. Johnland was incorporated in 1870, but came into preliminary operation three or four years earlier. The whole of Dr. Muhlenberg's long life was one stream of blessed charity. "His faith was not a theological formula, but a living conviction and power. It was a free, joyous allegiance to Jesus Christ. The incarnation was the central idea of his theology and the inspiration of his Christian brotherhood in Christ, brotherhood through Christ."

He never married, and, though born to affluence, did not leave money enough for his funeral. He died in St. Luke's Hospital, and was buried at St. Johnland. See Anne Ayres: *Life and Works of William Augustus Muhlenberg*, New York, Harper Brothers, 1890. ANNE AYRES.

MULLENS, Joseph, a distinguished foreign missionary, and secretary of the London Missionary Society; b. in 1820; d. near Mwapwa, Eastern Africa, July 10, 1879. He labored as a missionary in India from 1848 to 1866. In 1866 he was appointed secretary of the London Missionary Society, in 1870 visited the United States, and spent the year 1873-74 in a journey and visit to Madagascar in the interest of missionary work. He was active in securing the convention of the Mildmay Conference, held in London, 1878. His last great desire was to establish the missions of the London Society in Ujiji, Africa, on a permanent basis. In this interest he accompanied several missionaries to Africa. Starting from Zanzibar, and with his face set toward Lake Tanganyika, he reached the halfway station Mwapwa, where he died of peritonitis. There his remains lie buried on a conspicuous eminence; and his tablet will continue to be in Eastern Africa what Bushnell's is on the Western coast,—a sacred appeal and encouragement to further effort for the enlightenment of the Dark Continent. Dr. Mullen was a man of great earnestness, and rare gifts as a speaker. Among his works are *London and Calcutta*, 6th thousand, London, 1869; *Twelve Months in Madagascar*, 2d ed., London, 1875.

MÜLLER, Heinrich, b. at Lübeck, Oct. 18, 1831; d. at Rostock, Sept. 28, 1875; studied theology in the latter place, and was appointed professor of Greek there, 1859, professor of theology, 1862, and superintendent, 1871. He published a *Methodus politica*, 1843; *Harmonia veteris et novi testamenti chronologica*, 1848; *Theologia scholastica*, 1870, etc. But it was as a preacher and devotional writer, and not as a theologian, he exercised so deep and wide an influence. His dogmatical work, the centre of Lutheran orthodoxy; but he is, nevertheless, a precursor of Pietism, and his devotional books—*Himmelscher Liebeskuss*, 1859 (1848); *Apostolische*, 1863 (1855), H. M. und seine Zeit (Rostock, 1866) and C. Gottl. Schmidt: *Geschichte der Predigt* (Gotha, 1872, pp. 106-110). H. BECK.

MÜLLER, Johann Georg, b. at Schaffhausen, Sept. 3, 1798; d. there Sept. 20, 1819; studied theology at Zürich and Göttingen, and in Weimar under Herder, and was appointed professor of Greek and Hebrew in the *Collegium Humanitatis*, in his native city, 1794, and afterwards professor of encyclopedia and methodology. His writings,—of which the principal ones are, *Philosophische Aufsätze*, Breslau, 1798; *Unterhaltungen mit Serena*, Wintherthur, 1793-1803, 2 vols., 3d ed., 1834; *Briefe über das Studium der Wissenschaften*, 1798 (1817); *Theophil, 1801; Reliquien alt. Zeit.*, 1803-06, 4 vols.; *Vom Glauben d. Christ.*, 1816, 2 vols. (1823), etc. — were mostly intended for young people, and exercised a considerable influence as a mediation between the reigning rationalism and the winning religious awakening. He was the brother of the celebrated historian of Switzerland, Johannes von Mühler (1752-1809). See K. Stokar: *Johann Georg Müller, Professor und Ober schulherr zu Schaffhausen*, Basel, 1885.] G. KIRCHHOFER.

MÜLLER, Julius, a distinguished German evangelical theologian, and, for many years, professor of systematic theology at Halle; the son of a clergyman; was b. at Briesg, in Silesia, April 10, 1801; d. at Halle, Sept. 28, 1878. After the usual course of study in the gymnasium, he entered, in 1819, the university of Breslau. In 1820 he went to Göttingen, where his brother Otfried was acting as professor of *theology* at the Georgia Augusta. His parents had set him apart for a legal career; and both here and at Breslau his dissertations gained prizes in the department of jurisprudence. His works were printed, and favorably noticed by Savigny. On the fiftieth anniversary (June 4, 1871) of his
him doctor of laws. He felt, however, that a receiving the prize at Göttingen, the faculty made higher life was presenting itself to his mind; the degree of doctor of divinity.

In 1838 Müller became a contributor to the Studien u. Kritiken, by a review of Gœschel's works. In this and succeeding contributions he asserted the impossibility of harmonizing the philosophy of Hegel with the Christian system, as also the inadequacy of Schleiermacher's theology in some important particulars, as the cogoscibility of God, etc. In 1836 he contributed an article reviewing Strauss's Life of Christ, which he followed up, in 1838, by another on the same subject, in rejoinder to the reply of Strauss.

More important than these contributions was his work, D. christl. Lehre von d. Sünde ["The Christian Doctrine of Sin"]; first published at Breslau, 1839, under the title Vom Wesen u. von Grunde d. Sünde ["The Nature and Foundation of Sin"]). The second part followed, in 1844, which continued the investigation into the possibility of sin. Six editions have since appeared. The second and third contained many additions, taking notice of the criticisms, especially those of Rothe in his Ethics, and of Valke and Dorner. The last three editions have hardly any changes.

In the Dedication, he denies that intellectual thought stands in contradiction to Christian experience, and that meditation upon sin leads to the destruction of the religious fear of it. As against Hegel, he denied that a system of absolute knowledge is inconsistent with the actual state of the world pervaded by evil. Here, also, he gives due prominence to the consciousness of sin and guilt, which is made too little of in Schleiermacher's system. This personal consciousness of sin is declared to carry with it the sense of condemnation. Sin is intelligent self-determination. No recent system of theology is so closely allied to the theology of the confessions as this of Julius Müller, who asserts the reality of guilt and the necessity of an objective atonement.

Müller had several calls to other universities, but remained at Marburg until 1844 when he accepted the professorship at Halle, made vacant by Ullmann's removal to Heidelberg. [Here, during the remainder of his life, he exerted a wide influence, both by the stimulus of his lectures, and his simple, sincere Christian character. With Dorner of Berlin, he was the most learned and profound lecturer in the department of systematic theology in Germany, and, with Tholuck, the chief centre of attraction to the students at Halle.] In August of the same year he lost his wife, and in 1844 he was made a widower for the second time. He took a prominent part in the measures resulting in the Volkschulentag (see art.), and participated actively in its meetings till 1854. In 1850 he founded, in conjunction with Neander and Nitzsch, the Deutsche
MUMMY.

Zeitschrift für christl. Wissenschaft u. christl. Leben ("German periodical of Christian Science and Life"), to which he contributed many valuable articles. — Would there have been an Incarnation if the Fall had not occurred? 1850; Faith and Knowledge, 1853, etc. These have, for the most part, appeared in his Dogmatische Abhandlungen ("Theological Discussions"), Bremen, 1870.

From the year 1858 on, he suffered greatly from a sense of inadequacy in connection with his position to the public. He saw his colleagues dashing away, to the homes of his nine married children. On May 6, 1875, he celebrated, surrounded by them and his grandchildren, the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination. In the summer of his life, he confined his labors almost exclusively to the lecture-room. He saw his colleagues and friends, Hupfeld and Tholuck, pass away before him, but had much comfort from his visits, during vacation, to the homes of his nine married children. On May 6, 1875, he celebrated, surrounded by them and his grandchildren, the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination. In the summer of 1878 he resigned his professorship to make way for younger talent, but died soon after, Sept. 27.

Julius Müller's Lectures on Theology would have been welcomed in print by a large circle of pupils and admirers; but a provision of his will stipulated that all his manuscripts should be destroyed.

See Sketch of his life by his son-in-law, Leopold Scholze, Bremen, 1879. David Hupfeld.

MÜMPELGART, The Colloquy of, was occasioned by the incorporation of the countship of Mümpelgart with the duchy of Württemberg by inheritance. The Reformation had been established in the country in 1530, according to the Calvinistic type; but the Duke of Württemberg then tried to re-organize the church according to the Lutheran type. In order to solve the various complications which arose from those circumstances, a disputation was arranged between the Calvinists and the Lutherans in the castle of Mümpelgart. It lasted from March 21 to March 26, 1588. On the Calvinist side spoke Beza; on the Lutheran, André. But the only result of the disputation was, that the differences between the two parties became deeper and more glaring. No official protocol was kept. See A. Schweizer: Geschicheder reformirten Centraldogmen, Zurich, 1853, vol. ii.; [L. Keller: Geschichte der Wiedertäufer zu Münster, Münster, 1880; and the arts. Anabaptists and Bockholt].

MÜNTNER, Friedrich Christian Karl Heinrich, b. at Gotha, Oct. 14, 1781; d. in Copenhagen, April 9, 1880; was educated in Copenhagen, studied theology at Göttingen, travelled in Italy, 1786, and was appointed professor of theology in the university of Copenhagen, 1788, and bishop of Zealand, 1808. His erudition was comprehensive and accurate, and his influence was speedily felt. Rothmann began to preach — that infant baptism was only of property, but also of wives — a despotism was established, with John of Leyden at the head, as "king of all the world;" and every attempt of keeping the folly within certain bounds of soberness and decency was punished with outrageous cruelty. Sometimes more than fifty persons were beheaded a day. First the bishop, a count of Waldeck, tried to conquer the bewildered city, and restore order within its walls; but the army at his disposal proved utterly insufficient. Not until an imperial army had besieged the city for several weeks, and famine and dissension reduced the strength of the fanatics, were the walls forced, and the rioters overwhelmed, June 26, 1535. See Cornelius: Die Geschichtsquellen des Bethams Münster, Münster, 1858, vol. ii.; [L. Keller: Geschichte der Wiedertäufer zu Münster, Münster, 1880; and the arts. Anabaptists and Bockholt].

MÜNTZ, O. Thelemann.

MÜNTZER, Friedrich Christian Karl Heinrich, b. at Gotha, Oct. 14, 1781; d. in Copenhagen, April 9, 1880; was educated in Copenhagen, studied theology at Göttingen, travelled in Italy, 1786, and was appointed professor of theology in the university of Copenhagen, 1788, and bishop of Zealand, 1808. His erudition was comprehensive and accurate, and was a prolific writer in Danish, German, and Latin. Among his works, many of which have still considerable value for church history, and Oriental languages and antiquities, the principal are an edition of the Copernican translation of Daniel, Rome, 1790; Die Widerspruche der kirchlichen Alterthümer der Gnostiker, 1790; the publication of the statute-book of the Templars, 1794, which he discovered in the Corsini Library in Rome; Die dänische Reformationsgeschichte, 1802, 2 vols.; De schola Autochthona, 1811; Religion der Karthager, 1816; Kirchengeschichte von Dänemark und Norwegen, 1833–44, 3 vols.; Fefta et oraculam Montanistarum, 1829, etc. L. Pelt.

MÜNZER, Thomas, was b. about 1490 at Stolberg in the Harz region, and educated at Aschersleben and Halle. After studying theology at Leipzig, he was first appointed teacher at the Martini Gymnasium in Hannover, 1517, then chaplain and confessor in the nunneries of Beutitz near Weissenfels, 1519, and finally (1520) preacher at the Church of St. Mary in Zwickau. There his proper career began; though his craving for
adventures, his passion for secret societies, and his talent as a demagogue, had already previously revealed themselves. In Zwickau he immediately joined a union of fanatics, mostly weavers, who, with Nikolaus Storch at their head, had organized themselves under the leadership of twelve apostles and seventy-two disciples, and held secret conventicles, in which they proclaimed, with much division and activity. The activity of the union soon developed into open conflicts with the civil authorities; but the magistrates stepped in with energy, and a great number of the members were expelled from the city. Münzer left in April, 1521.

Wandering through Bohemia, where, in spite of the prevailing fermentation, he seems to have made only a slight impression, and Mark Brandenburg, he arrived, in the beginning of 1522, at Wittenberg, where Carlstadt and the Zwickau prophets had brought matters to a most dangerous crisis. Münzer immediately joined in the general excitement; but when in March, Luther reappeared in the city, and began to preach, he soon came to feel that the place for the realization of his ideals was not there, and he consequently left. Having been elected pastor of Alstedt in 1523, he soon gained the entire confidence of his flock; and all the changes which he proposed in the ecclesiastical organization of his congregation were willingly accepted. But even at Alstedt he felt Luther as an obstacle, and to destroy the influence of Luther became his first object. From the presses of Eilenburg, Jena, and Alstedt, a swarm of libels were issued against Luther; but as those pamphlets also preached open revolt against the civil order existing, and as at the same time the existence of a widely-spread secret society became palpably evident, the immediate result was, that, on the denunciation of Luther, Münzer was summoned to Weimar to defend himself before the Duke of Saxony, Aug. 1, 1524. He failed utterly in his defence, and was ordered to leave the country.

After a tour through Southern Germany, where he hoped to procure allies, he settled, towards the close of 1524, at Mühlhausen, and there he found the basis for his great schemes. Crowds of peasants and burghers, and even some noblemen of the neighborhood, joined the movement. The magistrates were unable to maintain order. They were compelled to consent to their own abrogation, and the establishment of a thoroughly revolutionary government in the city. From Mühlhausen the revolt spread through the whole of Thuringia, and gradually assumed the character of a peasants' war. Not only churches and monasteries, but also castles, were attacked, pillaged, and burnt. The Count of Mansfeld was unable to quell the uproar. But soon the Dukes of Saxony and Brunswick, and the Landgrave of Hesse, came to his aid; and at Frankenhausen (May 15, 1525) the peasant army, under the leadership of Münzer, was utterly defeated, and almost completely massacred. Münzer escaped, but was caught shortly after, and beheaded, together with Storch.

The tendency which Münzer represented was half religious, half social. He had drawn some inspiration from Joachim of Floris, Suso, and Tauler; and there were genuine elements of religious mysticism in his own nature. But the violence of his temper, and the incoherence of his character, prevented him from grasping the principles of the Reformation under any other form than that of wild fanaticism and uproar. His writings, which are few, and composed in an obscure and bombastic style, are unimportant, and show a singular combination of meagreness and confusion. To receive divine inspiration from Joachim of Floris, Suso, and Tauler; and there were genuine elements of religious mysticism in his own nature. But the violence of his temper, and the incoherence of his character, prevented him from grasping the principles of the Reformation under any other form than that of wild fanaticism and uproar. His writings, which are few, and composed in an obscure and bombastic style, are unimportant, and show a singular combination of meagreness and confusion.
various criteria are mentioned from which intention might be inferred. If a person killed another accidentally, he was still liable to the revenge of blood, if the victim died immediately; but he might escape the revenge by shutting himself up in a city of refuge. Even if the victim were alive, the slayer was considered guilty when the murder had taken place during night (Exod. xxii. 2, 3). Killing by poison is not mentioned in the Mosaic law. Later Jewish legislation treated it as a kind of witchcraft, and the attempt was punished by death (Josephus: Ant. 11. 8. 34). Nor is murder of wife, or husband, or children, mentioned. Parricide is specially abhorred (1 Sam. xxxi. 5; 2 Sam. xiv. 6). Suicide was not punished more heavily than other kind of murder (Gen. xxvii. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 6). Suicide was specially abhorred (1 Sam. xxxi. 5; 2 Sam. xii. 23). See also Josephus: Bell. Jud., 3, 8, 5.

MURDOCK, James, D.D., b. in Westbrook, Conn., Feb. 16, 1776; d. in Columbus, Miss., Aug. 10, 1856. He was graduated from Yale College, 1797; entered the Congregational ministry; pastor in Princeton, Mass., 1802-15; professor of ancient languages in the University of Vermont, 1815-19; professor of sacred rhetoric and ecclesiastical history in Andover Theological Seminary, 1819-28; retired to New Haven, and from then till his death devoted himself exclusively to the study of church history, orientalia, and philosophy. The principal fruits of this learned leisure are a translation from the German of Münch's Elements of Dogmatic History, New Haven, 1830; a translation from the Latin of Mosheim's Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, New Haven, 1832, 3 vols., revised edition, New York, 1839, and often since (republished in London, edited by Soames, 1841, and Reid, 1845); a translation of Mosheim's Commentaries on the affairs of the Christians before the time of Constantine the Great, New York, 1851-52, 2 vols.; The New Testament: a literal translation from the Syriac Peshito version, New York, 1841, and a further work, The Nature of the Atonement, Andover, 1849, a discourse which attracted considerable attention, and Sketches of Modern Philosophy, especially among the Germans, Hartford, 1842.

MURNER, Thomas, b. at Strassburg, 1475; d. at Obernehmeim, Aug. 23, 1537; entered the Franciscan order in 1490; was ordained priest in 1494; studied afterwards theology, philosophy, canon law, etc., in Paris, Krawcz, and Freiburg, and attempted at various places to teach logic and even jurisprudence by means of charts (Chartiudium logica et Chartiudium institute summariae). Greater reputation, however, he acquired as a poet. In 1509 appeared his Schelmenzunft and Narrenbeshreibung; in 1514, his Ein andechtig geistliche Badenfart, etc.,—very incisive satires on the faults and follies of his time. But, though he had an open eye for the corruption of the Roman-Catholic Church, he was decidedly hostile to the Reformers. Against Luther he wrote no less than thirty-two pamphlets, of which five or six have been printed. After the establishment of the Reformation in Strassburg, he lived for some time at Obernehmeim, but was driven away by the outbreak of the Peasants' War, and fled to Switzerland. Having settled at Lucerne, he became the head of the Roman party, and one of the most energetic opponents of Zwingli. But in 1529 he had to flee also from Lucerne; and he was then able to return to Wittenberg, where he spent the rest of his life. His life was written by G. E. Waldau, Nürnberg, 1775. Franz List (Münche).

MURRAY, John, founder of the Universalist denomination in America; b. in Alton, Hampshire, Eng., Dec. 10, 1741; d. in Boston, Mass., Sept. 3, 1835. His parents were members of the Church of England, and followers of Wesley. In 1751 they settled near Cork, Ireland. In 1760 Murray returned to England, and joined Mr. Whitefield's congregation; but embracing, somewhat later, the teachings of James Royly (see art.), a Universalist preacher, he was excommunicated. In 1770 he emigrated to America, and became a Universalist minister, his first sermon in Good Luck, N. J., Sept. 30, 1770. His field of labor was at first New Jersey and New York, but afterwards, almost exclusively, New England. He was largely instrumental in the formation of the Independent Christian Universalists of New England, and September, 1785. On Oct. 23, 1793, he became pastor of the Universalist society of Boston, and faithfully served them until Oct. 19, 1809, when paralysis compelled him to give up preaching. He was a man of great courage and eloquence, and in the defence of his peculiar views endured much detestation and abuse. In regard to Christ, he taught that in him God became the Son; for "God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost are no more than different exhibitions of the self-same existent, omnipresent Being." He taught that all men would ultimately be saved through the sacrifice of Christ. See his Letters and Sketches of Sermons, Boston, 1812, 3 vols., and his interesting Autobiography, continued by his wife, Boston, 1816, centenary edition by Rev. G. L. Dernrest, Boston, 1870.

MURRAY, Nicholas, D.D., b. at Ballynasloe, Ireland, Dec. 25, 1803; d. at Elizabethtown, N. J., Feb. 4, 1861. He emigrated to America, 1818; was apprenticed as a printer to Harper & Brothers. Brought up in the Roman-Catholic communion, he was in 1820 converted to Protestantism, and, after graduation at Williams College (1825), studied theology at Princeton, and became a Presbyterian pastor, first at Wilkesbarre, Penn., 1829, and from 1834 till his death, at Elizabethtown, N. J. In 1849 he was moderator of the (Old School) General Assembly. His fame rests upon his able and witty controversy with Bishop Hughes, afterwards published under the title Letters to the Right Rev. John Hughes, Roman-Catholic Bishop of New York, New York, 1847-48, 3 series (collective ed., revised and enlarged, 1855). These letters appeared in the New-York Observer, over the signature of "Kirwan." They attracted wide notice at the time, and made his name a household word. They have been translated into several languages. He addressed another series to Chief-Justice Taney, published in 1852 under the title Romanism at Home. Dr. Murray also wrote Notes, Historical and Biographical, concerning Elizabeth-town, 1844; and Men and Things as I saw them in Europe, New York, 1853.
MUSÄUS, Johann, b. at Langenwiesen, in Thuringia, Feb. 7, 1613; d. at Jena, 1681; studied philosophy and humaniora at Erfurt, afterwards theology at Jena; and was appointed professor there, first in history (1642), then in theology (1646). Possessed of an excellent philosophical training, he at once vindicated the application of philosophy to theology against the disciples of the stiff Lutheran orthodoxy, and condemned its too universal use by the Reformed theologians. (See his De usu principiorum rationis, Jena, 1647, against the Dutch theologian, Nicholas Vedelius.) His conception of theology as an object, not only of the intellectus, but also of a pia affectio (see his Introductio in theologiam, Jena, 1679), led him to emphasize the importance of good works and of the sanctity of the will, to such a degree, that he has since been designated as a precursor of the sanctity of the will, to such a degree, that he was strongly opposed; and he refused to subscribe to the Consensus repetitus fidet vere Lutheranae, drawn up by Calov in 1655. A long and bitter controversy ensued (Theologorum Jenensium Errores, Wittenberg, 1676, principally directed against Musäus; Der jenischen Theologen Erkärung, Jena, 1676, Musäus' answer, 718 pp. in quarto); but he lost the battle, and was compelled to renounce in a formal way all sympathy with the so-called "sinceritismus." See Hackenschmidt, in Studien und Kritiken, 1890. HENKE.

MUSCULUS (MEUSEL), Andreas, b. at Schneeberg, in Saxony, 1514; d. at Francfort-on-the-Oder, Sept. 21, 1581; studied theology at Leipzig and at Wittenberg, where he became an enthusiastic disciple of Luther, and was in 1540 appointed professor of theology at Francfort-on-the-Oder. He was one of the gladiators of the Lutheran party; and in his controversies (with Stancarus, Siaphylus, Abdis Frölorius, the magistrates of Francfort-on-the-Oder, etc.) he never yielded, though the students pelted him with stones in the street, and stormed his house. He published forty-six books, and partook in the drawing-up of the Torgau-Book and the Formula Concordiae. His life, written by Cur. Pfeil, Francfort-on-the-Oder, 1586.

H. WEINGARTEN.

MUSCULUS (MÜSSLIN or MEUSSLIN), Wolfgang, b. at Dieuze, in Lorraine, Sept. 8, 1497; d. at Bern, Aug. 30, 1563; was educated in the Benedictine monastery near Lixheim, but left it in 1527, roused by Luther's writings; studied in Strassburg under Capito and Butzer; married, and was appointed pastor at Augsburg in 1531, and professor of theology at Bern in 1549. Originally in favor of a union between the Lutheran and the Reformed Church, he afterwards gave up the idea entirely, and followed an exclusively Calvinistic direction, as seen both from his Commentarii and his Loci communes (Basel, 1560, and afterwards often reprinted). See his life by L. Grote, Hamburg, 1855.

MUSCRAVE, George Washington, D.D., L.L.D., b. in Philadelphia, Oct. 19, 1804; d. there Thursday, Aug. 24, 1882 and he entered the junior class of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, but his poor health prevented his finishing the course; yet, pursuing private studies, he finally entered Princeton Theological Seminary; was licensed, 1828, and was pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, July, 1839—52; was corresponding secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1852—53, and of the Board of Home Missions, 1853—61, 1865—70; from 1862 to 1868, pastor of the North Tenth-street Church, Philadelphia. He was president of the Presbyterian Historical Society, a director of Princeton Theological Seminary from 1836, and a trustee of the College of New Jersey from 1856 until his death. In 1868 he was moderator of the (Old School) Presbyterian General Assembly. He was particularly prominent in the re-union movement of 1867—69, and was chairman of the joint committee on reconstruction, May, 1870. He was a stanch Calvinist and Presbyterian and an eloquent speaker. He never married. See Presbyterian Re-union Memorial Volume, New York, 1870, especially pp. 541 sqq., for his work in connection with the re-union.

MUSIC AND MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS AMONG THE HEBREWS. Instrumental music, although, according to Gen. iv. 21, of profane, Cainitiah origin, appears to have been used in Hebrew antiquity, especially in the service of God, and the more so, since Israel has been separated from among the Semitic tribe to be the people of God. A larger variety of instruments than the people probably brought along out of Egypt. When the people sang praises to God for his great deeds,—be it after a victory, or after a deliverance out of great distress (Exod. xv. 4, 20; Num. xxi. 17 sq.; Judg. xi. 34; 1 Sam. xvii. 16; 2 Chron. xx. 28; Neh. xii. 22; Ps. ixvii. 25 sq.; 1 Macc. iv. 24, 54, xiii. 51), or at the anointing of a king, or a marriage (1 Kings i. 39 sq.; Jer. xxv. 10; 1 Macc. ix. 30), or when the people met on solemn occasions (2 Sam. vi. 4 sq. 15; 1 Chron. xiii. 8, xv. 16, xvi. 5 sq.; xxv. 1 sq.; 2 Chron. v. 12 sq.), even at idolatrous feasts (Exod. xxxii. 6),—song and music, also dancing, together with poetry, were combined for the one great purpose. According to the Mosaic law (Num. x. 2—10; Lev. xxiii. 24, xxx. 9), trumpets only were used, not so much in divine service, but for announcing holy seasons, or as signals at sacrifices, and for assembling the people in the march and in war. Since, however, the assemblies of the theocratic people had the character of a divine service, the trumpets could only be blown by the priests (Num. x. 2 sq.). The song of the female choirs mentioned (Judg. xi. 34; 1 Sam. xviii. 6 sq.) was not of a religious character. The cultivation of sacred music, which was commenced under Samuel, especially through the establishment of the school of the prophets (1 Sam. x. 5; xix. 19, 20), reached its height under David, who, encouraged and assisted by the choir of the prophets (2 Chron. xxix. 25), was not only an expert in song and music himself, but also an inventor of musical instruments, as may be seen from Amos vi. 5. His chief of the musicians instructed the people (2 Sam. i. 18); and the wonderful effects—soothing, on the one hand (1 Sam. xvi. 14 sq.), and inspiring, on the other hand (1 Sam. x. 5, xix. 20; 2 Kings iii. 15)—of the music of David, of the choir of the prophets, as well as of the temple orchestra (2 Chron. v. 12 sq.), indicate a certain degree of perfection of sacred music, in spite of its simplicity. According to 1 Chron. xxxii. 5, the terni...
ple orchestra consisted of four thousand Levites, who acted as singers, and were
presided over by Asaph, Heman, and Ethan. When the temple was built, these three choirs
were united into one (2 Chron. v. 12 sq.). According to Josephus (Ant., VIII. 3, 8), Solomon
provided the temple orchestra with two hundred thousand voices, forty thousand pateries and
harpers, and two hundred thousand trumpets which, can only mean that this provision was intended
for all time. That there were also female singers at the time of the temple cannot with certainty
be ascertained from 1 Chron. xxv. 6; but that there were such after the exile, we know from Ez. ii.
65, Neh. vii. 67. During the exile, although the national music had lost much of its ancient glory
and splendor, yet it was still preserved and cultivated; for, at the foundation of the second temple,
there were about two hundred and forty five singers who had returned with Zerubbabel (Neh.
vii. 14). Asaph and his brethren were kept together in the time of holy solemnities, of war
and rebellion, or of any other great occasion (Exod. xvi. 25; Isa. lxviii. 25; Isa. xlvii. 8, and often.
2 Tseltshin metittel, in the Septuagint, kymbala, or cymbals, which were held in either hand, and dashed
sharply together. They are first mentioned in 2 Sam. vi. 5, and were used by the conductor to
beat time to the whole Levitical choir (1 Chron. xxv. 1, 6; 2 Chron. v. 12). 3. Menaanim (2 Sam.
vi. 5), "shaking instruments," consisting of two iron bars, with movable rings and bars of metal
inserted in the frame, by the sharp impact of which upon the frame, when shaken in the hand,
a piercing sound was produced. 4. Shalishim (1
xvi. 6; 2 Chron. xi. 15; 2 Sam. vi. 5), an instrument apparently much resembling the
kinnor, or harp, in its nature and properties, though considerably different in form. According
to Joseph. 1, Ant. VII. 12, 13), it had twelve strings, which were played upon with the hand.
One variety of it had only ten strings (Ps. xxxiiii.
2; exiliv. 9); and from an expression in Isa. xxii.
24 (Heb., "all manner of nebel instruments"), we gather that the instrument, like the harp, was
used in various sizes and shapes. 5. The sabbeka
though considerably different in form. According
ting to Josephus (Ant., VII. 12, 13), it had twelve
strings, which were played upon with the hand.
It is often mentioned in the Old Testament, as
used in the service of God, in making announcements, and for calling the people together in the time of holy solemnities, of war
and rebellion, or of any other great occasion (Exod.
xix. 13; Num. x. 10; Judg. iii. 7; 1 Sam. xiii.
3, xv. 10; 2 Chron. xv. 14; Isa. xviii. 3). 5. The chatolet erah, the straight trumpet, was also
used for signalling. The two silver trumpets appointed by Moses to be made for the use of the
priestsof the tabernacle were of this construction, and were used for announcing to the people the
advent of the different feasts, for signalling the
journeying of the camps, and for sounding alarms in
time of war (Num. x. 1-10). Solomon increased the number to a hundred and twenty
(2 Chron. v. 12).
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MUSIC. Sacred. Of the music of the ancient Jewish Church, little need be said in this article. The days of Solomon, the office of praise in public worship was not left to regulate itself. Of the thirty-eight thousand Levites, four thousand were set apart to praise the Lord with the instruments of music which David had made (1 Chron. xxii. 5). Two hundred and eighty-eight chosen cunning men were instructed in the songs of the Lord (1 Chron. xxv. 7). In the tabernacle and in the temple, both the instrumental and vocal performers were selected from among the Levites, and they were specially trained for the service. The music was of the crudest and most rudimental kind: it was without harmony, with very little melody; recitative and responsive, with hymns in the church.

It was the Incarnation which gave birth to song. After the Last Supper, our Lord and his disciples sang together before going to the Mount of Olives (Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26). "At midnight, Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God," and then they did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God (Acts xvi. 25). Then we find the apostle exhorting the church at Ephesus, and that at Colosse, to worship in "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" (Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16).

We are told of the Christians of apostolic times, that "they were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God," and that "they did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God" (Luke xxiv. 53; Acts ii. 47). Such is the New-Testament basis of the history which we are to review.

Primitive Christians were characterized in history by Pliny, as those who sang hymns to the praise of Christ. The first efforts to systematize the music of the early church were made by Ambrose, bishop of Milan, 374-397. For the most part, his work was the adaptation of Greek music to the use of the church. The introduction of the four scales, known as the "Authentic Modes" (1, Dorian; 2, Phrygian; 3, Lydian; 4, Mixolydian), is generally ascribed to Ambrose.

But, much as Ambrose did, his work was greatly surpassed by that of Gregory the Great, 590-604. Gregory changed all this. His aim was to simplify the music of the church, regarding, as he did, all rhythmic singing too light and frivolous for the purposes of worship. Short melodies, or chants, for the psalms, were prepared, melodies with only a few intervals, consisting of the "Intonation" (two or more notes for the minister or precentor), the "Recitation," the "Mediation," and the "Cadence." There were no flats or sharps, there was no rhythm, there were no bars, or measures of time, there was no harmony, as we understand it: and yet these Gregorian Chants form the basis of the cathedral music, both in the Roman Church and in the Anglican, to this day; while many of them, adapted and harmonized, have made their way more or less widely through all branches of the church. They were the chief music of the Anglican Church, not only immediately after the Reformation, but even late in the seventeenth century: they are in Marbeck's book (1558), in Morley's (1597), in Lowe's (1681), in Clifford's (1684), and in Canon John's Collection of Choral Uses of the Churches of England and Ireland.

Choirs were formed as early as the fourth century; and the Council of Laodicea found it necessary to forbid congregational singing. But after Gregory's time, there was a marked decline in the music of the church. The seventh century the priest had monopolized the singing, and they sang only in Latin. From thence till the Reformation, the people were almost songless in public worship. In the eleventh century, Guido Aretino gave a new impulse to musical study: he introduced a system of notation, and the practice of solmization by scales of six sounds only. The names of notes still in use were suggested by an ancient hymn to John the Baptist:

"Uf, quaeus tant laxis
Re-conare fibris
Mi-ra gestorum
So-lve polluti
San-te Johannes."

"Ut," "Re," "Mi," "Fa," "Sol," "La," became thus the names of six notes. "Ut" was afterwards changed to "Do," and "Si" was added to complete the scale. Before the eleventh century, in written music the length of notes was not indicated. The oldest notation is on three or four lines, without bars or measures, and with square or angular notes variously colored. By the twelfth century the position of a note determined its pitch and the shape, its length. A Latin manuscript of the tenth century shows some slight knowledge of chords. It may be said that the organ is the mother of harmony, and the violin the mother of melody; that Germany was the birthplace of harmony, and Italy the home of melody. In the fourteenth century we first meet the word contrapunctum, or "counterpoint." Toward the last of this century some Belgian musicians brought to Rome the first harmonized masses that had been seen there.
The sixteenth century witnessed a great revival of musical interest and a great advance in musical knowledge. In France, at the suggestion of Beza, the court poet Marot prepared and published a version of some of the psalms in French rhymes, which became so popular, that the Sorbonne, though at first favoring them, at last felt constrained to forbid their use. These psalms, Calvin adopted, and published in Geneva, with a preface of his own. Luther devoted much time and attention to the preparation of music for the people, and published a small book in which the hymns and the tunes were mostly of his own composition. The people received this volume with avidity; and the air was full of the sound of sacred song. Cardinal Cajetan said of Luther, "By his songs he has conquered us." The "Infectious frenzy of sacred song," as it was called, was not confined to Germany, but was almost co-extensive with the Reformation. Sternhold and Hopkins (1548-49), followed by Rouse (1641), by Tate and Brady (1696), and then by Watts (1704-1748), carried on the work in England. In the Church of Rome the music had become so secular, that it came under the censure of the church altogether. In 1563 Pius IV. appointed eight cardinals to carry out the will of the Council. Meanwhile a great musician had been raised to save music to the church. Palestrina, b. in Palestrina (Prpeneste) near Rome, in Rome, 1594. The exact date of his birth is uncertain. This name marks the greatest epoch in the history of music after that of Gregory the Great. Palestrina starved through seven pontificates, but in and by his sufferings he became great. The committee of cardinals applied to Palestrina to save music to the church by such a composition as would silence opposition. In answer to this request, Palestrina composed his Missa Papae Marcelli. When the Pope heard one of these masses, he declared that it must have been some such music that the apostle of the Apocalypse heard sung by the triumphant hosts of angels in the New Jerusalem. The crisis was passed, and music was saved to the church. Palestrina may be said to have founded a school of church music. He was skilled in all the intricacies of his art, and carried the science of counterpoint much higher than had been done before. Some of his masses and motets are still in use in the Roman-Catholic Church; and three of his motets, adapted to psalms, are still in use in the English cathedral service. He was buried with great pomp in St. Peter's. His last words were directions to his son for the publication of his manuscripts,—"for the glory of the Almighty, and his worship in the congregations of the faithful."

The oratorio, for a time, advanced side by side with the opera; but a divergence came, not long after the beginning of the seventeenth century. Carissimi and the Scarlattis had prepared the way in Italy; and Bach (1685-1750), Handel (1684-1759), Haydn (1732-1809), and Mendelssohn (1809-47), besides others less conspicuous, made the oratorio extremely popular in Germany, England, and the United States. Of the masters of the symphonic school, and of the great writers for the lyric stage, it is not necessary here to speak. A recent elaborate work in the style of the oratorio is Gounod's *Redemption*.

We turn to take a brief survey of the history of church music in America. When the Puritans came to this country, they brought with them Ainsworth's *Version of the Psalms*. In 1640 The Bay Psalm-Book was printed; and the music for the later editions was taken principally from Ravenscroft's Collection (London, 1618). About the year 1690, music was first published in this country. In 1712, or thereabout, the Rev. John Tufts published *A Very Plain and Easy Introduction to the Art of singing Psalm-Tunes*. In 1718 Dr. Cotton Mather published Psalteryum Americanum: this was followed in 1721 by Walter's singing-book,—*The Grounds and Rules of Musick explained*. There was much ignorance, and not a little bigoted prejudice, among the churches against singing by note; but gradually singing-schools were established, which prepared the way for a general awakening of interest. In 1761 a music-book was published, under the title of *Urania*: three years later, another collection of music was published in Boston by the Joseph Fagg. The 1770 William Billings published a collection which had a wide popularity. Choirs and singing-societies had become general; and rapidly the people learned to sing the simple melodies and crude harmonies which were furnished them.

The republication of the *Lock Hospital Collection* (Boston, September, 1809), and of the *Harmonia Sacra* (Andover, 1818), marked a new era in musical culture in this country. It was the first grammatical music given to our people. Early in this century, Lowell Mason, Mus. Doc. (1792-1873), and Thomas Hastings, Mus. Doc. (1784-1872), began their musical careers,—the one in Boston, and the other in New York. Singing-schools and musical societies and conventions were multiplied. More than seventy distinct musical publications were issued by these two writers; and for some years a new collection of tunes was expected each year.

About the year 1856 this rapid multiplication of tune-books ceased, and ceased quite suddenly; and the present era of the "hymn-tune book" began. Much music, meanwhile, has been prepared expressly for the use of the sabbath school; and many books of what is called "refrain-music" have been published, for use in conference-meetings and revival services. With the growth of general musical cultivation, there has been developed a disposition to deny to the church a distinct repertoire, and to mingle secular music with sacred, and even to crowd out the sacred by the secular. The choral music, which has maintained its place so successfully in Germany and England, has not been popular here, where the people prefer light and frivolous melodies, or operatic airs, or else intricate harmonies, which can be sung, for the most part, only by professional choirs. The reaction will be, it is not for the writer to predict.

Jena, 1701.

He enjoyed a great reputation among the humanists; and the attitude served. They are of great historical interest.

He published only a few epigrams, and Musicians, London and New York, 1879-83, 3 vols.; John Hullah: The History of Modern Music, London, 1881; the same: Zur Geschichte der Musik in England,éd. at Erfurt and Bologna, and obtained in 1503 a small canonry at Gotha, where he remained for the rest of his life. He assumed with respect to the Reformation was very characteristic, not only for him, but for the whole party. He was very active in establishing the Reformation, and took an active part in all the great events of the Swiss Reformation. His family name was Geisshäuser. His life was written by Kirchhoffer, Zurich, 1813, and Hagenbach, Elberfeld, 1859.

MYRRH is the aromatic gum, or sap, of a low thorny tree, which grows chiefly in Arabia and Ethiopia, but not in Palestine. The gum is first oily, then fluid; first yellow-white, then reddish, hardening into small globules of a peculiar balasmonic smell, and bitter taste. There are several ways of collecting it: the best is to allow it to exude of itself; another way is to cut the bark of the tree. Myrrh was used for incense (Cant. iii. 9), perfume for clothing and beds (Ps. xlv. 8; Prov. vii. 17; cf. Cant. v. 1), as an oil (Ezech. ii. 12), an ointment (Cant. v. 5), in the holy anointing oil (Exod. xxx. 23), and, as to-day, in medicine, and for embalming (John xix. 34). Myrrh was also put in wine to give it a spicy taste and smell; and this unintoxicating wine was a favorite with the ladies. Jesus, before his crucifixion, was offered wine mingled with myrrh (Mark xiv. 28), probably the sour wine of the Roman soldiers.

MYRTLE, The, grows wild in Asia, whence it was imported into Greece and Italy. It makes a tree ten feet high, with evergreen polished leaves, white blossoms, and agreeable odor. On account of its beauty and fragrance, it was a favorite for cultivation, even in countries where it was native. Out of its black berries, an oil and a sort of wine were made. Myrtle-branches were used in the decoration of houses and rooms on joyful occasions, were thrown in the way of victors in their triumphs, and were woven into wreaths and chaplets for heroes and guests. Myrtle-wreaths figured particularly at weddings, as the shrub was sacred to Artemis, and from the Greek word for conjugal love. The Jews used its branches to cover their booths during the feast of tabernacles (Neh. viii. 15; cf. Lev. xxiii. 40); and in the Old Testament the myrtle is the picture of the church's prosperity (Isa. lv. 13; Zech. i. 8-11). RUETSCHI.

MYSTAGOGY (an initiator into the mysteries). MYSTAGOGY (introduction to the mysteries). The latter term is applied by the Greek Fathers, and in the Greek Church, to the sacraments; and the former, to the priest who prepares candidates for baptism.

Mysticism has been defined as belief in an immediate and continuous communication between God and the soul, which may be established by means of certain peculiar religious exercises; as belief in an inner light, an illumination of the soul, a contemplation of the divine, which may be the written revelation, etc. This definition, however, identifies mysticism too closely with its extravagances, its more or less unsound developments, — quietism, enthusiasm, fanaticism, etc. — and overlooks that...
Mysticism.

there is a mystical element in all true religion, both objectively in the revelation, and subjectively in the faith. According to general acceptance, therefore, mysticism simply means a one-sided development of that element. Religion is an equal interaction of the consciousness of God and the consciousness of self. But the mystic disturbs the balance by throwing himself wholly upon his consciousness of God, and, so to speak, losing the consciousness of his own self in the feeling of God. As soon, however, as the mirror of the personality of man is dimmed, the image of the personality of God is also dimmed, and the strange, pantheistic speculations, so characteristic of mysticism, begin; while, practically, the strained ideas of the power of human life to grasp and represent the divine lead into asceticism, ecstatics, etc.

In history, mysticism generally appears as the re-action against the formula. Whenever the intellectualism has become crystallized into stiff dogmas, and the definition begins to tyrannize over the free flow of spiritual life, the element of feeling, mystical in its very nature, rises and protests. Thus Brahmanism called forth Buddhism; the Talmud, the Cabala; the Mohammedan Koran-worship, Sufism; and, in the Spanish Inquisition called forth the Alombrados, Jesuitism, Quietism, Jansenism, etc. This must not be understood, however, as if the appearance of mysticism in history merely consisted of a series of abrupt outbursts. On the contrary, between the single phenomena there is a strong internal connection. At the foundation of the Christian Church, John stands as the born mystic in the circle of the apostles. Later on, Alexandria, the tomb of pre-Christian mysticism, became the cradle of Christian mysticism. From the Alexandrian theology ensued monasticism and the pseudo-Dionysian writings; that is, the practical organ and the speculative representation of Christian mysticism. Finally, during the middle ages, mysticism gained the ascendancy over scholasticism in the Western Church, and produced a strong internal connection between the Johannean logos-doctrine and the Alexandrian theology, and between the pseudo-Dionysian writings and the Victorines. Indeed, mysticism and scholasticism, though the former generally appears as the re-action against the latter, are simply the two faces of the head of Janus, equally important in the history of the Church; and when in the middle ages, scholasticism stood at its highest, mysticism also reached its fullest development.

The medieval mysticism falls into three groups, — the Greek, the Gallo-Romanic, and the Germanic. The mysticism of the Greek Church found in the fifth century its type in the pseudo-Dionysian writings, and, in the seventh century, its most considerable representative in the monk Maximus. After that time, it seems, in the cells of the monks, to have sunk into a merely pathological quality; and, if the medieval state of the Hesychasts can be designated as a kind of religious somnambulism, the Greek Church may be said, in the synods of Constantinople of 1341, 1347, and 1550, to have established somnambulism as the highest form of divine revelation. A corresponding phenomenon is found in the Western Church in the visions of the female saints, — Elizabeth of Schönaust, St. Hildegarde, St. Birgitta, St. Catharine of Siena, and others; but the phenomenon has there a distinctly popular character. Nicolaus Cabasilas, in the fourteenth century, shows that the Greek mysticism, however, was capable of higher inspirations. It is a striking fact, that, even in the Greek and Russian churches of to-day, mysticism presents a peculiar aspect of merely pathological sombreness. Another trait is also very characteristic, — the tendency the Greek mysticism evinces to fall into heresy. From the old mystical Gnosticism and Manichæism grew up a great number of heretical sects, some of which were very powerful, as, for instance, the Paulicians in the seventh century, and, later on, the Bogomiles, who were intimately connected with the wide-spread communities of the Cathari in the Western Church. The passing conflict between scholasticism and mysticism, which took place when Bernard of Clairvaux attacked Abelard, afterwards developed into a continuous contest. The pseudo-Dionysian writings, which were introduced in the Western Church in the ninth century by Scotus Eriugena, formed the basis of the Gallo-Romanic mysticism. Its principal seat was the monastery of St. Victor in Paris; and its principal representatives were Hugh, Richard, and Walter of St. Victor, all belonging to the twelfth century. Its most characteristic trait may be found in the curious fact, that, though it made a decided opposition to scholasticism, it was itself scholastical, and used the same forms and methods as its adversary. No wonder, therefore, that Bonaventure in the thirteenth, and Gerson in the fourteenth century, endeavored to reconcile the two antagonists. In the writings of Joachim of Floris this mysticism assumed an apocalyptic character. Among its aberrations may be mentioned the Gospel of the Holy Spirit, the Fraticelli, the Beguines, and the Beghards, etc. At the beginning of the thirteenth century a mystical pantheism stood in full bloom in the Rhine regions among the Brethren of the Free Spirit. This mysticism is generally put in connection with the Aristotelian pantheism of Amalric of Bena, and David of Dinant; and Meister Eckart, a provincial of the Dominican order, and consequently one of the chief champions of orthodoxy, is often mentioned as one of the centres of the whole movement. Eckart's views are at all events very closely related to those of Scotus Eriugena. Among his successors were Tauler, the great mystical preacher; Suso, a poetical genius; Ruybroek, the doctor ecstaticus; and others. From the Rhine region, the movement passed on into the Netherlands, where Gerhard Groo formed the community of the Brethren of Common Life, to which Thomas à Kempis belonged. Its final result was the German Reformation.

In the history of the Reformation, the Anabaptists designate a wild outburst of an unsound, fanatical mysticism, termed, as soon as doctrinal correctness gained the ascendancy in Lutherdom over the living faith, the protestes of mysticism appeared often in very curious forms, such as the montanistic chiliasm of Petersen, the ascetic theosophy of Gichtel, the pantheistic spiritualism
MYTHICAL THEORY

of Dippel, etc. (See G. Arnold: Kirchen- und Ketzer-Geschichte, 1809, vol. ii.) During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, mysticism entered into various combinations with Pietism, Hermhutianism, Methodism, etc., producing, in the eighteenth century, the Hebraaans in Holland, the Hutchinsonians and Jumpers in England, the Zionites in Norway, etc., and, in the nineteenth century, the Antonians in Switzerland, the Harmonists in North America, the Muckers in Württemberg, etc. But most of these phenomena belong under the head of chilliasm, or fanaticism, rather than under that of mysticism. The Reformed Church also had its mystics in the Labadists, besides a number of wild aberrations; and it is a curious fact that the Reformed Labadism on the one side is connected with the Roman-Catholic Jansenism, and on the other with the Lutheran Spenerism. The Jansenists are the mystics of the modern Roman-Catholic Church. But also the Alombrados in Spain, and the Molinists in Italy must be mentioned, besides a number of independent phenomena,—St. Francis of Sales, Fenelon, Michael Bajus, etc.


MYTHICAL THEORY, The, and the Legendary Theory, form a group of their own among the false theories of the life of Christ. They agree in considering the gospel narrative, in all its supernatural and miraculous features, as a poetical fiction: but they differ in the closer definition of the character of the fiction; the one dissolving the statements into myths, the other into legends.

The myth starts from an idea, and invents facts to embody and represent it: the legend starts from facts, which it modifies and alters, until they fit a certain idea. The myth-making instinct belongs naturally to the childhood of a nation, and may be considered as a stepping-stone towards truth. The various mythologies — the Indian, Greek, Scandinavian, Finnish, etc. — are splendid examples of its activity. The legendary instinct appears much later in the life of a people, and arises from an exuberant imagination and religious enthusiasm, but also from an utter want of the critical faculty. It seems to be merely a weakness, a lack of power to grasp the truth, and to distinguish it from fiction. The

THEOLOGY, and the Legendary Theory, form a group of their own among the false theories of the life of Christ. They agree in considering the gospel narrative, in all its supernatural and miraculous features, as a poetical fiction: but they differ in the closer definition of the character of the fiction; the one dissolving the statements into myths, the other into legends.

The myth starts from an idea, and invents facts to embody and represent it: the legend starts from facts, which it modifies and alters, until they fit a certain idea. The myth-making instinct belongs naturally to the childhood of a nation, and may be considered as a stepping-stone towards truth. The various mythologies — the Indian, Greek, Scandinavian, Finnish, etc. — are splendid examples of its activity. The legendary instinct appears much later in the life of a people, and arises from an exuberant imagination and religious enthusiasm, but also from an utter want of the critical faculty. It seems to be merely a weakness, a lack of power to grasp the truth, and to distinguish it from fiction. The

The mythical theory was applied to the gospel history by D. F. Strauss, in his Leben Jesu, 1835. He does not deny the historical existence of Jesus: he even admits him to have been a religious genius of the first magnitude. But, from pantheistic premises, he resolves all the supernatural and miraculous elements of Christ's person and history into myths, or imaginative representations of religious ideas. The ideas thus symbolized, especially the idea of the essential unity of the divine and human, are declared to be true in the abstract, as applied to humanity as a whole, but denied in the concrete, or in their application to an individual. The theory may be reduced to the following syllogism: There was a fixed idea in the Jewish mind, nourished by the Old-Testament writings, that the Messiah would perform certain miracles,—heal the sick, raise the dead, etc.; there was a strong persuasion in the minds of the disciples of Jesus, that he actually was the promised Messiah: therefore the mytho-poetic faculty instinctively invented the miracles corresponding to the Messianic conception, and ascribed them to him. The legendary theory was applied to the gospel history by E. Renan, in his Vie de Jésus, 1863. He agrees with Strauss with respect to the fictitious character of the gospel narrative; but he has a better appreciation of the reality, and of the environments, of the life of Jesus. He correctly remarks, that the term "myths" is more applicable to India and primitive Greece than to the ancient traditions of the Hebrews and the Shemitic nations in general. He prefers the terms "legends" and "legendary narratives," which, while they concede a large influence to the working of opinions, allow the action and the personal character of Jesus to stand out in their completeness. He regards the so-called "legend" of Jesus as the fruit of the conscientious enthusiasm and imaginative impulse of the primitive disciples. No great event in history, he says, has passed without creating a cycle of fables; and Jesus could not have silenced those popular creations, even if he had wished to. Thus he brings the gospel history down to a level with the history of Francis of Assisi, and other marvellous saints of the Roman-Catholic Church; though, inconsistently enough, he prefers to quote the myth of Sakya-Muni, the founder of Buddhism, as a parallel, thus falling back upon the mythical theory.

NA'AMAN (agreeableness), a distinguished Syrian general, who, through the agency of Elisha, was miraculously cured of leprosy by dipping himself seven times in the Jordan. The story is found in 2 Kings v., and teaches many valuable lessons of the goodness of God and the pride of man. On the traditional site of Naaman's house in Damascus, there is to-day a leper-house. Our Lord refers to Naaman's cure in his sermon to the Nazarenes (Luke iv. 37).

NAASENES. See GNOSTICISM, p. 880.

NA'BAL (fool), a synonym of churlishness and bестility; the husband of the wise Abigail (who subsequently was married to David), and a wealthy citizen of Maon, a town of Judah near Hebron. He had been a fertile field (the third year of David) and the band; whereupon David determined his destruction, but was prevented by Abigail's prudent gifts. Nabat, on being told by her of his action as he was recovering from a drinking-bout, was seized with an illness, from which he died in ten days.

This episode is related in 1 Sam. xxiv. 2-43.

NADAB, Bernard Harrison, D.D., LL.D., b. in Talbot County, Md., March 27, 1812; d. at Madison, N.J., June 20, 1870. He was admitted as a preacher in the (former) Baltimore Conference, and was graduated 1848. From 1854 to 1857 he was professor of church history in Drew Theological Seminary, and, after Dr. McClintock's death, was acting president. Dr. Nadal was a vigorous abolitionist. By his speeches and sermons on this subject he made a great impression. His attainments were quite extensive, and he was a welcome contributor to the religious press. He was, for a session, chaplain to Congress. See Memoir, in the posthumous volume of his sermons, New Life Dawning, and other Discourses, New York, 1873.

NA'HOR is the name of Abraham's grandfather, the father of Terah (Gen. xi. 22, 24), who led the Hebrews into Ur Casdim; and also the name of Nahor's brother (Gen. xi. 26). This younger Nahor had eight sons (Gen. xxii. 23), among whom was Bethuel, the father of Rebekah. When Nahor had eight sons (Gen. xxii. 23), among those was Lotah, the father of Lot (Gen. xiii. 2). Nahor's sons were Abraham's and Isaac's cousins, and not of the same family. Lotah died and left seven sons (Gen. xiii. 2). Nahor's family was distinguished by poetical beauty and classic beauty. For disputing this; for, as Haverneck says, why should it be considered unfitting if the prophet, before announcing his name, should declare the purpose of the book? Nahum's style is distinguished by poetical beauty and classic beauty. Lowth, in his Hebrew Poetry, pungently says, "Of all the Minor Prophets, no one seems to equal Nahum in sublimity, warmth, and boldness," etc.

LIT. — Commentaries, — Luther, 1555; CHYTRÉUS, Viteb., 1565; HAFENREFFER, Stuttg., 1668; ABARBANEL, Helmut., 1705; H. A. GRIIMM, Düsseldorf., 1790; FEREN, hardinth., 1811; LEIPZIG, 1820; HOKLEMMANN, Leipzig, 1842; O. STRAUSS, Berol., 1853; KLEINERT (Eng. trans., in the Lange series by Professor Elliott, New York, 1875); GANDALL, in Speaker's Commentary.
The peculiarities of the names of the animals named. The nomen clature of localities also was determined by some of names (Gen ii.20) followed and defined the natural characteristic (e.g., Rama, Mizpah, Jericho, etc.) or historical occurrence (Gen. xi.9), or the special relations in which they stood to, the natural characteristic (e.g., Rama, Mizpah, Jericho, etc.).

Names, Biblical Significance of. Names are designed to distinguish objects. Originally they were not words arbitrarily chosen, but expressed the distinct impressions which objects made upon, or the special relations in which they stood to the person. Thus, as it would appear, the first giving of names (Gen ii.20) followed and defined the peculiarities of the animals named. The nomenclature of localities also was determined by some natural characteristic (e.g., Rama, Mizpah, Jericho, etc.) or historical occurrence (Gen. xi.9, xxii.14, xxvii.19, etc.). The same may be said of the names of persons. They bring out some prominent characteristic connected with the birth, etc. (Gen. xxv.25–30; 1 Sam. iv.21, etc.), or designate the specific historical place of the individual (Gen. iii.20, iv.29). The name was also regarded as an omens; as, for instance, in the case of Benjamin (Gen. 35, 18), Nabal (1 Sam. xxv.25), etc.

In the Bible, names are specially significant as pledges of the divine guidance, and defining the relation of the bearer to God. Such names were either given at birth,—as Noah (Gen. v.29), Ishmael (xvi.11), Isaac (xxii.3), Jesus (Matt. i.21), etc.,—or subsequently, on some particular occasion, as the entrance upon new relations, as in the case of Abraham (Gen. xvii.5), Sarah (xvii.15), Israel (xxxii.28), Joshua (Num. xiii.16), Cephas (John i.42), Barnabas (Acts iv.36), etc. In the same way, perhaps, Saul took the name “Paul” from his first convert, Sergius Paulus (Acts xiii.12). The prophets laid much emphasis upon a name. Nathan calls Solomon Jedidiah (2 Sam. xi.25); and Hosea (i.1) and Isaiah (viii.5, viii.8) press out of or into the name a religious meaning. When King Saul chooses a man on account of personal qualifications he calls him by name (Exod. xxxii.2; Isa. xlv.3, 4). The reception of a new name from God (Isa. lxv.15; Rev. ii.17, etc.) indicates a new personal relation to God, inaugurated by grace.

The names used by different nations are an important monument of the national spirit and moral tone. Likewise the names current in Israel are a significant testimony to its peculiar calling, and amongst no people of antiquity do we find so many names occur of a religious origin. Matthew Hiller’s collection (Onomasticon) contains a hundred names of this kind. Compounded with the divine name, שד (Shaddai), י’h (Tvor), and, later, with יהוה (Yahweh), they contain references to God’s attributes, and his relations to the chosen people, or express hope in and thanks and petition to God. The religious significance of the name was enhanced by the connection of the naming of boys with circumcision (Luke i.59, ii.21). To be called by one’s name was another expression for the rights of inheritance (Gen. xlviii.10; Deut. xxv.6, 7). Children frequently received foreign names, or the term bar (son) was prefixed, as in Bartholomew, Bartimeus, etc. In the later periods of Israel’s history, Aramaic (Martha, Tabitha, etc.), Greek (Aquila, Mark, etc.), and other foreign names were introduced, or Hebrew names were furnished with Greek forms; as, Lazarus for Kleazar, Matthew for Amittai, etc.

Many Jews also added a foreign name to their original Hebrew name; as John Mark (Acts xii.12), Jesus Justus (Col. iv.11), etc.

The names of God and Christ are also of deep significance. God announces his name as expressive of the relation in which he places himself to men, or the attributes by which he wishes to be known and appealed to. He thus designates what he is to men. He is the God who seeth (Gen. xvi.18); and that which is characteristic of the patriarchal stage of revelation is expressed in the divine name, “the Almighty God,” Gen. xvii.1. It is he who changes the name of Abram with the allusion to the patriarch’s being the progenitor of a numerous posterity,—he who subjects nature to his purposes. For the meaning of Jehovah and Elohim see the articles.

The expression “name of God” indicates the entire administration of God, by which he reveals himself and his attributes to men. The believing Hebrew saw God’s glory and power displayed in the realm of nature; and the Psalmist exclaims (viii.1), “How excellent is thy name in all the earth!”

Expressions as “to believe his name,” “to be called by his name,” “to have life through his name,” “to be known in his name,” “to have hope in his name” (John xx.31), “to be saved by his name” (Acts iv.12), etc., refer to the saving and life-giving power in Christ, which is communicated to the believer. The expression “name of God” was baptism into the name of Christ, signifies primarily that the candidate is received into a saving relation with God, and into the experience of that which God is to man as the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

NAMES. 1697

NATHAN.

The Edict of, regulating the relations between the Reformed Church in France and the State, was issued by Henry IV., April 13, 1598, and revoked by Louis XIV., Oct. 17, 1685. It was very far from establishing religious liberty in France, or placing the Protessants on equal terms with the Roman Catholics. It granted freedom of conscience, but not freedom of worship. The Protessants were allowed to celebrate divine service, only in certain places and under certain restrictions. They were obliged to keep all the feast and fast days of the Roman Church, pay tithes to her priests, and conform to her marriage-laws. But they gained admission to the universities, schools, and hospitals; and mixed courts were established for cases in which the litigants were of different denominations. After it had been signed by the king, its verification by the parliaments presented many difficulties; and infringement on its regulations took place even during the reign of Henry IV. The plea on which Louis XIV. revoked the edict was, that—in consequence of this and other measures taken, there were no more Protessants in France. See the special treatises by Sander (Breslau, 1885), Schott (Halle, 1885), Bersier (Paris, 1886).

NAPHTALI. See Tribes of Israel.

NARD. See Spice.

NARDIN, Jean Frederic, b. at Montbeliard in 1687; d. at Blamont in 1728; studied theology at Tubingen; was strongly impressed by the German Pietism, and was appointed pastor of Hericourt in 1714, and of Blamont in 1715. A collection of his sermons (Le prédicateur évangélique, Bessé, 1735) was often reprinted, last in Paris, 1821, in 4 vols. His life was written by Duvernoy.

NARTHEX, an architectural term, of somewhat doubtful etymology, designating that portion of the ancient church—sometimes without and sometimes within the building—in which the catechumens and penitents gathered. It communicated with the nave by the “beautiful gates,” where stood the Auditoria; and with the outside, by the “great gates,” where stood the catechumens.

NASMITH, David, Scotch philanthropist, b. at Glasgow, March 21, 1799; d. at Guildford, Nov. 17, 1839. He was the originator of city missions, having established the first one, in Glasgow, 1826. He founded the London City Mission, 1835, and city missions in many other cities of Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. From 1821 to 1828 he was secretary to the united benevolent societies of Glasgow, but spent the remainder of his life in propagating his benevolent schemes. See John Campbell: Memoirs of David Nasmith, London, 1844.

NATALIS (NOEL) ALEXANDER, b. at Rouen, Jan. 19, 1638; d. in Paris, Aug. 21, 1724; entered the Dominican order in 1653; taught, for several years, theology in the college of San Foy, in Paris, and was appointed provincial of his order in 1706. On the instance of Colbert, he wrote his Selecta historia ecclesiastica capita, Paris, 1677—86, 24 vols.; to which he afterwards added six volumes of Old-Testament history. The work is a series of dissertations, rather than a continuous history. It is written in a liberal spirit, and from a Gallican point of view. The first parts, in which the Gallicanism of the author had no opportunity of showing itself, gained much favor even in Rome, but so much the greater was the disappointment caused by his representation of the middle ages; and by a decree of July 13, 1684, Innocent XI. forbade people to read the book, under penalty of excommunication. Natalis Alexander, however, did not recant. He defended his book, and Benedict XIII. finally removed it from the Index. He also wrote a Theologia dogmatica et moralis (Paris, 1693, often reprinted), some homilies, etc.

NATHAN (given), a name of frequent occurrence among the Hebrews. A son of David, born to him by Bathsheba, in Jerusalem (2 Sam. v. 14; 1 Chron. iii. 5), bore that name, and may have received it in honor of the celebrated prophet...
NATHANAEL.

NATHANAEL. See Bartholomew.

NATIVITY OF CHRIST. See Christmas.

NATURAL ABILITY. See Inability.

NATURAL LAW. The definition of a natural law always consists of three constituent elements, — matter, its inherent force, and the invariableness of the activity of the force. By induction, this invariableness — the external identity of effects when the causes are identical — is first made into an internal necessity (that is, an empirical result is made into a postulate of reason); and then all natural laws are combined into one great totality, the law of nature, denoting the internal necessity with which the whole world of phenomena springs from the causality inherent in nature. Twice the idea of the law of nature, or natural law, touches theology, and has to be considered by the theologian. — once in the department of dogmatics, and again in the department of ethics.

Christian dogmatics must define the relation between the necessity of the law of nature and the omnipotence of the living God, both with respect to the creation and with respect to the government of the world. The question is, whether the law upon which nature, the whole world, all creation, stands, admits or excludes any further direct interference from the side of God; and the answer to that question will decide upon the possibility of miracles. Nature may be conceived of pantheistically, as the all, in which even God has become absorbed; and it may be conceived of deistically, as an accomplished fact, which, from the moment of its completion, becomes utterly external to God. In both cases the possibility of miracles must be denied. The theological representative of the first-mentioned view is Schleiermacher. Christian ethics must define the difference between the causality of natural forces and the causality of the human will, between the necessity of nature and the freedom of man, between natural law and moral law. On account of his sharp distinction between phenomena and noumena, theoretical and practical reason, subject and object, etc., it came natural to Kant to define the difference between natural and moral law as one between fact and commandment; but, when the distinctions of Kant had been blinded by the philosophy of Schelling, it came equally natural to Schleiermacher to oppose the forced and strained idea of duty descending from Kant, and give an exposition of Christian ethics from the view, not of duty, but of the highest good, though thereby even spiritual life assumed the aspect of a natural process, and the idea of the freedom of will became much obscured.

Thus natural law is, both in dogmatics and in ethics, confronted with freedom, — in the former with the freedom of God, in the latter with the freedom of man; and the great problem of theology is, that neither the omnipotence of God be deistically clarified, nor the freedom of man pantheistically destroyed, by the necessity of nature. Everything depends upon the true conception of the spirit, and "the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. iii. 17).

NATURAL RELIGION. See Religion.

NATURAL THEOLOGY is the scientific exposition of the existence, nature, and attributes of God, so far as revealed to us by nature. Of the legitimacy and value of this science, two directly opposite views have been propounded. On the one side, it has been said that natural theology is not a science, but a misunderstanding; first, because the idea of God, and all the ideas immediately connected with or dependent on it, are intuitions, of which no evidence or demonstration can be given; and, next, because nature, on account of its very character, can give no revelation of God. To this objection may be answered, that, though the idea of God is truly an intuition, the scientific refutation of the denials of that intuition is not only not valueless, but even necessary. And the second objection depends simply on a superficial and materialistic view of nature, which may usurp, but can never vindicate for itself, the title of being truly scientific. On the other side, it has been said that the natural revelation of God is so complete as to make a supranatural revelation quite superfluous, and that, consequently, natural theology is the only true theology existing. It is apparent, however, that about the salvation of man, nature can tell us nothing; and consequently a natural theology which does not establish itself as an introduction to Christian theology is in its very essence a denial of Christianity.

Natural theology figures particularly in the deistic controversies of the last century. The deists claimed that there was no need of any revealed theology. See Deism.


NAUDAUS, Philippus, b. at Metz, 1654; d. in Berlin, 1729; sought refuge in the latter city in 1687; became a member of the academy of scientists, and acquired a name in the history of theology by his stanch defence of the old doctrinal system of the Reformed Church, with its strict Calvinistic orthodoxy. He fought for supralapsarian predestination, imputative justification, etc.; and in his great work, La souveraine perfection
of Brandenburg, the Margraves Hans and Georg had been specially invited. Several princes who were present, met Jan. 20, 1561, and lasted till Feb. 8, 1561. The convention, held twenty-one sittings. Personally present on the Saale, in order to come to an agreement should be invited to a convention at Naumburg and were introduced to the conveners of the confession of Augsburg could not be agreed upon. On the contrary, one of the conveners of the convention, Duke Johann Friedrich of Saxony, Duke Christof of Württemberg, the Elector Friedrich the Pious of the Palatinate, and his son-in-law, Duke Johann Friedrich of Saxony (at Hilsbach, June 29, 1560), it was determined that all the Protestant princes should attend the Naumburg-on-the-Saale, in order to come to an agreement both with respect to a new subscription to the Confession of Augsburg, as a manifestation of their unity, and with respect to the policy to be adopted towards the Council of Trent. The convention met Jan. 20, 1561, and lasted till Feb. 8, holding twenty-one sittings. Personally present were the Elector Friedrich III. of the Palatinate, and his son, the Count-palatine Casimir, the Elector August of Saxony, the Count-palatine Wolfgang of Zweibrücken, and his cousin Hans Georg, Duke Johann Friedrich of Saxony, Duke Christof of Württemberg, and his son Eberhard, Duke Ulrich of Mecklenburg, the Dukes Ernst and Philipp of Brunswick-Grubenhagen, Margrave Charles of Baden, Count Georg Ernst of Henneberg, Landgrave Philipp of Hesse, and his son Ludwig, Duke Francis of Lauenburg, besides a great number of counts and barons who had not been specially invited. Several princes who were not personally present — the Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg, the Margraves Hans and Georg Friedrich of Brandenburg, the Dukes of Pomerania, Brandenburg, Lauenburg, Holstein, etc. — had sent representatives. The princes adopted other measures to show their disagreement. More harmony prevailed with respect to the second great question of the convention, — the Council of Trent. Two papal legates, — Bishop Defino of Faro, and Bishop Commandone of Zante, — and an imperial embassy, arrived at Naumburg, and were introduced to the convention at its sixteenth sitting (Feb. 8). They were very politely received; but when it was discovered that the papal breves inviting the Protestant princes to participate in the Council of Trent began with the words, Dilecto filio, they were sent back unopened, with the remark that the Protestant princes were not, and would never be, the sons of the Pope. The convention finally answered the emperor and the Pope, that none of its number would participate in the Council of Trent; that they wanted a national German council, — a council in which they not only could be heard, but also have a vote, etc.


NAVE, an architectural term of doubtful etymology (some deriving it from voa, a temple; others, from naua, a ship), denotes the body of the church, between the choir — from which it is generally separated by a screen, or by rails — and the porch. It is the receptacle of the congregation proper; just as the choir is the receptacle of the clergy, and the porch or narthex, that of the penitents. It generally has one or more aisles on each side, and contains the pulpit, the baptismal font, and the organ.

NAVIGATION. See Ship.

NAYLOR, James, a Friend preacher; b. at Ardsley, Yorkshire, Eng., about 1616; d. 1690. In 1631 he was convicted at the Naumburg-on-the-Saale, and was sent to the January, and Wolfgang of Zante, — and an imperial embassy, arrived at Naumburg, and were introduced to the convention, — a council in which they not only could be heard, but also have a vote, etc. Wagenmann.

NAZARENE, See Ebenites.

NAZ'ARETH (from a Hebrew root signifying to sprout, to germinate, referring to the rich vegetation of the place), a city of Galilee, stands in a valley among the mountains which separate the plain of Zebulon in the north from the plain of Esdraelon in the south, in the same latitude as the southern end of the Gulf of Gales. The valley is long and narrow, but opens up towards the plain of Esdraelon, above which it is elevated more than three hundred feet. A zigzag mule-track leads from the plain to the valley; and the traveller is most agreeably surprised when he reaches the upper end of the path, and discovers the quiet green valley, and the stately city with its white walls. The gardens abound in olive-trees and fig-trees, and some palm-trees are also found; and the view from the tops of the northwestern mountains, reaching north to Mount Hermon, and west to the Mediterranean, is one of the finest in Palestine.

The place is never mentioned in the Old Testament, or by Josephus; but its name occurs very often in the New Testament. It was the abode of the parents of Jesus (Matt. ii. 23; Luke i. 29, ii. 4, 39, 51); he spent his youth there (Matt. xiii. 54; Mark vi. 1. Luke iv. 20); it was the scene of his first public activity (Luke iv. 16);
he afterwards visited it (Matt. xiii. 54; Mark vi. 1); from it his adherents received the name of Nazariane, which is still the common designation of the Christians in the Orient. According to Epiphanius (Her. 1, 130), it was inhabited exclusively by Jews in the time of Constantine: but in the sixth century Antoninus found there, besides the synagogues, also a great cemetery; and a century later, when Arculf visited it, it had two churches,—one built over the spring of the valley, and the other over the house of Mary. In spite of the conquest and destruction by the Moabites, Sawulf tells us that it contained a celebrated monastery in 1103; and when Tancred was enfeoffed with Galilee, in 1109, he removed the episcopal seat from Scythopolis to Nazareth. After Saladin's victory in 1187, and still more after the siege by the Turks in 1517, the prosperity of the city sunk very low. In 1620, however, the Franciscans succeeded in making a settlement there; and after that time the city gradually arose again.

At present it has between 5,000 and 6,000 inhabitants; of whom 2,500 are Greek, 2,000 Mohammedan, 800 Latin, 100 Protestant, and 80 Maronites. The Latin inhabit the western, the Mohammedan the eastern, and the Greek the northern, quarter.

In the Latin Church of the Annunciation, which occupies the central portion of the Franciscan monastery, there is a crypt under the high altar, where formerly stood the casa sancta, which in 1291 was removed by angels to Tarsato in Dalmatia, and thence to Loreto near Ancona. The Latin quarter also contains the Protestant church, the school of the Protestant mission, and a female orphan-asylum founded by the Female Education Society in London. [See Renan's description in his Life of Jesus, and Schaff's, in Through Bible Lands, chap. xxvii.]

NAZARIITES. The most important kind of vows occurring among the Hebrews was that taken by the Nazarites,—a vow of abstinence, of separation unto the Lord. It was regulated by the law (Num. vi. 1-21); which prescribed the term, the person, man or woman, who took the Nazarite vow, should, for the term of the vow, abstain from wine and every other intoxicating liquor, from the vineyard made of any such liquor, and, indeed, from anything coming from the vine, from the kernels to the husks. He should, furthermore, allow his hair to grow, and keep himself clean from all defilement by dead bodies, even those of his parents, or sisters or brothers. In other respects he was not excluded from intercourse with his fellowmen. If, for instance, by a case of sudden death in his own house, the Nazarite became unclean, he should, on the legally fixed day of his cleansing, the seventh, have his hair shaved off; and on the eighth he should offer two turtle-doves or young pigeons,—one as a sin-offering, and one as a burnt-offering,—after which his head should again be consecrated, and his term begin anew. When the term of the vow was completed, the Nazarite offered one he-lamb of the first year for a burnt-offering, one ewe-lamb of the first year for a sin-offering, and a ram for a peace-offering; after which his hair was cut at the door of the tabernacle, and burnt, together with the sacrifice. The vow fulfilled, the Nazarite was allowed to drink wine, etc. Generally the term of the vow was thirty days; but instances of vows for life also occur; as Samson, Samuel, John the Baptist, etc.

The religious significance of the Nazarite vow must be sought for in its analogy to the priesthood. The abstinence from wine, the avoidance of defilement by the dead, even the long hair, which was an ornament to the Nazarite, as was the mitre to the high priest,—everything reminds of the regulations of sacerdotal life. Indeed, though the Nazarite did not serve at the temple, his vow was a temporary and voluntary adoption of that idea on which the life of the priest was placed by birth. The institution was very old among the Hebrews: it probably originated among the Semitic nomads, and not in Egypt; comp. the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv.), the Nabataeans (Diod. 19, 94), etc. The examples of Samson and Samuel show that it flourished during the period of the Judges. After the exiles, no remarkable instance of vows for life also occur; as Samson, Samuel, John the Baptist, etc.


NEALE, John Mason, was the only son of Cornelius Neale, a clergyman of the evangelical school, and something of a poet. He was born in London, Jan. 24, 1818; graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1840; was ordained deacon, 1841, and priest, 1842; was for a time incumbent of Crawley in Sussex, and from May, 1846, till his death (on Aug. 6, 1866), warden of Sackville College, East Grinstead. His degree of D.D. was bestowed, I think, by Trinity College, Hartford.

He belonged to the most advanced section of High-Churchmen; and his outspoken and consist
for a time, the order was before his death in demand everywhere, as furnishing the best nurses and benevolence.” He founded, in 1856, the Sisterhood of St. Margaret. Desperately unpopular in England.

Congregationalist Josiah Miller, “between varied talents.” His life was divided, says the our space: those esteemed the greatest are his. But his zeal and industry matched his great and parallel. A full list of his books is impossible within our space: those esteemed the greatest are his History of the Holy Eastern Church, and of the Patriarchate of Alexandria, 4 vols., 1847–51, and his Commentary on the Psalms, from Primitive and Mediaval Writers, 1860: the latter was left incomplete, and was continued by Dr. Littledale. We may mention, also, his Readings for the Aged, four series, 1850, and later; Hierolouga, or the Church Tourists; Ecclesiological Notes on the Isle of Man; Voices from the East: History of the so-called “Janissary” (Dick, 1853); Sermons for Children, 1867; The Patriarchate of Antioch (a posthumous fragment), Lond., 1873; an adaptation of Pilgrim’s Progress, 1863. This last, we are told, caused some controversy; but so did every thing of his, when noted by others than the comparatively few who received his principles. He had strong convictions, and the full courage of them: in his own view he was a witness, and at need a confessor, of a system of absolute truth. On almost every page of his writings, whether prose or verse, learned or popular, his point of view and his resolute purpose are apparent. They are books of faith and of intention; he could not and would not make them otherwise: so one obvious motive runs through them all. To him “religion was the solidest of all realities,” and religion and the church (as he understood and received her) were inseparably one.

Nowhere is this more marked than in his wonderful stories for children and young people; though they were written for bread, and necessarily aimed to entertain the reader. Most of these have an historical foundation; many of them recite real or supposed facts, dealing with ancient or obscure trials and martyrologies. His sympathies seem rather Roman than Protestant, and dubious legends are accepted with unquestioning belief; but the charm of style, the minute knowledge of distant times and places, the vivid realization, the subdued feeling, at once profoundly devout and intensely human, his comparison with no other English popularizer of Christian history — if we except single works of Newman, Manning, Kinglake, and Mrs. Charies — has approached. The Farm of Aptonga, The Egyptian Wonders, The Followers of the Lord, Leni Legends, Tales of Christian Heroism and Endurance, The Query of the Dioscuri, and some others, are as much prized by adult as by infant readers: an expurgated edition of these (if that were possible) would form such an array of Sunday-school books as is often sought in vain. More lengthy and less powerful, but yet readable, instructive, and edifying, are Stories of the Crusades, 1846, and Duchesnair, or the Revolt of La Vendée, 1848.

As a poet, Neale eleven times gained the Seatonian prize. An edition of his Seatonian Poems (1864) was dedicated, by permission, to his bishop, after their reconciliation. His Songs and Ballads for the People, for Manufacturers, etc., are secular only in name. But his greatest services have been rendered, and his widest fame won, through his hymns. Here he worked under no false or limiting conditions, in a field entirely congenial. He easily leads the roll of those churchmen, who, within living memory, have revolutionized English hymnody; and only one or two British names of the present century can be doubtfully ranked with his.

His twenty Hymns for the Sick (1843), and eighty-six Hymns for Children (in three series, 1844, and later) include some gems and much useful matter, but he himself cast into the shade by his translations. Most of these appeared 1851. The Hymnal Noted is chiefly given to long metres, which seem to the uninitiated somewhat dry and formal; yet many, even of these, have gained large acceptance. Mediaval Hymns and Sequences (3d ed., enlarged, 1868) afford more variety and many valuable nouns. Many of the most precious of these is Neale’s first selection from the famous Rhythm of Bernard de Morlaic, completed 1858. No strains have been more thrilling or more effective than these; and their cry of “heavenly homesickness” came no more genuinely from the heart of the Cluniac monk than from that of the inhibited priest at East Grinstead: feelings like these cannot be counterfeited, nor work of this sort done to order.

After the Rhythm of Bernard, his noblest work is Hymns of the Eastern Church, 1863. There he was on ground familiar to him, and to him alone; and the mine he opened yielded treasures indeed. Whatever the originals, such renderings from any language into English as some of these (if we except John Wesley’s free paraphrases from the German) had not been known; nor were there as many original sacred lyrics of unmingled Greek as Art thou Worthy, Safe Home, The Day is past and oer. Within twenty years, more or less of these Greek hymns, like others from the same busy brain and hand, have made their way almost everywhere.

Dr. Neale was a singular compound of mediaeval (he would have called it primitive) doctrine and devotion with modern culture and English manliness. He was the sworn foe of “breadth” and “liberalism;” but his large gifts and nature transcended his self-imposed (or, as he thought, God-imposed) limits, and made much of his work catholice in the sense which he repudiated. Those who most disliked his “Romanizing” tendencies have been forced to admire his vast industry, his rigid consistency, his patience under long adversity, injustice, and neglect, his superiority to all questions of self-interest, his heroic and unflinching faith. His tone toward “sects” and heresies might seem full of arrogant contempt; but, as he says of St. Theodore of the Studium, there are those “whom the world, judging from a superficial view of their characters, has branded with unbending haughtiness and the merest formality in religion, while their most secret writ-
ings show them to have been clinging to the cross in an ecstasy of love and sorrow." And many who have little sympathy with his peculiar type of theology and ecclesiasticism hold his memory in affectionate reverence as that of a great hymn-writer, a great scholar, and a great saint.

**NEANDER.** Joachim, a distinguished German hymn-writer of the Reformed Church, and a supporter of the doctrines of Labadie (see art.); was b. in Bremen, probably in 1650; d. in Bremen in 1680. Untereyk, who was at that time the representative of the movement of Labadie (or the Pietism of the Reformed Church) at Bremen, was the subject of much ridicule. Neander, who was a wild youth, sympathized with this spirit, but was suddenly converted on attending one of Untereyk's services. From that time on, he was intimately identified with the pietistic movement of Germany. After studying in Heidelberg, he went to Frankfurt, where he met Spener, and was called to Düsseldorf as preacher, and master of the Latin School. He was suspended for a time, on account of his peculiar religious views, but was re-instated in 1677, after signing a document disapproving of the separatistic tendency of Labadie's movement. Two years afterwards he was called as pastor to St. Martini Church, Bremen. Neander is one of the few great hymn-writers of the German Reformed Church (Tersteegen, Henrietta of Brandenburg, Lampe, etc., being the others), and one of the greatest of Germany. He wrote sixty-four hymns, which appeared under the title A und O, Joachim Neandri Glaith-und Liebe.iiibung., etc. They were taken up and sung by Spener and his friends, and in 1898 several were admitted to the Darmstadt Collection. Among the best of these hymns is [the so-called German Te Deum] Lobe, den Herren, den miichtigen König der Ehren ("Praise to Jehovah, the Almighty King of Creation!") etc. They are characterized by simplicity and sincerity of thought, and warmth and purity of expression. Neander was also the author of some classic tunes, as Wunderwarmth and purity of expression. Neander was also the author of some classic tunes, as Wunderwarmth and purity of expression. Neander was also the author of some classic tunes, as Wunderwarmth and purity of expression. Neander was also the author of some classic tunes, as Wunderwarmth and purity of expression. Neander was also the author of some classic tunes, as Wunderwarmth and purity of expression. Neander was also the author of some classic tunes, as Wunderwarmth and purity of expression. Neander was also the author of some classic tunes, as Wunderwarmth and purity of expression. Neander was also the author of some classic tunes, as Wunderwarmth and purity of expression. Neander was also the author of some classic tunes, as Wunderwarmth and purity of expression. Neander was also the author of some classic tunes, as Wunderwarmth and purity of expression.
NEANDER.

[Eng. trans., History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostle, by Ryland, Edinburgh, 1842, 2 vols. revised by Dr. Robinson, New York, 1885], and Leben Jesu, Hamburg, 1837 (Eng. trans. by J. M. McClintock, D.D., and Blumenthal: The Life of Jesus Christ, New York, 1848), to write which he was incited by the conflict with Strauss.

In order to appreciate the position of Neander as a church historian, it is necessary to take into consideration the views which had, up to this time, prevailed amongst church historians. The most important church historian of that time was Plancek, and he belonged to the so-called pragmatic school. The views of this school prevailed when Neander began his great work. It must not be forgotten, however, that higher conceptions of church history had begun to be expressed by Schelling, Marheineke, and Gieseler. The pragmatic school only looked at Christianity as a system of doctrine. It failed to look upon it as a historical development. It lost sight of objective forces in its interest in individuals whose thinking and plans are the only causes of all changes. Of higher causes it knows nothing. It substituted, in the place of the fulness of a living development, its own poor shallow conception of Christianity. Instead of devotion to events, instead of a revelation of the fulness of Christ's life, church history was turned into a gallery of pictures representing human follies and errors, which the historian felt free to condemn or ridicule.

Neander broke through the rules of the pragmatic school in his very first work, Julian, when he remarks at the beginning, "How little it is in the power of any one to create anything! how little one can achieve in a conflict with Providence, which leads and forms, according to its own eternal decree, the spirit of all the periods of history!" He substituted for psychological arts the rich results of a study of the historical sources, and it is only necessary to observe the way in which Neander introduces the work of Julian into the progressive development of the church, to become aware that his conception of history was higher than that of his contemporaries. He regarded him merely from the stand-point of an apostate, or surrounded him with a halo. The general principle of Neander's method is seen to even better advantage in his monograph on Bernard. Author and subject of the biography were kindred spirits; and, in the treatment of Bernard's career, Neander lays bare the innermost principle of his life, and derives his activity from it. In his Chrysostom, the most elaborate of his biographies, often diffuse and defective in style — and style was his weakest point — Neander displays the same method. He regards church history as set forth in his introduction to his great work in these words, "We look upon Christianity, not as a system born in the hidden depths of man's nature, but as a power which has come down from heaven, in that heaven has opened itself to a master's hand; a power which in all its phases, as well as in its origin, is exalted high above all that man can create with his own powers, and which was designed to impart to him new life, and transform him in his innermost nature." He regards Christianity as a force, a life, and not alone as a dogma or a divine power which has come down from heaven. In his view, therefore, the history of the church is the history of the process of the interpenetration of man's life with the divine life; the history of the divine life of Christ pervading humanity. He constantly recurs to the parable of the leaven to illustrate this process. This new life was perfectly manifested in Christ, the second Adam, and becomes concrete in the lives of individuals whose peculiarities are not destroyed, but transformed and glorified. Every Christian, therefore, repeats the life of Christ in his own characteristic way. In no one is that life repeated in its comprehensive fulness. Each only presents a single aspect of it. Neander is constantly representing the one life of Christ in its conflict with sin, its adoption and rejection of worldly principles and forces in the various phases of rationalism and supernaturalism, scholasticism and mysticism, speculative and practical effort. To this general conception is due the edifying character of Neander's History. "The understanding of history presupposes the understanding of that which is its operating principle." And the history of the church, being a representation of Christ's life as it pervades mankind, can be understood only in proportion as the life of Christ is known by experience. The history of the church is the church's consciousness of its own life. Pectus est quod facit theologum ("It is the heart which makes the theologian") was Neander's often-used motto. He therefore expressly says, that it was his purpose from the beginning to present the history of the church as a striking proof of the divine power of Christianity and as a school of experience.

One of Neander's characteristics as an historian is his talent for portraying individual traits of character and life. He honored the individual as no other historian before him, and brought out the objective features of his subject, without mixing in his own subjective thoughts and opinions. Closely connected with this talent is his ability, which we have already referred to, of understanding and sympathizing with the experiences of others, and unveiling the contents of their innermost nature. Hence that mildness of judgment which Neander displayed side by side with an absolute love of truth.

The objectivity of Neander's portrayal of events and persons is the most important feature of his work. But here we are brought to his weakest point. The concrete and individual are relatively far more prominent than the universal. The body consists only of an aggregation of separate individuals, but the aggregate is not sufficiently emphasized. In one word, Neander's defect is a failure to give prominence to and appreciate the church as such. Instead of the church, we have a collection of single portraits of individuals animated with the life of Christ. The biographical element predominates. He loves to dwell upon the spiritual life of his characters, and has depicted with a master's hand the hidden life of the church; but in doing so he has neglected to portray its conquering power over the world. The influence of the church upon the formation of dogmatic beliefs, upon civil law, social customs, art, and architecture, he does not sufficiently bring out. In spite of the variety of individual character
and experience, the history of the church in his hands does not present an harmonious and progressive development. It is an endless portrait-gallery. Neander has given us a commentary of the parable of the heaven, but fails to give a commentary of the parable of the mustard-seed.

Neander's division of church history is extremely simple. So far as the spiritual life of the church is concerned, it falls into three periods. The boundary between the first and second is the growth of a priesthood,—a fact to which he can not call attention too often; for his history is a history of the universal priesthood. The first period is a period of pure spiritual religion; the second is characterized by a re-inswathement of Christianity in habiliments like to those of the Old Testament; the third is marked by a reaction, and an effort of Christian liberty to re-assert itself.

Neander's personal influence in the classroom was little less important than, if not quite as important as, his literary activity. He labored in Berlin for thirty-eight years. In his exegetical lectures he pursued a practical method. This he also did in his commentaries [Exposition of First John, the Philippians, and James, translated by Mrs. Conant, New York, 1886]. He also lectured on systematic theology (in which he depended too much upon Schleiermacher), and, after Schleiermacher's death, on ethics. His lectures in these two branches appeared after his death, in the three volumes, Dogmengeschichte [Eng. trans. by Ryland, 2 vols., London, 1885], Katholizismus u. Protestantismus, and Geschichte d. Ethik.

Neander's personal influence upon his students was also very great, and became a rich blessing to many. He presents the figure of a man of simple and childlike spirit, helpless in the practical affairs of life, faithful to his calling, severe towards himself, and temperate, full of love and gentleness towards others, and wholly and unreservedly devoted to the Lord. But he could be severe, and entered a protest against the enthusiastic Kirchenzeitung [Evang. Ch. Journal, Hengstenberg's organ], and opposed, not only with great firmness, but often with heat, both pantheistic and spiritualistic speculations, and the more rigid wing in the church which insisted upon a dead formalism, at times fairly threatening to overturn the desk, and yet all the while pursuing forth with the greatest earnestness and enthusiasm, without any other help than that of some illegible notes, an uninterrupted flow of learning and thought from the deep and pure fountain of the inner life, and thus, with all the oddity of the outside, at once commanding the veneration and confidence of every hearer,—and you have a picture of Neander, the most original phenomenon in the literary world of this nineteenth century."


NEAPOLIS (new city), a town eight or ten miles from Philippi, in Northern Greece, containing at present about six thousand inhabitants. It is memorable as the first place in Europe visited by Paul (Acts xvi. 11); and, since Neapolis is as port of Philippi, he probably went there on his second missionary tour, and certainly thence embarked for his last journey to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 1, 6).

NEBAIOTH. See Arabia, p. 123.

NEBO is mentioned in Isa. xi. 1, after Bel, as a deity worshipped by the Babylonians. The Septuagint has Νεβοῦ. — Among the Assyrians and Babylonians. In the cuneiform inscription the name reads Nabu or Nabius. It occurs frequently in Babylonian and also Assyrian patronymics, as, for instance, Nebuchadrezzar, Nabu-kudurri-usur "Nebo protect the crown". Neba-bal-usur "Nebo defend the son". Nabonassar, Nabu-nāṣir "Nebo protect", etc. It is also found in the Chaldean name Samgarnebo, Sumguṯ-Nabu — "be gracious Nebo" (Jer. xxxix. 3); and perhaps the name Abednego (Dan. i. 7) is a corruption of Abraham. The above patronymics shows that Nebo was worshipped as a benevolent deity; and their great number,
NEBO.
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that the worship was quite extensive. In the later Babylonian Empire, all the kings, with very few exceptions, were named after him; while, out of fifty names of Assyrian kings, only two show that derivation. The character of the deity is further proved by the epithets applied to him, — "the governor of the world," "the god of science," etc. It is not improbable that the Assyrian nabu, which means "to speak," "to announce," is connected with the Hebrew nabi, "prophet," or, more correctly, "messenger." In the Assyro-Babylonian star-worship, the planet Mercury is assigned to Nebo; and the Greco-Roman nations have not failed to recognize in Nebo their Hermes-Mercury, the mediator between the divine and human spheres. He was, however, a younger god, son of Merodach. A statue of him, dating from the end of the ninth or the beginning of the eighth century B.C., has been found at Nineveh (impending or accomplished) overthrow of the Assyrian power went up against the King of Assyria to the River Euphrates (2 Kings xxv. 19; but on the movements of the Egyptian king see Necho). In a decisive battle near Carchemish (Djirbas), on the western bank of the Middle Euphrates, Necho was utterly defeated and put to flight in the year B.C. 605 (or 606). Nebuchadnezzar was path, from the top of which Moses looked down into the promised country (Deut. xxxii. 49, xxxiv. 1). Near the mountain, stood a Moabitic city of the same name. It was assigned to the tribe of Reuben (Num. xxxii. 3), but never taken possession of. There was also a city thus named in Judaea (Ez. ii.29). The occurrence of the name Nebo in some patro- nymics in the inscriptions of Palmyra does not necessarily prove the ancient worship of that deity among the Aramaeans, as the name might be a later post-Christian importation. From Babylonia the worship of Nebo spread to the neighboring Armenia. Moses Chorennessis tells us that King Abgarus was a worshipper of Nabok (Nebo), and introduced his worship into Edessa; and to this worship Jacob of Sarug testifies in the treatise "Die Seherin," and in the book "Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament," 1872, pp. 272 sqq.; SCHRÄDER: "Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament," 1872, pp. 272 sqq.; WOLF BAUDISSIN.

NE'BO (prophet), a mountain, of the range Abarim, in Moab, from which Moses surveyed the promised land, and whence he died (Deut. xxxii. 49, xxxiv. 1–5). It was rightly located by Eusebius as six Roman miles (south-west) west from Heshbon, and is called "Nabibeh" by the Bedawin. From its summit, one can in clear weather see from the Dead Sea, which is six miles away, to Mount Hermon — in short, the view of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 49, xxxiv. 1–5). In 1875 Professor Paine maintained the identification of Nebo with the eastern summit of this mountain of Moab, called by the Arabs "Jabal Nebba," and Pisgah with a projecting western shoulder, called "Siagiah." See PISGAH, and ACT of Nebo," in RIRIKI'S Handwörterbuch d. bib. Altertums.

NE'BÖ, a city of Moab assigned the Reubenites (Num. xxxii. 8), identified by Professor Paine with a ruin at a mile south of the summit of Mount Nebo.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR (Babylon., Nabu-kudurri-usur, "Nebo, protect the crown," through the ex-
nent a certain Gedaliah was appointed governor. His assassination, two months later, instead of securing new independence for Judah, was followed by dread of Babylonian vengeance, which led to the flight toward Egypt of those who were left in the land.

Having thus wiped out all semblance of independent power in Palestine, Nebuchadnezzar turned his attention northward, and began vigorous operations against Tyre. The siege of that city occupied thirteen years. Ezek. xxix. 18 seems to indicate that it was not wholly successful. But Nebuchadnezzar must, by force of arms or treaty, have secured himself from molestation in this quarter before venturing on his campaigns in Egypt; and we know that he gained a foothold in Cyprus. His name was doubtless known and feared in all the Phoenician colonies.

In his thirty-third year (—it seems to have been the twenty-seventh of Ezekiel’s exile, Ezek. xxix. 17 (B.C. 572)—he undertook a campaign as far as the borders of Ethiopia, where he was at length repelled by Hophra (see Wiedemann: Ägyptische Zeitschrift, 1878, pp. 2 ff.; 87 ff.; and cf. Ezek. xxix. 10, 20; and in his thirty-seventh year (B.C. 569) a second expedition occurred, this time against a king who is probably to be identified with Amasis. Amasis was apparently first a co-regent with Hophra, and then his successor. (See Wiedemann: ib.; Schrader: Ägypt. Zeitschrift, 1879, pp. 45 ff.; Pinches: Trans. Soc. Bib. Arch., vii. 2, 1881, pp. 210 ff.) This second Egyptian campaign is the only one of which a record has thus far been found in the cuneiform inscriptions.

There must have been many other important expeditions of which we have no information as yet. To Nebuchadnezzar is undoubtedly due the credit of firmly establishing and greatly extending the dominion which Nabopolassar had secured. He was the most formidable and successful monarch who sat upon the throne of Babylon up to the time of its overthrow by the Persians.

We are better informed about the details of his occupations at home. Numerous inscriptions tell us of his devotion to the gods (cf. Dan. iii. 1 ff.), particularly Bel-Merodach (see Merodach), and are largely occupied with an account of his occupations at home. Numerous inscriptions tell us of his devotion to the gods (cf. Dan. iii. 1 ff.), particularly Bel-Merodach (see Merodach), and are largely occupied with an account of his restorations of temples. Among the most famous are those of Neb (called Ezida) in Borsippa, and of Bel-Merodach (called Esagil) in Babylon; but, besides those, traces of his work were left in Sippara, Cutha, etc. The fondness for building here evidenced appeared also in the construction of a splendid palace, of strong city walls and citadels, enclosing and protecting a vast area, probably also the so-called “Median Wall,” stretching from the Euphrates to the Tigris. Temples, tombs, gardens, and a network of canals and reservoirs for irrigation, are also attributed to him. Of Nebuchadnezzar’s insanity, and the events which preceded it, we have no account except from the Book of Daniel. (See Daniel.)

NECROLOGIUM (NECROLOGY), also called obituarium, obituarium, calendarium, etc., was the name of a book kept, in the library of the original diptychs of the church, in all religious houses, and containing the names of those dead for whom prayers should be made, — members of the house, its benefactors, members of houses with which a compact for mutual intercession had been made, etc.

NECROMANCY (from the Greek ἁποκουστική, "divination by means of the dead") was exercised under two different forms, — the one consisting in examining the viscera of one newly dead or slain, in order to draw out omens; and the other, in raising the soul of one departed, in order to obtain direct information concerning the future. Eusebius, in his Vita Constantinian (1, 30), says of Maxentius, that he opened the wombs of pregnant women, and searched the viscera of newly-born infants. Similar stories are told about Valerian, and even about Julian. The method, the raising of the souls of the dead, was of course the much more frequently used, and is often spoken of by Justin, Clemens Romanus, Tertullian, and others. After the sixth century the word began to be used in a vague sense of all exercise of pretended supernatural powers.

NECTARIUS, Patriarch of Constantinople, was the successor of Gregory Nazianzen, and the predecessor of Chrysostom. Immediately after the Council of 381 had been called, Gregory Nazianzen retired, and the see of Constantinople became vacant. Nectarius, a native of Tarsus, and at that time a very old man, lived in Constantinople as a senator, but was just about to return home. Before departing, however, he paid a visit to Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, who was present in Constantinople on account of the council; and the bishop became so impressed by the venerable old senator, that he put his name on the list of candidates for the vacant see. The emperor's choice fell upon the senator, to the great surprise of the bishops, who had never before heard his name, but soon learned that he was not an ecclesiastic, nay, even not baptized; and Nectarius was soon after installed in the patriarchate, and became patriarch of the church of Constantinople, and as such became very celebrated. It was first printed at Jassy, 1682, afterwards in London, 1702. GASS.

NEEDHAM, John, was a Baptist pastor at Hitchin, Hertfordshire, and, from 1743, at Bristol. He was living in 1787. He published in 1768 two hundred and sixty-three hymns, a number of which have been largely used; nineteen being included by Rippon, 1787, and twenty-four by Dobell, 1806. They are moderate in doctrine and in talent, and of late years have been chiefly, though not exclusively, employed by the Unitarian denomination.

F. M. BIRD.

NEEDLEWORK. See Clothing, Vestments.

NEFF, Félix, b. at Geneva, Oct. 8, 1798; d. there April 12, 1829; entered, when he was seventeen years old, upon military service; he enlisted in the garrison of his native city, but was afterwards reached by the religious revival, which at that time took place in the city, and became himself a revival preacher among his comrades. In 1819 he renounced his position in the army; and May 16, 1823, he was ordained in Mr. Clayton's chapel, in the Fournie, London. After laboring for some time at Mena, he settled in the lonesome valleys of the Quejas and Freissiniere in the Hautes-Alps. Some remnants of the Waldenses had at one time sought refuge there, but they had utterly degenerated. Not only had fights and drunkenness taken the place of the hymns of their ancestors, but they had even forgotten the commonest arts, and sunk into barbarism. The work which lay before Neff in that place was almost overwhelming. He performed it, however, though it cost him his life. When in 1827, he returned, dying, to Geneva, the settlements in the far-off valleys were converted and flourishing. See GOLLY: Memoirs of Neff, London, 1832; A. Bost: Lettres de Félix Neff, Geneva, 1842, 2 vols., and Vie de Félix Neff, Toulouse, 1800.

NEGRI, Francesco, b. at Bassano, in the Venetian territory, in 1500; d. at Chiavenna, in the Grisons, after 1559; entered the Benedictine order, but left it again on the outbreak of the Reformation; joined Zwingli, whom he accompanied to the Conference of Marburg, 1529; was present at the diet of Augsburg, 1530; and settled finally at Chiavenna as a school-teacher. He published several books of philological interest, and is the author of the curious allegorical drama, Tragedia de libero arbitrio, Geneva, 1544, translated into French in 1559, La tragedie du roi Fran-Arbière.

NEGRO EVANGELIZATION AND EDUCATION IN AMERICA. 1. The EVANGELIZATION of the negroes began, both at the North and South, at an early date. Their warm natures — full of hope, faith, and love — presented a fruitful soil for religious truth; and in spite of the wrong and cruelty of slavery, and of its denial of education, much was done in giving them oral religious instruction. The Methodist Church was organized in America in 1766; and in 1800 it reported an aggregate colored membership of 13,450, who were enrolled in the white churches. To prosecute this work among the slaves demanded the heroism of an apostle. Slaveholders were
exceedingly jealous of any influence among their negroes. The first regular Methodist mission among the colored people was established in 1829, in South Carolina. The Rev. Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Capers was its superintendent. The result of the year's labor was two missions, with 417 church-members. The second year their membership was more than doubled. Before the war these stations had increased to 26, with 32 preachers, and a colored membership of 11,546. But the work was not confined to South Carolina: every conference in the South had its colored missions. In the Mississippi Conference fully one-third of the effective ministry were employed exclusively on the colored missions; while every pastor on circuit, station, or white mission, had a colored membership to whom he gave regular pastoral attention. Galleries were made in the churches, where the negroes sat during public services for the whites; in addition, every Sunday afternoon they had special services, filling the body of the churches in many places. In 1844 the Methodist-Episcopal Church was divided; and in 1860 the colored membership of the Methodist-Episcopal Church South had reached 207,786. In 1870 the colored portion of the effective ministry of the Methodist-Episcopal Church South were by mutual agreement set apart in a separate organization, styled "The Colored Methodist-Episcopal Church," which in 1882 had a membership of 125,000. The African Methodist-Episcopal Church was organized in New-York City in 1816, and reports a membership of 391,044 in 1880. The Zion African Methodist-Episcopal Church was formed in New-York City in 1819, and now has 300,000 members.

The Baptists, at least two generations before the civil war, had given attention to the religious condition of the slaves. In 1801 the Charleston Baptist Association petitioned the Legislature for an amendment of the law passed the preceding year, imposing restrictions on religious meetings, so far as it respects persons of color, and renewed it the next year with a degree of success. Pastors of white Baptist churches, some of the most eminent, labored faithfully among these people; and, as a rule, the slaves of persons identified with Baptist churches sat with their masters in the same house of worship, occupying the rear seats or the galleries, heard the same sermon, were received into membership by baptism upon evidence of conversion, and were admitted to the same table of the Lord. In these churches the colored members had no voice in the government, or in cases of discipline, except those cases relating to their own race, when they voted with the whites. In the sparsesettlements, on large plantations, and in the smaller towns, this mixed church-membership prevailed. Planters frequently paid liberally from theirown members. The cnurch-property was held by white trustees; but in their spiritual matters these churches were independent, though taking counsel of their white brethren in licensing and ordaining their preachers. They elected their own officers, administered the ordinances, conducted their own discipline. That the religious effort thus put forth was successful, is shown by the fact, that, in 1850, the colored Baptists of the country, so far as reported, numbered 86,895; South Carolina having 14,691, Georgia 16,552, and Virginia 85,546. In 1880 their numbers are estimated varially at from 400,000 to 500,000.

The Presbyterians, in like manner, took an early interest in the religious instruction of the slaves. The synod of New York and Philadelphia in 1787 recommended "to all the members belonging to their communion to give those persons who are at present held in servitude such good education as may prepare them for the better enjoyment of freedom." This action was sanctioned by the General Assembly in 1788. In 1815 the Assembly urged upon the Presbyterians "to adopt such measures as will secure, at least to the rising generation of slaves within the bounds of the church, a religious education." In 1825 the Assembly notice "with pleasure the enlightened attention which had been paid to the religious instruction and evangelization of the unhappy slaves and free people of color," and "especially commend the prudence and zeal combined in this work of mercy by the presbyteries of Charleston, Union, Georgia, Concord, South Alabama, and Mississippi." It adds, "No more honored name can be conferred on a minister of Jesus Christ than that of an apostle to the American slaves." In 1839 one minister in Georgia is reported as devoting his time exclusively to the colored people; and most, if not all, settled pastors and stated preachers, preach as often as once a week to them. Similar reports are subsequently made from other portions of the field occupied by the colored people. In the houses of worship of the whites, provision was made for the blacks, where they might enjoy the privileges of the sanctuary. Services were held for them on the plantations, and it was the custom to have household servants at family prayers. On large plantations it was not uncommon for a family to be gathered together by a minister to preach statedly to their slaves. The colored members of the Presbyterian Church in 1860 numbered 13,887.

The English bishops who had charge of the missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the American Colonies showed a warm interest in the religious instruction of the negroes. In 1724 a list of inquiries was sent to the missionaries in the Colonies, asking, "Are there any inhabitants, bond or free, within your parish? and what means are used for their conversion?" The answers from Virginia to this question are various, but show, that, with some exceptions, the masters favored the instruction of their slaves; and the missionaries embraced the opportunity to instruct, and, when proper, to baptize, and admit them to the Lord's Supper. Few baptisms, however, are reported.

The Friends everywhere sought the overthrow of slavery; and, though it found a place among them for a time, it was at length ruled out. But this body of Christian people always endeavored to instruct the negroes, who found them to be friends indeed, wherever located, whether in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, or the South.
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The Roman Catholics, who settled Maryland, made early provision for the instruction of the colored people in the churches. Bishop English of South Carolina was ordained among the negroes of his diocese in 1820. A school for free colored girls and the instruction of female slaves was begun about 1830. A colored sisterhood has existed in Baltimore since 1826, and the Jesuites have taught the Catechism at Frederick since 1840. In 1871 an enterprise was begun for the conversion of the colored population in America through the agency of an English training-school. The report of 1877 shows that it has had 42 students, and in 1878 returns 33 students and 6 lay-brothers. Three students from this school have been laboring in Charleston, S.C., and report 196 baptisms. The Catholic Directory of 1882 reports one colored church in Baltimore, one in St. Louis, two in Charleston, and two in Florida.

The emancipation of the negroes in 1863 gave a strong impulse in the North to efforts for their evangelization. The barriers were broken down, and the call was urgent. The four millions of emancipated slaves were, it is true, far in advance, religiously, of their heathen ancestors when torn from Africa. Their churches and preachers were numerous, and the piety of the people themselves was in many cases deep and genuine. But there were heavy drawbacks. At the opening of the war, only about one-eighth of their number were actually church-members. The instruction they had received from the white ministers was only oral, and that which came from preachers of their own race (and that was the main source) was from men usually illiterate, and often immoral. The slaves themselves had come forth from bondage in poverty and ignorance, and the white masters had become too impoverished by the war to render much assistance. The call to the North was the voice both of piety and of patriotism. Since emancipation, the Methodist-Episcopal Church (North) has entered more extensively than any other denomination into the work of organizing these people into churches under its care. The colored membership of that church now numbers 183,730. The Baptist Church (North) has entered also into the work among the freedmen, and hence its efforts in distinctively church-work have been small. It now reports only 21 ministers and 2,219 church-members. The Presbyterians (North) have done a larger church-work, reporting 105 churches, with a membership of 12,156. The Congregationalists, represented by the American Missionary Association, having few adherents among the blacks before emancipation, aim to gather churches around the schools of the Association. They have 83 churches, with 5,941 members. The Protestant-Episcopal Church reports 26 missionaries (white and colored) and 3 lay-readers among the colored people in the South.

It is estimated that there is now (1882) a total membership in the colored churches of this country of more than 1,000,000.

If the Education of the negro after emancipation was to have commenced almost from the foundation. In the early colonial days, education was not rigidly forbidden, and many acquired a knowledge of letters; while a few, like Banneker the mathematician, and Phillis Wheatley the poet, rose to distinction. But, as the slaves became numerous and the slave-power more dominant, almost every Southern State adopted laws prohibiting the education of the negroes, under severe penalties; and, where no such laws existed, public sentiment was exacting in forbidding their education. The emancipated slaves, therefore, came into freedom, as a mass, wholly illiterate. After emancipation (1860), the first appropriation of public funds for their education was made by the National Government, in the establishment of the Bureau for Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands, in 1865. The Bureau closed in 1870, and during its existence devoted to the education of the freedmen $5,202,611, which was employed largely in the erection of school buildings on lands owned by benevolent societies or by the colored people themselves, in the rental of buildings, in paying the transportation of teachers, and in the founding of Howard University, Washington, D.C.

In the final report of the Commissioner of the Bureau, Gen. O. O. Howard, July 1, 1873, the enrolment in colored schools of all classes—including those supported by the government, the benevolent societies, and individuals—is estimated at 247,333 scholars.

The former slave States, in the period of reconstruction after the war, made ample provision, in their remodelled constitutions and laws, for popular education; all the States, except Delaware, Maryland, and Kentucky, guaranteeing equal school privileges to all children, irrespective of race. But the want of funds, existing prejudices, and the paralyzing effects of the civil war, prevented satisfactory results. Yet good progress was made. The enrolment of colored schools of all grades, in 1880, supported by the States and the religious societies, numbers 800,118 pupils. Towards the support of the public schools, the Southern States (except Delaware and Maryland) paid, in 1880, $2,280,629. Delaware and Kentucky appropriate the tax collected from the colored citizens. In the latter State it amounted, in 1880, to only forty-eight cents for each colored child. Maryland makes a biennial appropriation by the Legislature. For the higher education of the negroes, Maryland appropriates annually $2,000; Virginia, $10,000; South Carolina, $7,000; Georgia, $5,000; Mississippi, $10,000; Louisians, from $5,000 to $10,000; and Missouri, $5,000.

But the earliest schools for the freedmen were established by the benevolent contributions of individuals, churches, and societies in the North; and the colored schools for higher instruction were founded almost exclusively by these societies. The first school for the freedmen was established by the American Missionary Association. On the 17th of September, 1861, only five months after the beginning of the war, that school was opened at Hampton, Va., where many fugitive slaves had congregated, under the protection of the guns of Fortress Monroe. The spot overlooked the waters on which the first slave-ship entered the American continent. The Association steadily extended its work, until it had founded chartered institutions in every large Southern State,—Berea College, Berea, Ky.; Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.; Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.; Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.; Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.; Tou-
galoo University, Tougaloo, Miss.; Straight University, New Orleans, La.; Tillotson Collegiate and Normal Institute, Austin, Tex. Land has also been purchased for the Edward Smith College in Little Rock, Ark. It has 49 other schools of different grades. Connected with some of its charitable institutions, are theological, law, and industrial departments. Those at Hampton, Talladega, and Tougaloo, have large farms. Charterd institutions, 8; normal and high schools, 11; common schools, 39; total, 57. Teachers, 241; students, 9,968. Howard University, founded by the Freedmen's Bureau, had, in 1882, 29 teachers and 319 students. Its theological department is sustained mainly by the American Missionary Association.

The Freedmen's Aid Societies were early organized. The first was formed in Boston, Feb. 7, a second in New York, Feb. 22, 1862. Others followed rapidly, — in Cincinnati, Chicago, Cleveland, and elsewhere throughout the North; and in 1865 the teachers employed by all the societies numbered 634. With a view to economy and efficiency, they were consolidated, in 1866, in the American Freedmen's Union Commission. These societies devoted themselves in large part, at first, to physical relief and the organization of labor. But ere long the education of the freedmen became their chief endeavor, and they accomplished much good in the line of secular education. But the several branches were at length abandoned, or became absorbed in the societies of the religious organizations. The Commission itself closed in 1869.

The Baptists, who conduct their work, both educational and church, among the freedmen, through their Home Missionary Society, entered early into the establishment of schools; beginning in the spring of 1862, with schools at St. Helena and Beaufort, S.C., and afterwards adding others at Fortress Monroe, Washington, Knoxville, and New Orleans. Missionaries were appointed to preach, and to teach day schools; and assistants, both male and female, were sent out to remain in school, thereby in 1865, and pupils were taught yearly, until about 1872, when the secular or day-school system was given up, and efforts were concentrated on permanent or higher institutions, some of which had been planted in 1865. In 1882 the society has under its care twelve schools; as follows: Wayland Seminary, Washington, D.C.; Richmond Institute, Richmond, Va.; Shaw University, Raleigh, N.C.; Benedict Institute, Columbia, S.C.; Atlanta Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.; Nashville Institute, Nashville, Tenn.; Leland University, New Orleans, La.; Natchez Seminary, Natchez, Miss.; Alabama Normal and Theological School, Selma, Ala.; Florida Institute, Live Oak, Fla.; Bishop College, Marshall, Tex.; Louisville Normal and Theological School, Louisville, Ky. Normal instruction is given in most of the schools, industrial education in several, and biblical instruction in all. In four institutions a collegiate course is pursued, five are chartered institutions. In 1882, schools, 12; teachers, 79; pupils, 2,397.

The Freewill Baptists have an excellent institution, Storer College, at Harper's Ferry, Va., with 5 teachers and 240 students.

The Friends, true to the principles of the founder of their denomination, George Fox, entered at once the opened door for relieving the physical necessities of the freedmen, and at length established schools among them; but, when the public schools furnished the education, they gradually withdrew. They now maintain Southland College, Helena, Ark., with 277 pupils; a school in Maryville, Tenn., with 13 instructors and 211 pupils; and one in Philadelphia with 291 pupils; with 22 other schools in the South, maintained for a portion of the year. The Friends (Hicksite) entered the work in 1862; furnishing supplies at first, afterwards sustaining schools numbering at one time 25. They now have one school with 150 scholars.

The Methodist-Episcopal Church had from the first co-operated with the undenominational Aid Societies in the care of the freedmen in relieving physical suffering, and in giving instruction in primary education; but it concentrated its efforts by the organization, in Cincinnati, Aug. 6, 1866, of the Freedmen's Aid Society of the Methodist-Episcopal Church. This society now reports 6 chartered institutions; viz., Central Tennessee College Nashville, Tenn.; Clark University, Atlantic, Ga.; Clawson University, Orangeburg, S.C.; New Orleans University, New Orleans, La.; Rust University, Holly Springs, Miss.; Wiley University, Marshall, Tex.;— 4 theological schools, viz., Centenary Biblical Institute, Baltimore, Md.; Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.; Baker Institute, Orangeburg, S.C.; and Thomson Biblical Institute, New Orleans, La.; — 1 medical college, viz., Meharry Medical College, Nashville, Tenn.;— and 14 institutions not chartered. Total number of institutions, 25; teachers, 95; pupils, 3,506. It gives special attention to biblical instruction, and at Clark University a department of industry is established. The African Methodist-Episcopal Church founded and sustains Wilberforce University at Xenia, O., with 13 teachers and 170 students.

The Presbyterian Committee of Missions for Freedmen was organized by the General Assembly in New York in 1865, for the purpose of sending preachers and teachers to the South. Its efforts thus far are confined to the two Carolinas, Virginia, and Tennessee, with a few missions and schools in Georgia, Kentucky, and Florida. It has under its care 3 other relations, — Biddle University, Charlotte, N.C. (with a theological department); Wallingford Academy, Charleston, S.C.; and Scotia Seminary, Concord, N.C., — 2 normal schools, 3 graded schools, and 50 parochial schools. Total number of schools, 58; teachers, 108; scholars, 6,068. Lincoln University (Lincoln University P.O.), Oxford, Penn., has an able corps of 13 professors and 200 students, — 18 theological, 100 collegiate, and 82 preparatory.

The Protestant-Episcopal Freedmen's Commission was organized October, 1865; and in a few months it opened schools in Petersburg, Va., Wilmington and Raleigh, N.C. The first year the teachers numbered 34, and the scholars, day and night, 1,900. The Committee for Domestic Missions (under whose care this work now is) reported, in 1862, 2 normal schools with 8 teachers each, and 11 schools with 1 teacher each. The normal schools are at Raleigh, N.C., and at Petersburgh, Va.
NEGRO EVANGELIZATION.

The United Presbyterians have 2 schools,—one in Abbyville, Va., with 4 teachers and 245 students; the other in Chase City, Va., with 3 teachers and 251 students.

The Catholic Directory for 1882 reports for the archdiocese of Baltimore, 1 academy for colored girls with 60 pupils, and 4 other schools with 693 pupils, total, 753; archdiocese of New Orleans, 7 schools, 330 pupils; archdiocese of St. Louis, 1 school, 120 pupils; diocese of Louisville, 6 schools, 332 pupils; diocese of Natchez, 8 schools, 80 pupils; diocese of Natchitoches, 2 schools, 40 pupils; diocese of Savannah, 2 schools, 75 pupils; diocese of St. Augustine, 6 schools, number of pupils not given. Total: schools, 30; pupils reported, 1,730.

The princely gift of $2,100,000, by the philanthropic George Peabody, to education in the South, has yielded an annual income varying from $70,000 to $100,000. Of the money given for pupils, total, 753; archdiocese of New Orleans, students; the other in Chase City, Va., with 3 schools, 332 pupils; diocese of Natchez, 3 schools, one in Abbyville, Va., with 4 teachers and 245 pupils; diocese of St. Augustine, 6 schools, number of pupils not given.

Total: schools, 30; pupils reported, 1,730.

It is estimated that the appropriations of the American Missionary Association, the Freedmen's Aid Society, the Baptist Home Missionary Society, and the Presbyterian Church, has used in erecting buildings in Atlanta, Nashville, Talladega, and New Orleans. She has also given to Hampton Institute, Berea College, and the theological department of Howard University, $35,000.

It is estimated that the appropriations of the American Missionary Association, the Freedmen's Aid Society, the Baptist Home Missionary Society, and the Presbyterian Church, has used in erecting buildings in Atlanta, Nashville, Talladega, and New Orleans. She has also given to Hampton Institute, Berea College, and the theological department of Howard University, $35,000.

It is estimated that the appropriations of the American Missionary Association, the Freedmen's Aid Society, the Baptist Home Missionary Society, and the Presbyterian Church, has used in erecting buildings in Atlanta, Nashville, Talladega, and New Orleans. She has also given to Hampton Institute, Berea College, and the theological department of Howard University, $35,000.

It is estimated that the appropriations of the American Missionary Association, the Freedmen's Aid Society, the Baptist Home Missionary Society, and the Presbyterian Church, has used in erecting buildings in Atlanta, Nashville, Talladega, and New Orleans. She has also given to Hampton Institute, Berea College, and the theological department of Howard University, $35,000.

It is estimated that the appropriations of the American Missionary Association, the Freedmen's Aid Society, the Baptist Home Missionary Society, and the Presbyterian Church, has used in erecting buildings in Atlanta, Nashville, Talladega, and New Orleans. She has also given to Hampton Institute, Berea College, and the theological department of Howard University, $35,000.

BOOK OF. — The Book of Nehemiah is valuable for the description it gives of the restoration of Jerusalem, which is our best guide in mapping out the topography of the city, the development of the enmity between the Jews and the Samaritans, and the revival of the reading of the law and the observance of the feasts. It contains an account of Nehemiah's return to Jerusalem, and reconstruction of its walls (chaps, 1—vii.), the institution of the public reading of the law and a religious feast by Ezra, and the prayer of the Levites (viii., ix.), the covenant and genealogy of the Levites, and the separation of Israel from the mixed multitude (x.—xiii. 3), and Nehemiah's reforms concerning the temple, and marriages with foreign women (xiii. 4—81). It is the latest of the books of the Old Testament. The authenticity of its contents has not been a matter of dispute. There are no events of a miraculous nature to awaken suspicion. The questions of interest concern the relation of the work to Ezra and the authorship.

In the Hebrew canon, Nehemiah and Ezra were
NEHUSHTAN.
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NEOPHYES.

counted as one book. The LXX. and the Vulgate divided them into two books. The events which they narrate belong to the same period of restoration; but, as has already been stated in the article Ezra, there is danger of being deceived by this argument, as the instances cited in the art. Ezra prove. The style of chaps. viii.–x. is, as Rawlinson and others have shown, different from the first seven chapters; and the lists of chaps. xii.–xiii. have evidently been interpolated (xii.10–22, etc.).

Lit.—The Fathers did not give much attention to Nehemiah; and Venerable Bede was the first to give a commentary upon it in his allegorical interpretation, Allogorica Expositio in Librum Nehemia. Among the older commentators are Striggelius (Schola in Nehem., 1575), Bishop PILKINGTON (Exposition upon Nehemiah, 1558), CROMMUS (Lovain, 1632), TRAPP (London, 1656).

The more recent commentators are by BERTHEAU, 1862; KEIL:1870; Canon RAWLINSON, in Speaker's Commentary. London and New York, 1873; HOWARD CROSBY, in Lange, New York, 1876. See art. "Nehemiah," by Bishop HERVEY, in Smith's Bible Dictionary, the vivid portraiture by EWALD, in his History of Israel, and the art. "Ezra und Nehemia," in Herzog; SAYCE: Introduction to Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, London, 1885.

NEHUSHTAN (brazen thing) is the name which King Hezekiah of Judah gave to the brazen serpent set up in the wilderness by Moses (Num. xxi. 8). It had been preserved by the Israelites up to that time; but Hezekiah ordered it to be burnt, because the people regarded it as an idol, and offered incense to it (2 Kings xviii.4). The name Nehushtan he gave it in derision.

NELSON, David, Presbyterian clergyman, b. near Jonesborough, Tenn., Sept. 24, 1793; d. at Oakland, Ill., Oct. 17, 1844. He was graduated in 1810 at Washington College, Virginia. He practiced medicine, imbued infidel opinions, but was converted, and licensed to preach, April, 1825. After five years'service in Tennessee and Kentucky, he established Marion College in Missouri, and for six years was its first president; but his abolitionist views at last forced his departure, and in 1836 he opened at Oakland a training-school, particularly for missionaries. Besides other literary work, he wrote that widely circulated work, Cause and Cure of Infidelity, New York, 1836, often reprinted and edited. The American Tract Society publishes translations of it in French, German, and Spanish.

NELSON, Robert, b. at London, June 22, 1656; d. at Kensington, Jan. 16, 1715. He was graduated a fellow of the Royal Society, and passed a life of study and beneficence. He was a Nonjuror, and did not return to the Church of England until 1709. He wrote several books, which were widely circulated in his day; and in some, Canon Rawlinson addressed several letters and a poem; but there is no positive proof of that supposition. It is probable, however, that he lived towards the close of the fourth century, as he mentions no writer of a later date, but often quotes Apollinaris and Eunomius. His book must early have been ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa. It was much used by Philostratus, John of Damascus, Elias Cretensis, etc. Having been several times translated into Latin, it was for the first time edited in Greek by Nic. Eliebodius, Antwerp, 1556; afterward, as, for instance, in Middwe. Patr. Graeco, vol. 40, [translated into English by George Wither, London, 1636].

NEVUS, a Christian philosopher, author of a book (νενήσων οἰκονομον) on human nature, and, according to the titlepage of the book, bishop of Emisa, or Emesa, in Phoenicia. Nothing more is known of his life, even not the exact period in which he lived; for, though his book was much used, he was not quoted until late. By some he has been identified with Nemesis, the pagan prefect of Cappadocia, to whom Gregory Nazianzen addressed several letters and a poem; but there is no positive proof of that supposition. It is probable, however, that he lived towards the close of the fourth century, as he mentions no writer of a later date, but often quotes Apollinaris and Eunomius. His book must early have been ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa. It was much used by Philostratus, John of Damascus, Elias Cretensis, etc. Having been several times translated into Latin, it was for the first time edited in Greek by Nic. Eliebodius, Antwerp, 1556; afterward, as, for instance, in Middwe. Patr. Graeco, vol. 40, [translated into English by George Wither, London, 1636].

W. MÖLLER.

NEVUS is the name of several Celtic saints, of whom one (d. in 809), pupil of Elbod, archbishop of North Wales, is often mentioned as the author of the Historia Britonum. Out of the thirty manuscripts, however, which have come down to us, only two, dating from the twelfth century, mention Nennius as the author; while seventeen other manuscripts mention Gildas, and one of the best, a certain anchorist, Marcus. But the oldest manuscripts, dating from the tenth century, mention no author at all; nor does William of Malmsbury (about 1125), who often quotes the book under the title Gesta Britonum. The book belongs to the time when the Britons, driven away by the Saxons, consolated themselves for the loss of their freedom and power by boastful fictions. It seems to have been written between 822 and 831; but in its present shape it has gone through the hands of no less than five different editors, who have enlarged it, and filled it with confusion. See Schöff: De Eccl. Brit. Historiae Fontibus, pp. 29–37.

C. Schöff.

NEOLOGY, from νέος ("new") and οἶδα ("word," "idea"), is used in philology to denote the introduction of new and more or less superfluous words, and in theology to denote the introduction of new and more or less unsound doctrines.

NEONOMIANISM, from νέον ("new") and νόμος ("law"), is a term which in the controversies of the English dissenters, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, was applied to the views of Dr. Daniel Williams and his adherents, because they defined and construed Christianity as a "new law."

NEOPHYES (νεοφύτως, "the newly-planted") denoted, in the primitive church, such as had recently been baptized: see 1 Tim. iii. 6, where it is rendered "novice." The term was retained by
NEO-PLATONISM.
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The Fathers, though with various modifications. According to Apos. Canon., 60, a neophyte could hold no office in the church, except under peculiar circumstances. Neoplatonists of the Roman-Catholic Church — that is, non-Christians, or Christians of other denominations, entering the Church of Rome — receive many privileges from the Pope. Compare Ferrari: Bibliotheca Canonica.

Neoplatonism was the last of philosophy which the Greek civilization developed, and stood in a curious relation to Christianity, alternately attracting and repulsing it. When Christianity entered into history, the whole Greek-Roman civilization was falling into decay, its moral and religious foundation was decomposed and crumbling away, and the uncertainty and insufficiency of its scientific construction became apparent by the glaring contradictions of the various philosophical systems. Its inherent power was still too strong, however, to yield without making one last grand exertion for self-restoration. The history of philosophy was reorganized, and those systems which presented a combination of philosophy and religion (Pythagoras, Plato, etc.), supplemented with such Oriental ideas as making one last grand exertion for self-restoration were only eclectics. Their influence was merely temporary. They simply prepared the way for Neo-Platonism, which, though firmly planted on the basis of the preceding Greek philosophy, may be considered a new manifestation of the genuine creative power of the Greek spirit, distinct both from the philosophy of Philo, with its peculiar Jewish admixtures, and from Gnosticism, with its preponderating Oriental elements. Its deepest impulse was a longing away from the finite existence in the world towards the infinity of God. Its principal object was to discover the means by which the human soul may escape from its imprisonment in matter, and return to the spiritual world from which it originates. This impulse is characterized in each of its three phases. — The Alexandrian-Roman school, 290—270 (Ammonius Saccas and Plotinus), the Syrian school, 270—400 (Porphyry and Jamblichus), and the Athenian school, 400—529 (Proclus and his disciples).

Ammonius Saccas, a native of Alexandria (d. about 250), a Christian by education, but afterwards converted to Paganism, was the founder of Neo-Platonism. He wrote nothing; but among his disciples were Origen the Neo-Platonic, Orig. the Christian Father, Longinus the critic, and Plotinus (b. at Lycaon in Egypt, 205; d. in Campania, 270), who first gave a systematic form to the Neo-Platonic doctrines. Plotinus settled in Rome in 244, gathered a large circle of pupils, and began it 254 to put his ideas into writing. His essays, fifty-four in number, were collected by Porphyry, and arranged, according to their contents, in three books. They were first printed in a Latin translation by Marcellus of Ficinus, Florence, 1492, and then in Latin and Greek at Basel, 1580, in Greek, with critical apparatus by Moser, and Creuzer, Oxford, 1855, 3 vols., by Dübner, Paris, 1855, by Kirchhoff, Leipzig, 1856, and by H. F. Müller, Berlin, 1878—80. [Parts of his works were translated into English by T. A. Taylor, London, 1757, 3d ed., 1817. There is a complete French translation by Bouillet, Paris, 1857—60; also a German, Berlin, 1878—80.] Among modern works on Plotinus' philosophy are, C. H. Kirchner: Die Philosophie Plotins, Halle, 1854; A. Richter: Neu-platonische Studien, Halle, 1856. The system of Plotinus comprises three divisions, the supersensual world, the world of the senses, and the elevation of the soul from the latter to the former. The centre and foundation, not only of the supersensual world, but of all that exists, is God. But God is incomprehensible by reason, above reason, and can be approached by the human understanding only under three forms, as the infinite, without limit or form, without magnitude or life, without thought or being, definable only through negations; as the one and the good, the source of all that loves, the goal of all that lives; and as the sum total of all power or force, the absolute causality, which three conceptions afterwards were introduced into the Christian dogmatics, as the three ways of knowing God, by the Christian Neo-Platonists, Dionysius Areopagita, Maximus Confessor, and Scoto-Eriugena. From the super-abundance of this absolute causality issues forth the Idea, or world of ideas (άρχειον), which, though radiating from God, "like the beans from the sun," is different from him, "like the flower from the root," and as unable to exercise any influence on him as is "the river with respect to its source."

From the Idea again issues forth the Soul (ψυχή), one by itself, as the All-Soul or the World-Soul, and yet comprising an innumerable multitude of individual souls. Though the Soul belongs to the supersensual world, she has an instinctive longing towards her own creation, the world of the senses, the world of appearances, the world of matter. This last stage in the development of the universe is as necessary, according to its inherent plan, as any of the preceding; but matter is, nevertheless, the very opposite of good, evil by itself, and the source of all evil. The goal of all moral effort of man must consequently be to rid himself from his origin, and at last the Soul will turn through the Idea to God. The means by which that goal can be reached is virtue; not the simple, plain virtue by which social life is regulated and adorned, but a thorough purification of the Soul, by which the sensuous affections are not only limited and governed, but absolutely extinguished, and a concentration of all the powers of life upon the Idea, that is, upon the study of the sciences and the contemplation of the divine, until at last the Soul is completely absorbed in God through a holy enthusiasm, or ecstasy.

The most prominent of Plotinus' disciples, and the head of the Syrian school of Neo-Platonism, was Porphyry (b. in 238 at Tyre, or, according to another account, at Batanea in Syria; d. in Rome, 305 or 304). He studied first under Longinus, but repaired in 298 to Rome, and entered the school of Plotinus. After a residence of several years in Sicily, he returned in 271 to Rome, where he edited the works of Plotinus, and wrote most of his own books. Christian writers — Socrates (Hist. Ecc., I. 23) and Augustine (De Civit. Dei, X. 20).
— tell us that he was educated a Christian, but was converted to Paganism, and, from a feeling of revenge, became a bitter enemy of Christianity; and, indeed, one of his most pious works was his Ἀγαθὸς Ἰσιδωρος ("Against the Christians"). It has perished, and so have the refutations of it by Methodius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinaris, and Philostorgius; but it is often spoken of (Eusebius: Hist. Eccl., VI. 19; Demonstr. Evang., II. 34; Athenaeus, XX. 23). In the first exposition of Plato's Timaeus, and most of his original works on philosophy, are also lost. Still extant are his Introduction to the Categories of Aristotle, his epitome of the system of Plotinus, etc. (see Fabricius: Bibl. Graeca, V. 725). In the system of Porphyry, the tendency of restoring and regenerating Paganism by means of philosophy is much more apparent than in the system of Plotinus. Porphyry was a man of a practical turn of mind, clear, cutting, and popular; a scholar and a critic, rather than a speculative genius. He added nothing new to Neo-Platonism; but he proceeded from the system into practical application. Of course, he could not avoid stumbling now and then against the vulgar conception of the Greek religion. He abominated the sacrifice of animals; he advocated abstinence from flesh; he spoke of the true worship of God as consisting in devout contemplation and the piety of the heart: but he, nevertheless, considered the Hellenic polytheism as a true and legitimate stage in the elevation of the human soul from matter to spirit, and capable not only of restoration, but also of reform. His disciple Jamblichus (a native of Coesarea, a contemporary of Constantine; d. about 330), and the disciples of Jamblichus (Edesius, Chrysanthius, Maximus, Eunapius, etc.), approached the problem still more closely, and gave to Neo-Platonism the aspect of a fantastic theology of polytheism, the character of a mysticism and theurgy, in which both the speculative spirit and the pure piety of the earlier Neo-Platonists were lost.

After the death of the Emperor Julian, who was a Neo-Platonist, and the complete failure of the practical re-action against Christianity, the Neo-Platonic philosophers were for some time compelled to retreat into the East, in order to escape the penalties of the imperial edicts and the violence of Christian mobs. Hierocles was ill treated in the streets of Constantinople; Hypatia was killed in a church in Alexandria; nevertheless, in the large cities the philosophical schools were still kept open, and they were often frequented by Christians for the sake of the scientific education they offered. Themistius taught with success in Constantinople, and was appreciated even by Christian theologians (Gregory Nazianzen). The school in Alexandria was very prosperous in the beginning of the fifth century; but it was especially the school in Athens which became celebrated by adopting a stricter method, and cultivating a more accurate and more comprehensive scholarship. Proclus stood at its head, a Lycian by descent (b. in Constantinople, 410; d. in Athens, 485). He was revered by his pupils, not only as a profound philosopher, a great scholar, and a prolific writer, but also as a model of moral perfection, a favorite of the gods. He collected all the results of the Neo-Platonic speculation into one body, remodelled the whole mass of doctrines, and gave to the system its consummate scientific form, dissolving the contradictions, filling up the gaps, etc. In spite of his talent and conscientiousness, under his hands Neo-Platonism became a kind of scholastic art, a stiff tradition, built up with dialectical subtlety on the basis of the works of Plato, the oracles, and the Orphic poems; and under his successors (Marinus, Isidorus, Hegias, Damascius) the school sank down to empty formalism. By order of Justinian, it was closed in 529. Damascius, Simplicius, and five other Neo-Platonists, emigrated to Persia, where they found an appreciative patron in King Chosroes. Four years previously (in 525), the last representative of the old philosophy in the Occident, the Christian Neo-Platonist, Boethius, had found his death by violence.

The discrepancies between the Neo-Platonic philosophy and the Christian religion are palpable. What the one seeks, the other has found: what the one asks for, the other gives. But they proceeded from the same premises, and met the same moral goal,— to give to human life a new and safe foundation by reconciling those awful contradictions which were burning in every man's heart,— God and the world, spirit and nature, mind and matter, etc. No wonder, then, that, as Augustine says in his Epistle to Diodorus (Ep. 119), Neo-Platonism became to many the bridge which led them to Christianity. But, besides that, Neo-Platonism exercised a discernible influence on the historical development of Christianity. Origen, Methodius, Synesius, the three Cappodocians in the East, Marius Victorinus, Boethius, and Augustine in the West, had frequented Neo-Platonic schools (see Léche: Augustinus plotinianae, Jena, 1881). The Fathers often used the expositions of Neo-Platonic writers, especially of Plotinus (see A. Jahn: Basilius plotinianae, Bern, 1838). Theodoret, in his De curanda Gr. aff., even employs Plotinus' propositions concerning Providence, though at the same time protesting that Plotinus has derived his ideas from Christian sources. But the greatest influence Neo-Platonism exercised on Christianity through the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius. According to general acceptance, that author was a Christian, who, educated in the school of Proclus, undertook to combine Christian and Neo-Platonic ideas into a system of mystical gnosis, which then was accepted by many as the genuine and original Christian doctrine, handed down from the apostles themselves as a secret but divine science. Through Maximus Confessor, John of Damascus, and Scotus Eriugena, those writings exercised a decisive influence on the scholasticism, and more especially on the mysticism, of Western theology during the middle ages.

Lit. — For the history of Neo-Platonism, see, besides the general histories of philosophy, Jules Simon: Histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie, Paris, 1845; Vacherot: Histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie, Paris, 1846-51, 3 vols. For the relation between Christianity and Neo-Platonism see, besides the general church histories, Vogt: Neu-Platonismus.
of chiliasm; defended the literal, realistic exegesis of Scripture against Origen and his disciples, and the chiliastic Petersen. See Walch: Religionsgeschichtlich besonders interessant. A. BCHWEIZER, der in his Opera, Heidelberg, 1612, t. ii. 

The work has perished; but its views found many adherents, especially at Arsinoe: the middle of the third century; an ardent champion accepted its ideas. See Eusebius: Hist. Eccl., VII. 24 et sqq. Schupart's De chiliasmo Nepotis (Giessen, 1724) caused a controversy between him and the chiliasts. Neri was persuaded that a deity worshipped by the men of Cuth, who from Babylonia were transplanted into Samaria. The planet Mars was called Nerig, which evidently is a corruption of Nergal. According to the Talmud and the rabbins, Nergal was worshipped under the form of the domestic cock. This state ment may be due to a merely arbitrary combination; the meaning of the name was revealed by Fan Eclectus, who translated it into "negal", and the name of the god. But it is not improbable that the cock—entirely unknown to the ancient Hebrews, and never mentioned in the Old Testament, first introduced from India to the Persians, and then from the Persians to the Greeks—may have formed one of the symbolical representations of Nergal, as it everywhere, in India, Persia, Greece, etc., was consecrated to the god of war. WOLF BAUDISSIN.

NER GAL-SHAREZER (Nergal-sar-usur, "Nergal protects the king") is the name of a Babylonian nobleman (Jer. xxxix. 3) entitled Rab-mag, probably as the chief of the magicians, and generally identified with Neriglissar, the son-in-law and successor of Nebuchadnezzar. The palace built by him has been discovered among the ruins of Babylon. NERI, Philip (Filippo de), founder of the Congregation of the Oratory; one of the saints of the Roman-Catholic Church, perhaps the most witty of their number, and free, from all pharisaical leaven; was b. at Florence, July 22, 1515; d. at Rome, May 25, 1595. He was characterized from childhood by a cheerful and gentle disposition. Left comparatively poor by the loss of his uncle, a rich merchant in St. Germano. Resisting his uncle's generous offers, he went in 1533, out of religious devotion, to Rome, where he studied philosophy and theology under the guidance of the Augustinians. He gave himself up in his spare hours to works of charity, and had no sooner concluded his studies than he sold his library, and gave the proceeds to the poor. On one occasion, in his thirtieth year, while he was engaged in prayer for the Holy Spirit, he was so overcome that he threw himself on the ground; but when he rose up, he found his chest had expanded to the extent of a fist's width. Later, at the dissection of the body, it was discovered that the heart was perfectly sound, and two of the ribs had been broken.

Neri was ordained priest in the Lateran Church, May 29, 1531. He took part in the foundation of the Society of the Holy Trinity for the care of the poor and strangers; but it is especially with the Congregation of the Oratory that his name is associated. This society grew out of evening gatherings which Neri held in a hall,—the Oratory,—for prayer, readings from the Bible, the Fathers, and the martyr-legends, song, etc. The musical treasures of the church were put under tribute, and the pieces chosen were called "oratorios." Down to this day such compositions are performed at the Church of the Oratory in Rome, the St. Maria in Vallicella, from All Saints' Day (Nov. 1) to Palm Sunday (the first Sunday in Lent).

A familiar and cheerful atmosphere pervaded these gatherings. Neri was persuaded that a cheerful temper was far more in accordance with Christianity than melancholy. The most of his alleged miracles he performed with the simple words, "Be cheerful, and doubt not." This spirit he carried into his daily life; and he was full of humor in his social relations, and even engaged in games. This conduct could not escape the notice of those who sought to bring about a reformation by pharisaical seriousness. He was accused by the cardinal-vicar of Rome of having piped for his companions to dance, etc., and was suspended from the confessor's chair and the pulpit. But the cardinal-vicar died; and Neri was honored by the repeated offer of a cardinal's
that, which he refused. Many miracles are ascribed to him. He was often, for hours at a time, in a state of ecstasy; and his body was seen, on such occasions, to sway in the air several feet from the ground. It does not seem to have been his custom to pray to Mary. Miracles are said to have followed his decease; and in 1822 he was canonized, at the Petition of Louis XVIII of France.

In 1575 a papal decree was secured recognizing the Congregation of the Oratory. The principle of perfect equality prevails among its members, and even the superior takes his turn in serving at the table. The members are not monks, and do not renounce their private fortunes, or take vows. It was Neri's wish to limit their functions to prayer, the administration of the sacrament, and preaching. The Italian societies are, for the most part, independent of each other, and there is no centralization of authority and jurisdiction. The Church of St. Maria in Vallicella, Rome, belonging to the Oratory, was built in 1576. Three years later, Taruccì founded societies in Naples and Milan, which were followed by others in Palermo and other cities. Neri's successor as superior of the Roman society was the church historian Baronius. In 1611 a society was opened in France. In 1622 the Congregazione dell'Oratorio at Birmingham, the members of which were for the most part made up of former members of the Anglican Church. The order decayed after the Revolution, but has since been revived [1853] under the impulse of the devout Pététot of St. Roch, and has the name of the "Oratory of Jesus and the Immaculate Mary." Gratry belonged to it. [In 1847 Cardinal Newman founded a Congregazione dell'Oratorio in London by the Oratorians, many of whom were the former members of the Anglican Church. In 1819 a second Congregation was established at London, with Frederick W. Faber as the superior.]


REUCHLIN. ZÖCKLER.

NERO (Roman emperor 54-68) has made his name conspicuous in the history of the Christian Church by his persecution of the Christian congregation in Rome,—the first great persecution instituted against the Christians. In the night between July 18 and 19, 64, a fire broke out on the southern declivity of the Palatine Hill. It raged for six days and six nights, spreading far and wide, and suddenly started anew in the northem parts of the city, lasting for three more days, and destroying ten out of the fourteen wards of the city. The excitement in Rome was indescribable; and a rumor was abroad that the conflagration was the work of the emperor himself,—a suspicion not altogether improbable on account of his delirious craving for magnificence, and his desire to imitate the suicide of Socrates in order to aver the popular fury, which could not be appeased by lavish contributions, public processions, etc., Nero formally accused the Christians of having caused the calamity. Why he first chose the Christians is a question not easy to answer. Some have surmised that the accusation was due to the influence of the Empress Poppaea. She was on very friendly terms with the Jews; and she was excessively jealous of Acte, the mistress of Nero, and said to have been a Christian. It is more probable, however, that the emperor simply made use of the prejudice of the Romans against all Orientals and their aversion to the Jews. Though, at that time, people in general hardly made any distinction between Christians and Jews, simply considering the former a sect of the latter, there were certain Christian ideas—the belief in the speedy return of Christ, in the destruction of the world by fire, etc.—which were well known to all who had heard any thing about the Christians, and which made it specially easy to fasten the accusation on them. The effect was fearful. In the gardens of Nero, the present St. Peter's Square, the Christians were crucified, sewn into hides of wild beasts, and thrown before the dogs, enveloped with some inflammable stuff, raised on poles, and used as torches, etc. Beyond the city of Rome the persecution did not spread, but the impression it made on the whole Christian community was visible for a long time. Hence the widely spread rumor among the early Christians that Nero would return as Antichrist. Many modern writers find his name in the mystic number of the Apocalypse (xiii. 18).


R. FÖHLMANN.

NERSES is the name of three great dignitaries of the Armenian Church, of whom Nerses 1., the great, has already been spoken of in the article ARMEMIAN CHURCH, p. 141. — Nerses Clayensis, as catholicos. Nerses IV., b. about 1100; d. Aug. 5 or 13, 1173; belonged to the same family as Nerses the Great and Gregory Illuminator, and was catholicos from 1166 to 1173. He labored with great zeal for the establishment of a union between the Armenian and the Greek Church. At a personal meeting with Alexius, the son-in-law of the Emperor Manuel Comnenus, and commander of the garrison of Mopsuestia, he was surprised at the insignificance of the differences which separated the two churches, and sent a confession of
the creed of the Armenian Church to the emperor. Thus the negotiations were opened. Later on, the emperor sent the Greek philosopher Theorion, and Johannes Uthman, abbot of a monastery in Philippopolis, to Armenia; and a great disputation took place between the Greek and the Armenian theologians, the effect of which was actually to draw the two churches still nearer to each other. The protocol of this disputation was first printed in Latin and Greek by J. Leunclavius, Basel, 1577, and in Bibl. Vet. Patr., iv., then in Latin and Armenian by Clemens Galanus, in his Conciliatio Eccl. Armeni cum Romana, l. 212-222, and by Angelo Mai, in his Scriptum lum Vet. Nova Collectio, Rome, 1892, tom. iv. The emperor then sent a declaration to Nerses, setting forth nine different points which it would be necessary that the Armenian Church should accept, and they were really accepted by a local synod convened by Nerses. But, before a general synod was called, the caliph died. Nerses also distinguished himself in literature, both as a poet and as a theologian. He wrote The Word of Faith, an extract from the Gospels, in thirteen hundred and fifty-nine verses; Jesus the Son, in four thousand verses, and other religious poems, printed in Venice, 1812; a very striking, but impresses the reader with respect. The monkish character of the work is very striking, but impresses the reader with respect. 

The author narrates in simple and devout manner; and, when his credulity does not lead him astray into the fabulous, he is reliable. The earliest edition is from 1707; the latest, by Miklosich, from 1860. He also wrote a Patericum Preczcionem, containing lives of the abbots of the cave-monastery of Kief. See Strahl: Beiträge zur russischen Kirchengeschichte, Halle, 1827; [Stanley: Eastern Church, London, 1861].

The Nestorians, History of the (after 1816). The Nestorians rapidly developed into a powerful ecclesiastical party, and, excluded from the empire, carried on an extensive missionary activity in Persia, India, and China. They spread at first in Persia. A letter of Ibas of Edessa to Bishop Mares of Persia, and the translations of the works of Dodorus of Tarsus, in 1847, translated into the language of the Persian Church (the Syrian), contributed to extend the doctrines of Nestorius in the Persian Empire. The teachers who had been expelled from Edessa also entered Persia, and settled down at Nisibis, and were strengthened by the addition to their number of Nerses the Leper. Christianity had been carried to Persia at an early period, and the bishop of Seleucia became the acknowledged head of the church. Persian bishops were present at the Council of Nicea. Babseus assumed the title of "patriarch," and, according to Assemani, was the first schismatic Nestorian bishop of Seleucia (498-503). His predecessor, Acacius, was also suspected of being a Nestorian; and Xenaias of Mabbug (i.e. Philoxenus, the translator of the Syriac New Testament) gave to him and his followers the designation "Nestorians." This is the first occurrence of this name. The Nestorians, designated called themselves "Chaldeans," or "Chaldean Christians," and affirm that Nestorius was not their patriarch, and that he followed them, not they him. The Turks of to-day call them Nasrak; i.e., Christians. Babseus, however, was the
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first to boldly avow himself a Nestorian. He
inaugurated his patriarchate with a synod, which
granted the privilege to the patriarch, bishops, and
priests, to marry one wife (as opposed to
polygamy), and established the primacy of the see of
Seleucia.

The successors of Barseus filled all the sees
with Nestorians, and were intent upon propagating
their form of Christianity. The principal seat of
Nestorian learning was Nisibis. The sect produced
learned theologians, and also distinguished
physicians and philosophers, who translated Greek
classics,— especially Aristotle, Hippocrates, and
Galenus,— and were the only representatives of
letters in the Orient at that time.

In Arabia the Nestorians were also successful
in propagating their doctrines. They spread in
Syria and Palestine under the caliphs; and a
bishop of the Nestorians in Egypt is mentioned
under Mar Aba II. (742-752). The bishops of
Arabia were subject to the metropolitan of Persia.
India, in which, according to a very old tradition,
the apostle Thomas introduced Christianity, also
belonged to this jurisdiction. Nestorian influence
spread to China, where a Nestorian monument
of the year 781 was found by the Jesuit mission-
aries in 1625 at Si-gan-fu. The inscription,
which is in Chinese and Syriac, gives a long list
of Nestorian clergymen. Its genuineness, once
widely disputed, is now very generally acknowled-
ged. The patriarch Salibazacha (713-726) ap-
pointed the first Nestorian metropolitan of China.

Early in the sixth century there was a split
amongst the Nestorians in Persia, two patriarchs
(Nerses and Elisreus) being elected by two parties;
but it was healed at the end of twelve years.
Both parties united upon Paul, who was followed
in a few months by Mar Aba I., a converted
Magian (536-562). This prelate translated the
Nestorian Liturgy from the Greek into the Syriac,
which is still in use, and displayed remarkable
energy in the government of the church. He
made tours of visitation, and in 544 held a synod,
which decreed that neither the patriarch nor the
bishops might marry,— a decree which is still
authoritative. It also established the authority of
the Nicene Creed, and of Theodore of Mop-
suestia as an expositor of the Bible. The synod
of 577, convened by patriarch Ezekiel (577-580),
pronounced against the Messallians. The Emperor
Chosroes I. is said to have become a Christian
before his death; and his successors, Hormizd IV.
and Chosroes II., greatly favored the Nestorians;
the latter forcing all other Christians to accept
their doctrines.

Under the Mohammedans, the Nestorians were
not only almost wholly free from persecutions,
but could boast of several edicts licensing their
religion, the genuineness of some of which, how-
ever, has been justly a matter of dispute. The
tradition runs, that Mohammed had the acquaint-
ance of a Nestorian monk, Sergius, and got from
him his knowledge of Christianity. The patri-
arch Jesujah is also reported to have gone to
Mohammed, and secured from him an edict of
toleration, which was issued by the caliph Omar,
Paris, 1830. The same is said to have received
a like favor from Omar. The Nestorians often
filled high political positions under the Moham-
dedans, and acted as secretaries to the caliphs
or physicians (both of which classes stood very
high in the esteem of the Mohammedan rulers),
and took a prominent part, on account of their
position, in the election of the patriarchs. At one
time Bagdad was the patriarchal residence; and
here the patriarchs were elected, though they were
ordained at Seleucia.

Under the Mongols, likewise, the Nestorians
were favored. When Hulagu Khan captured
Bagdad, in 1298, he spared them. His successors
were likewise favorable to the sect; which may
be, at least in part, explained by the resemblances
of the Buddhistic ritual to its own. A son of
Zingis Khan is reported by Marco Polo to have
passed over to Christianity. The famous and
mythical Presbyter John was a Nestorian; and it
was among the Nestorians that John of Monte
Corvino (1292) labored.

The favorable position of the Nestorians under
the Arabs and Mongols was attended with a rapid
extension of Christianity in Eastern Asia. After
the siege of Bagdad and the capture of 1299, the
Mohammedan rulers acknowledged the jurisdiction of
the Nestorian patriarch. The first persecutions were
inaugurated by Timur. Thenceforth their congrega-
tions began to shrink up, or wither away. The
Roman-Catholic Church also contributed to this
result by undertaking active missionary opera-
tions among them. Pope Innocent IV. despatched
some bishops in 1247 with a communication to the
vicar of the Nestorian Orient, who replied by
sending a confession signed by the archbishop of
Nisibis, two other archbishops, and three bishops,
acknowledging Mary as the "mother of Christ"
(ματροτορίας). Nicolaus IV., in 1288, likewise com-
municated with the Nestorians, as also did Bene-
dict XI., and received from the patriarch Jahbal-
aha, in 1304, an answer acknowledging the Roman
Church as "the mother and teacher of all the
others," and the Pope "as the head shepherd of all
Christendom." Assemani concludes too abruptly,
that the Nestorians at this time united with the
Roman Church: at any rate, the Nestorians under
Jahballaha's successors continued to be independ-
ent. In 1445, however, under Pope Eugenius IV.,
the entire Nestorian body on the Island of Cyprus
was won for the Roman Church by the efforts of
Archbishop Andrew. In the sixteenth century a
strong Catholic party was formed. At the death
of the patriarch Simeon, in 1651, a party in the
church, refusing to acknowledge his nephew, Bar
Mama, who had been elected his successor, chose
a patriarch of their own, Johannes Sulaka, who
was sent to Rome for consecration. For a hun-
dred years this succession was kept up. The
patriarch who was contemporary with Paul V.
accepted the confessions the Pope sent him in
1617; but his successors renounced the union.
But in 1684 Innocent XI. again nominated a
patriarch, who assumed the name "Joseph;" and
ever since, this has been the name of the patri-
arch of those Nestorians or Chaldaeans who ac-
knowledge the jurisdiction of Rome. The other
wing of the Nestorians also retained its organi-
zation and its patriarch, who, since the close of
the seventeenth century, has borne the name
"Simeon," and the title "Patriarch of the Chal-
daeans." He has his residence in an inaccessible
NESTORIANS.

1629

NESTORIUS.

valley of the Kurd Mountains. The small residue of the once powerful Nestorian Church is confined to these hills and the plain around Oroomiah, in 1833 numbered, according to Smith and Dwight, seventy thousand souls. The American Board sent missionaries to them in 1834, who, by their prudent and in every way much-blessed labors, have done not a little to prevent the few surviving Nestorians from breaking their union with the Roman-Catholic Church. It was through these missionaries that the news was first brought, that the Nestorians still preserved a dialect of the old Aramaic language. They have set up their presses in Oroomiah [1840], and made this dialect the language of the Scripture translation. Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress (1848), Baxter's Saints' Rest (1854), and many other books, have been published in this same tongue, especially under the distinguished guidance of Rev. Mr. Perkins. In 1835 the learned missionary, David T. Stoddard, gave the first systematic account of this dialect in a Grammar of the Modern Syriac Language (4 vols.), which contains a Dissertatio de Syris Nestorianis et Romanis pontificum primatus, Rome, 1870. See also Doucin : Hist. du Nestorianisme, 1859; Layard : Nineveh, etc.; Smith and Dwight : Researches in Armenia with a Visit to the Nestorian and Chaldæan Christians of Oromiah, etc., 2 vols., London, 1843; Badger : The Nestorians and their Rituals, London, 1852; Grant : The Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes, London, 1841. 3d ed., 1844; Justin Perkins : A Residence of Eight Years in Persia, An dover, 1843; Holmberg : De originibus et fatis celeis chr. in Irup, et voce Nestorii, etc., Preussen, 1839; see also Anderson : History of the Oriental Churches.

PETERMANN. (Kessler.)

NESTORIUS AND THE NESTORIAN CONTROVERSY (to 489). Nestorius (a prominent name in the history of the christological controversies of the early church), b. in the Syrian city Germanicia, and probably educated in Antioch under Theodore of Mopsuestia, won for himself, as monk and presbyter, by his ascetic life, zeal in the cause of orthodoxy, and sermons, a wide reputation in Antioch. He was consecrated bishop of Constantinople April 10, 428, and, according to Socrates (VII. 30), was the enemy of the heretics. In several sermons he took the part of the presbyter Anastasius, and combated the use of the title, "Mother of God" (τοτάκος), of Mary. Not God the Logos, but only the human nature, he assumed to himself, had a mother. It was not God who suffered and died. These utterances produced an intense excitement in Constantinople. Clergymen like Proclus preached against him, and laymen interrupted him in the pulpit. As soon as the matter became known abroad, Cyril of Alexandria, a zealous representative of the Alexandrian school, and, by position, a rival of the patriarch of Constantinople, rose against Nestorius, and wrote to his followers among the clergy of Constantinople, and to the sister and wife of the emperor, to win them for his side. The emperor espoused the cause of Nestorius. Nestorius answered Cyril with not a little haughtiness. His reception of some Pelagians who had been expelled from the West, with the purpose of examining their case, afforded him an opportunity of writing to Celestine, bishop of Rome, and defining his christological views. Celestine, however, received them with disfavor. (See also Anderson : History of the Oriental Churches.)
are to be predicated of him in order that suffering, and all that is mortal (birth, crucifixion, and death), be not ascribed to the divine nature, and that the humanity which was made subject to death be not regarded as essentially divine. Both natures in the God-man remained what they were before their union. Notwithstanding this, there is only one person in the God-man. He was God in man. Therefore it is proper to say that Mary bare the humanity of Christ, but not that she bare the Son of God. She was the "mother of Christ" (μητέρα Χριστοῦ), or the "receptive organ of God" (οὐρανός). In these assertions Nestorius does not lay the same stress upon the human development of Christ as the Antiochian school did. It was his aim, however, to distinguish sharply between the two natures. Cyril, on the other hand, was justified in failing to derive from the treatment of Nestorius the distinct assertion of a single divine-human personality. Nestorius did not by any means intend to predicate two persons. But Cyril starts with the emphatic affirmation, that his opponent taught a co-existence of two persons (συνεξής ἰδρύμων), whereby Immanuel was split into two Christs, two Sons. The Logos, on the other hand, actually became man, and did not merely assume a human nature to himself (wherefore Cyril was accused of Apollinarianism). The human nature was made a participant (εὐκοσμίου) in the divine. The Logos did not assume a human personality; nor were there two natures after the incarnation, but only the single nature of the incarnate Logos. The predicates of the human and divine natures became the common property of both. Cyril said, "Nestorius resolves Christ into two Sons, to a man filled with God." Nestorius said, "Cyril makes the Logos undergo a transmutation into flesh, ascribes to him a capacity to suffer," etc. Each drew deductions from the statements of the other which were not intended.

The Council of Ephesus was convened in 431, by order of the emperor, Theodosius II., to settle the dispute. Nestorius arrived in season, under the protection of the imperial legate, Ireneus; and another imperial legate, Candidian, was also present to watch over the proceedings. Cyril arrived with fifty bishops; but the Syrians, with John of Antioch at their head, tarried. After waiting sixteen days, Cyril, in spite of the protests of Candidian, opened the council, June 22. Nestorius was treated as an accused party; and two hundred bishops voted to depose him from the controversy, was ready to retire. The empress to Constantinople, and Cyril and Memnon to return to their dioceses.

The emperor, however, had not abandoned the cause of Nestorius. He desired a compromise, which met with disfavor from John of Antioch, the aged Acacius of Berœa, and Theodoret. Cyril made some advances by modifying his theological definitions. He knew also how to get an influence at court. The friends of Nestorius, including John of Antioch, forsook him. The Antiochians presented a confession to the emperor, to which Cyril gave his assent. It acknowledged two natures in the one Christ, and admitted the use of the epithet, "mother of God." Cyril's acceptance of this confession was a theological inconsistency. Neither party was fully satisfied. Cyril laid to listen to the objections of fanatics belonging to his party. On the other hand, an extreme Antiochian party of bishops from Central Asia, Syria, and Thessaly, was constituted, who favored Nestorius, and strongly opposed John, the patriarch of Antioch. The effort, however, to give efficacy to the compromise, confirmed John of Antioch and the emperor as advocates of Cyril. In 435 the emperor banished Nestorius to Petra in Arabia, and ordered his writings to be burned. Nestorius probably lived in the oasis of Upper Egypt, and died there as a hermit in 451. Cyril probably died in 444. Cyril's course. Both factions hurried to present their opinions are found in the later history of the Greek Empire. Cyril's course. Both factions hurried to present their assertions with these teachers. The school of Edessa, regarded by the Emperor Zeno as the last stronghold, in the Greek Empire, of Nestorianism, was destroyed in 489. Few traces of this school of opinion are found in the later history of the Greek Empire.

LIT. — Some of the numerous writings of Nestorius are preserved in the Latin translations of Marius Mercator, in Baluzius (1684), Mansi, and Assemani (Bibli. Or.). See also the so-called Synodicon of the sixth century (best edition, Vario Dis. ad Conc. Ephes. pert., Loyola, 1882), the proceedings of the synod of Chalcedon (Mansi, vii., viii.), and the three-controversy chapter (Mansi, ix., i.;) the works of Cyril of Alexandria, in Migne's Greek Patrology (iv.—ixvii.); Socii. — Hist. Eccl. (vii.); Evagrius (i. sqq.), etc.; Jablonsky: Exercit. Hist. theol. de Nostorius, Berol, 1724; Walch: Hist. d. Ketzereien, Baur: Geschicht, d. Dreieinigkeit (i.); Dörner: History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ; Hefele: Consoinischichte; and the Church Histories of Schrock, Gieseler, Neander, Schaff, etc. W. Müller.

NETHERLANDS. See Belgium, Holland.

NETHERLANDS MISSIONARY SOCIETY. See Missions.

NETTER, Thomas (generally called Thomas Waldensius). See L老爷子.

NETTER, Thomas (generally called Thomas Waldensius). See L老爷子.
NETTLETON, Asahel, a distinguished American revivalist preacher; b. at North Killingworth, Conn., April 21, 1783; d. at East Windsor, Conn., May 16, 1844. He was brought up on a farm, of which he was called upon to take the full charge in 1801. He prepared himself for college, and graduated at Yale in 1809. After studying theology under the Rev. Mr. Pinneo of Milford, he graduated at Yale in 1809. After studying theology, he was called upon to take the full charge of the church in the recently established theological institute of East Windsor (now Hartford Seminary), but declined the appointment. Mr. Nettleton himself, who had two interviews with Mr. Finney,—at Albany in December, 1826, and January, 1827,—in which he called upon him to abandon certain practices, such as the calling upon women to pray in public, praying for individuals by name, etc. A discussion was afterwards carried on through an open correspondence.

In this controversy Mr. Nettleton was supported by Drs. Lyman Beecher, Justin Edwards, Hawes, and others. His only published work was the Village Hymns (1824), according to Professor Bird "one of the most influential and important of American collections." See BENNET TYLE: Memoir of Rev. A. Nettleton, D.D., Hartford, 1844.

In 1833 he was appointed professor of pastoral theology in the recently established theological institution of East Windsor (now Hartford Seminary), but declined the appointment. Mr. Nettleton himself, who had two interviews with Mr. Finney,—at Albany in December, 1826, and January, 1827,—in which he called upon him to abandon certain practices, such as the calling upon women to pray in public, praying for individuals by name, etc. A discussion was afterwards carried on through an open correspondence.
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Nov. 3, 1430; studied at Oxford; entered the order of the Carmelites; became their provincial in 1414, and confessor to Henry V. in 1420; was present at the Council of Pisa in 1460, and at the Council of Constance 1414-18; and visited Lithu-ania in 1419 in order to effect a reconciliation between the king of Poland and the Teutonic knights. He was a prolific writer. His principal work is Doctrinale antiquitatum fidelis ecclesiae catho-lici, in six books, on God and Christ, the church, monasticism, the mendicant orders, the sacra-ments, and the ritual and liturgy. In spite of its title, the book is simply an elaborate criticism of the doctrines of Wiclif; and the criticism is moderate, honest, successful in finding out the weak points of the adversary, and energetic in the attack. Thus the book came to play a con-spicuous role in the century of the Reformation. It was thrice printed, once in Paris (1521-32, 3 vols.), once in Salamanca (1556), and once in Venice (1571). France, Spain, and Italy, the great strongholds of Romanism, drew from this work their principal weapons in their contest with the Lutheran and Calvinist heresy. The book, also gave its merit as a source of information concerning Wiclif himself. Among his other works is Fasci-culi Zizaniorum Johannis Wyclif cum titico, edited by Walter W. Shirley, in RerumBrit. medii avi Scriptores, 1859. See LECHLER: Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation, Leipzig, 1873. G. LECHLER.

NETTLETON and the Vorgeschichte der Reformation, Leipzig, 1873. G. LECHLER.

NEUFCHATEL, The Independent Evangelical Church of. In the canton of Neufchatel, containing a population of about 110,000 inhabitants, chiefly Protestants, there was organized, A.D. 1531, a free church, independent of the State, and comprising in 1882 twenty-two parishes, with a membership of about 12,000 souls, among whom 3,961 are voters. The circumstances were as follows:

The origin of the Independent Church of Neufchatel may be said to date back to the time of the Reformation. At that time the sovereigns of the country remained attached to popery; and the governor, their representative, opposed with all his might the powerful preaching of Farel, and the reformatory impulse aroused in the people by that preaching. One day, however, the citizens gave his emissaries the following decisive an-swer: "Tell the governor, that, so far as God and our souls are concerned, he has nothing to command over us." Throughout the whole country the Reformation was adopted by a majority of votes, with the exception of two places, which have continued Roman Catholic up to this very day. And thus the Reformed Church was established in Neufchatel without, and even in spite of, the State; while in the other Swiss cantons the administration of the Church and that of the State were generally united in the hands of the political power, because it was the Grand Coun-cils which placed themselves at the head of the movement, and imposed the Reformation on the country, even against opposition.

The pastors of the new church, with Farel, the Knox of Switzerland, at their head, used to meet regularly in the city of Neufchatel, and discuss the affairs of their churches. From these spontaneous re-unions originated the body called the "Company of Pastors," which continued at the head of the church of Neufchatel down to 1848, governing the Church completely, independently of the State, and maintaining with great fidelity the preaching of the pure gospel. For the material sustenance of the church a fund was provided, formed partly from old-church property, partly from private contributions. But in 1848 the revo-lution which dissolved the relation in which the Church of Neufchatel stood to Prussia since 1707, also overthrew the ecclesiastical sovereignty of the Company of Pastors. From the negotia-tions between that body and the new authorities...
resulted a re-organization of the church, according to which its administration was confided to a synod, composed of ecclesiastics and laymen chosen by the forty churches of the country. The synod also appointed the professors of theology, without any interference from the side of the State. The former church-property was absorbed by the State treasury, which then was charged with the payment of the ecclesiastical officers. The theologicalseminary of the new church lived in peace until about 1865. At that time a number of freethinkers who had acquired great influence in the circles of the government, and who felt irritated at the orthodoxy reigning in the church, resolved to burst the stubborn dogmatic unity.

To that end they invited some anti-evangelical preachers from France and Holland, who publicly attacked the traditional faith. But, as the campaign did not lead to the result desired, other means were resorted to. A revision of the ecclesiastical law was decided upon in the Grand Council; and shortly after a new law was carried through voters. According to Art. 4 of the new law, every citizen of the state is a member of the church by the mere fact of his birth, and has the right to vote. According to Arts. 6 and 12 every minister is eligible to an office in the church, if he only has a license to preach; and he cannot be bound in advance by any measure whatever, regulation, creed, etc. Art. 17 leaves the synod no authority outside of the administration; and an article added during the debate transfers the appointment of professors in theology from the synod to the council.

Under such circumstances, what should the pastors and the evangelical members of the church do? The question was discussed in a public assembly. Some thought that it was their duty to submit to the new law, though it was ruinous to the church, and live on under the deplorable constitution, waiting for better times. Others thought that the new establishment had nothing whatever in common with the church founded by Christ himself, and insisted upon the necessity of an organization independent of the State. As the case was one of individual conscience, no vote was taken; but on the very same day the adherents of the latter opinion assembled, and charged the members of the old synod who were present with taking the necessary measures for the organization of the new church. The professors of the theological faculty were invited to open their lectures at the ordinary term, and under the direction of the synod.

Out of the forty parishes of the country, twenty-one groups of faithful were formed, which, with their pastors, declared in favor of forming the new church. The most numerous groups contained between five and six hundred voters; others, however, only about thirty. A synod was elected, consisting of all the pastors, and three laymen for each pastor. A new constitution was also drawn up, and submitted to the churches, which adopted it with a unanimous vote.

A synodical committee governs the church in the intervals between the sessions of the synod. The pastors are paid, not directly by their parishes, but from a central fund formed by voluntary gifts. The annual budget, comprising the maintenance of the theological faculty of four professors, amounts to about a hundred and ten thousand francs, each pastor being paid from twenty-five hundred to twenty-eight hundred francs a year. Thus in ten years somewhat more than a million francs has been voluntarily furnished by three thousand voting members. The use of the church-buildings is by law guaranteed to all religious denominations, the independent congregations being limited to the synod. Thus one-half of them do so. But the others, having met with various impediments in the exercise of their right, have built their own places of worship, and spent for that purpose a sum which amounts to another million. These sacrifices, however, are not considered a burden by those who have undertaken to maintain a Christian church in their country; and, indeed, by those sacrifices they have preserved the preaching of the pure gospel, not only for themselves and their children, but also in the State church; for the government has felt compelled to give up the introduction of a synod in the country. This document, feeling convinced that a number of pious persons who still cling to that institution would, in such a case, immediately enlist in the ranks of the independent church.

Thus, by giving to Cesar what belongs to Cesar, the faithful of the church of Neufchatel have attempted to give to God what belongs to God, and to follow the same course as their ancestors in the sixteenth century, when they gave the representative of the political power the above-mentioned noble answer. See the Bulletins de Synodes, especially that of 1874, and G. Godet: La Question Eclesiastique d. Neuchâtel, in the Revue Chrétiennes, September, 1873-January, 1874.

NEVINS, William, D.D., a distinguished Presbyterian clergyman, the youngest of twelve children, b. in Norwich, Conn., Oct. 13, 1797; d. in Baltimore, Sept. 14, 1835. He embraced the gospel while his parents were as yet not members of the church. In his fourteenth year he entered a counting-room in New-York City. He afterwards entered Yale College, and, graduating in 1818, went to Princeton Seminary. In August, 1820, he accepted the pastorate of the First Presbyterian Church, Baltimore. He was greatly beloved as a pastor, and excelled as a preacher. He wrote articles in the New-York Observer, on Roman Catholicism, which were published in a volume, Thoughts on Popery, New York, 1836. A posthumous volume of Sermons appeared, New York, 1837. See Select Remains of W. Nevins, D.D., with a Memoir, New York, 1836.

NEW BIRTH. See REGENERATION.

NEW-BRUNSWICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. The theological seminary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America finds the beginning of its uninterrupted history in the election by the synod, in October, 1784, of Rev. Dr. John H. Livingston of New-York City (one of the pastors of the Collegiate Church) as professor of theology, and Rev. Dr. Hermanus Meyer of Pompton, N.J., as instructor in the “inspired languages.” For more than a hundred and fifty years the Dutch churches in America had been subject to the classic of Amsterdam, and had no authority to educate and ordain ministers, but
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NEWCHURCH. See NEW-JERUS. CHURCH.

NEWCOMB, Harvey, b. at Thetford, Vt., Sept. 2, 1803; d. at Brooklyn, N.Y., Aug. 30, 1863. From 1818 to 1826 he taught school in Western New York; from 1826 to 1831 he was editor upon several journals; from the latter year, until 1840, wrote Sunday-school books; from 1840, till his death, Congregational minister in Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania. He is said to have written a hundred and seventy-eight books; but most of them were children's books, and very few of them are now in print. By one book, however, he laid the religious public under heavy contribution,— A Cyclopaedia of Missions, New York, 1854, 2d rev. ed., fifth thousand, 1860. It remains the only comprehensive work of its kind, but sadly needs enlargement and revision to bring it down to date.

NEWCOME, William, D.D., Archbishop of Armagh; b. in Bedfordshire, Aug. 10, 1729; d. at Dublin, Jan. 11, 1800. He was graduated M.A. at Pembroke College, Oxford, 1753; took holy orders, and was appointed bishop of Dromore, Ireland, 1766; transferred to Osory 1775, to Waterford 1779, and to the archbishopric of Armagh. He was the author or editor of several important and valuable works,— An Harmony of the Gospels [in Greek], Dublin, 1778, based upon Le Clerc, new eds., with Engl. trans. of text, London, 1802 and 1827; An historical view of the English Biblical translations; the expediency of revising by authority, our present translation, and the means of executing such a revision, [with] a list of the various editions of the Bible and parts thereof, in English,
NEWELL, Samuel, one of the first band of American missionaries to foreign lands; b. on a farm at Durham, Me., July 24, 1784; d. in Bombay, India, March 30, 1821. Left an orphan at the age of ten, he went four years later to Boston, and secured a place in a family; but an interest in books led him to prepare for college, the means being furnished by his employer and some other friends. He graduated at Harvard in 1807, and went to Andover Seminary in 1808. Mr. Newell was one of the four students who presented the petition which induced the formation of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. In 1812 he married Harriet Atwood (see Harriet Newell); on Feb. 6 was ordained at Salem with Judson, Nott, Rice, and Gordon Hall, and on the 19th sailed with Judson for Calcutta. Not being permitted to embark, he went to the Isle of France; and in January, 1814, he joined Hall and Nott at Bombay. He married, a second time, Miss Thurs ton, in 1818. He died of the cholera. Mr. Newell published, with the help of Hall, The Conversion of the World, or the Claims of Six Hundred Millions (Andover, 1818), which aroused much interest; and a biography of Harriet Newell.

NEWELL, Harriet, one of the most attractive female characters who have given their lives to missionary labors among the heathen; a daughter of Moses Atwood; b. at Haverhill, Mass., Oct. 17, 1793; d. on the Isle of France, Nov. 30, 1812. She early displayed a pious disposition, and interest in missions; was married in 1812 to the Rev. Samuel Newell, and with him sailed for Calcutta on Feb. 18, 1812. Not being allowed to remain at Calcutta, they sailed for Mauritius, and from thence to the Isle of France. A daughter born on the journey died, and was buried at sea. Rapid consumption soon set in, and carried the mother off likewise. "She is interred in a retired spot in the burying-ground in Port Louis, under the shadow of an evergreen." Mrs. Newell's early death, at the age of nineteen, aroused wide sympathy, and did more, by the interest it stimulated, for missions, than, perhaps, a long life would have accomplished. Her Memoirs were published by Samuel Newell; and a Life was written by Dr. Leonard Woods, to which her Letters were appended and the Memorial Sermon of Dr. Woods. The latter work has a very large circulation.

NEWELD. 1634 NEW-ENGLAND THEOLOGY. Names and Genesis.— This system has been adopted by a larger number of divines out of New England than in it, but it derives its name from the first of those who initiated the system were New Englanders. One impulse moving them to the initiation of it was given by the fact that they were not secluded students, but were pastors and preachers; and, as they were high Calvinists in many of their views, they aimed to present these views in a practical way,— a way fitted to awaken the conscience, and to persuade the will, of their hearers. Another impulse was given by the fact that they deemed the system to be necessary for reconciling apparently discordant passages of the Bible. They were led into their views of scientific theology by their views of the inspired Word.

In the beginning, in 1808, 2 vols. (taken as the basis of the Unitarian Version, London, 1808).

The Nature of Holiness and Sin.— Holiness, or true virtue, is the choice of the greater and higher, rather than of the smaller and lower, good of sentient being. It is voluntary and impartial benevolence. Sin is the choice of the smaller and lower, rather than of the greater and higher, good of sentient being. It is the elective preference for self or the world above God. Holiness and sin, then, are not passive states, but they are acts of the will. They are free acts, and imply that the agent's power to render obedience, and avoid disobedience, to the moral law, is commensurate with his obligation to render the one, and to avoid the other. They constitute moral agency; and this consists in the agent's choosing the right when he had the natural ability to choose the wrong instead of the right; or else, in his choosing the wrong when he had the natural ability to choose the right instead of the wrong. By natural ability is meant power in its literal sense. This idea of power is a simple one, and is expressed without qualification when a moral agent is defined as an agent who does or can choose either holiness or sin.
unusual prominence to the doctrines of divine sovereignty, predestination, and eternal punishment. In giving this proportion to this part of Calvinism they were penetrated with the conviction that all the acts of God, even those which appear to be the sternest, are forms of infinite benevolence, are reducible to a choice of the greatest and highest good of universal being. — of the uncreated universe alone, but of the uncreated also.

The Will and the Natural Sensibilities. — When the New-England theologians insist that all moral character lies in the will, in choice, they do not define the will in the manner adopted by the recent philosophers of Europe. They do not admit that the will is the faculty of merely intending, purposing, resolving, determining, putting forth an exertion ab extra. These acts presuppose a choice distinct from them. They follow the choice in the order of nature, if not of time. Right will is the result of choosing to perform executive acts, and also of choosing objects other than its own future acts. The process of choosing is unique, different from an exertive process, also from a constitutional emotion.

The earlier New-England divines made the distinction, but did not make it sharp enough nor clear enough, between the will and the sensibility. They did not anticipate the nomenclature of modern times. Often, if not commonly, they speak of moral character as inhering in the "heart," the "affections," the "temper." They speak of "desires" as belonging to the will: still of their sermons and practical writings, they especially in. The want of a precise nomenclature, however, occasions much ambiguity in the style of the elder Edwards and his immediate followers. — When the New-England theologians insist that infants commit sin as soon as they are born, and this is not a "transferred," is not literally "imputed" to us: we are not punished for it, although, on account of it, we suffer evils which represent God's abhorrence of sin, and signify his determination to inflict the legal penalty upon those who persevere in committing it. We, however, do not suffer a legal penalty for any sin which does not consist in the disordered or corrupt state of our nature.

Total Depravity and Original Sin. — All the moral acts of the unrenewed man are entirely devoid of holiness, and are sinful on the whole. The fact of his entire sinfulness is occasioned by the disordered or corrupt state of his nature. "I believe — that by nature every man is personally depraved, destitute of holiness, unlike and opposed to God; and that, previously to the renewing agency of the Divine Spirit, all his moral actions are adverse to the character and glory of God." (Andover Creed.) As his sinfulness is occasioned by nature, so his corrupt nature is a consequence of Adam's apostasy. The sin of Adam is not transferred, is not literally "imputed" to us: we are not punished for it, although, on account of it, we suffer evils which represent God's abhorrence of sin, and signify his determination to inflict the legal penalty upon those who persevere in committing it. We, however, do not suffer a legal penalty for any sin which does not consist in the disordered or corrupt state of our nature.

The Union of Man's Free Activity with his Constant Dependence. — Not without the common influence, but without the supernatural influence of God, a man has, in the proper sense of the word, the power to repent of his sin; but it is infallibly certain that he never will use this power in repenting. His natural ability does not lessen his dependence on the special interposition of the Holy Spirit for any, even the smallest, degree of holiness. Without that interposition, he has not the moral power to choose the right; that is, he certainly never will choose the right. In the proper sense of the word, natural power is the only kind of power; but, in the technical or figurative sense, the infallible certainty that an agent will act in one way is his moral power to act in that way, and the infallible certainty that he will not act in one way is his moral impotence to act in that way. The New-England divines guarded their system against Pelagianism by emphasizing the distinction between an agent's literal ability to do right and any degree of probability that he will do right. They gave a marked prominence to the truth, that, while an unrenewed man does not choose the wrong inevitably, yet he does so infallibly; that is, while left to himself, he will certainly choose the wrong, although he has the literal power to choose the right. For every holy choice which he puts forth is constantly dependent on the sovereign, the special, or supernatural interposition of divine grace. These theologians were also careful to emphasize the distinction between the natural power of a regenerate man to apostatize from the faith, and any degree of probability that he will apostatize. He has the ability to fall away finally and forever from his "new obedience;" but it is infallibly certain that he will not fall away. He will be kept from falling by the same supernatural power which kept him from continued sin. Thus, in the renewal of sinners and in the perseverance of saints, there is a combination of the divine and the human activity, the divine preceding the human logically, if not chronologically.

Regeneration. — According to all advocates of New-England theology, regeneration is a change occasioned or produced by the special or supernatural interposition of the Holy Spirit. According to one class of these divines, it is the
change of the sinner's volition from sin to holiness. According to a second class, it is the change of his nature, and precedes the change of his volition; — the latter being distinguished by the term "conversion." According to a third class, it is the change of both his nature and his volition, — the two being inseparable in the logical, if not the chronological order.

On this general topic, more, perhaps, than on any other, has been illustrated what classes it is admitted to be a logical sequence from the premises of Edwards; but a third class it is deemed either false or doubtful.

The Atonement. — The sufferings, and especially the death, of Christ, were sacrificial; were not the punishment of the law, but were equivalent in meaning to it; were representative of it, and substituted for it. The demands of the law were not satisfied by it; but the honor of the law was promoted by it as much as this honor would have been promoted by inflicting the legal penalty on the elect. The distributive justice of God was not satisfied by it, but his general justice was satisfied perfectly. The active obedience, viewed as the holiness, of Christ, was not a work of supererogation performed by our Substitute, and then "transferred" or "imputed" to us. The atonement rendered it consistent and desirable for God to save all who exercise evangelical faith; yet it did not render it obligatory on him, in distributive justice, to save them. It was designed, for the welfare of all men, to make the eternal salvation of all men possible, to remove all the obstacles which the honor of the law and of distributive justice presented against the salvation of the non-elect as well as the elect. The atonement does not render any act charitable, whereas some men are regenerated, and others not; but this reason is found only in the sovereign, electing will of God. The atonement is useful on men's account, and in order to furnish new motives to holiness; but it is necessary on God's account, and in order to enable him, as a consistent Ruler, to pardon any, even the smallest, sin, and therefore to bestow on sinners any, even the smallest, favor.

Varying Tendencies, or Shades, of New-England Theology. 1. The Hopkinsian System.

— This is largely incorporated into the present New-England system. It is distinguished, however, by giving a greater prominence than the New-England divines now give to the doctrines of divine sovereignty and decrees, to election and reprobation; also in giving a smaller prominence to the doctrine of holiness, etc. On this one hand is the agency of God, and our dependence upon it; on the other hand is the free agency of man, and the divine recognition of it. His decrees are his intentions to perform certain acts. Primarily they have regard to what he does himself; secondarily, to what his creatures do. The moral acts of men result certainly, but not inevitably, from the providential acts of God; and these result from the decrees, which, in his infinite benevolence, he formed in eternity, and executes in time. In executing his decrees he leaves all moral agents just as free as they would be if there were no decrees referring secondarily to them.

Optimism. — The created universe is, on the whole, the best which could have been created. It is the best, viewed comprehensively, viewed in all its relations to the Creator and the creature. Although the Creator had the natural power to prevent all sin in his creatures, yet he could not prevent it wisely, could not prevent it in the best system, could not prevent it consistently with the greatest good of the universal being. This statement is sanctioned explicitly by one class of the New-England divines; but another class it is admitted to be a logical sequence from the premises of Edwards; but a third class it is deemed either false or doubtful.

The Sovereignty and the Decrees of God. — Men have objected to the New-England system, that it is ethical and anthropological, rather than theological. The reverse is true.

Its primary and signal aim has been to exalt God as a sovereign, and to glorify the eternal plan on which he governs the universe. He is a sovereign; that is, he does what he chooses to do, because his choice is infinite benevolence, securing the greatest and highest well being of the universe. "I moreover believe that God, according to the counsel of his own will, and for his own glory, hath fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass, and that all beings, actions, and events, both in the natural and moral world, are under his providential direction; that God's decrees perfectly consist with human liberty; God's universal agency, with the agency of man; and man's dependence, with his accountability" (Andover Creed). Two lines of truth, both parallel with each other, run through the doctrine of decrees, as well as other doctrines, such as regeneration or conversion, saints' perseverance, etc. On the one hand is the agency of God, and our dependence upon it; on the other hand is the free agency of man, and the divine recognition of it. His decrees are his intentions to perform certain acts. Primarily they have regard to what he does himself; secondarily, to what his creatures do. The moral acts of men result certainly, but not inevitably, from the providential acts of God; and these result from the decrees, which, in his infinite benevolence, he formed in eternity, and executes in time. In executing his decrees he leaves all moral agents just as free as they would be if there were no decrees referring secondarily to them.

The Atonement. — The sufferings, and especially the death, of Christ, were sacrificial; were not the punishment of the law, but were equivalent in meaning to it; were representative of it, and substituted for it. The demands of the law were not satisfied by it; but the honor of the law was promoted by it as much as this honor would have been promoted by inflicting the legal penalty on the elect. The distributive justice of God was not satisfied by it, but his general justice was satisfied perfectly. The active obedience, viewed as the holiness, of Christ, was not a work of supererogation performed by our Substitute, and then "transferred" or "imputed" to us. The atonement rendered it consistent and desirable for God to save all who exercise evangelical faith; yet it did not render it obligatory on him, in distributive justice, to save them. It was designed, for the welfare of all men, to make the eternal salvation of all men possible, to remove all the obstacles which the honor of the law and of distributive justice presented against the salvation of the non-elect as well as the elect. The atonement does not render any act charitable, whereas some men are regenerated, and others not; but this reason is found only in the sovereign, electing will of God. The atonement is useful on men's account, and in order to furnish new motives to holiness; but it is necessary on God's account, and in order to enable him, as a consistent Ruler, to pardon any, even the smallest, sin, and therefore to bestow on sinners any, even the smallest, favor.

Varying Tendencies, or Shades, of New-England Theology. 1. The Hopkinsian System.

— This is largely incorporated into the present New-England system. It is distinguished, however, by giving a greater prominence than the New-England divines now give to the doctrines of divine sovereignty and decrees, to election and reprobation; also in giving a smaller prominence to the doctrine of holiness, etc. On this one hand is the agency of God, and our dependence upon it; on the other hand is the free agency of man, and the divine recognition of it. His decrees are his intentions to perform certain acts. Primarily they have regard to what he does himself; secondarily, to what his creatures do. The moral acts of men result certainly, but not inevitably, from the providential acts of God; and these result from the decrees, which, in his infinite benevolence, he formed in eternity, and executes in time. In executing his decrees he leaves all moral agents just as free as they would be if there were no decrees referring secondarily to them.

Optimism. — The created universe is, on the whole, the best which could have been created. It is the best, viewed comprehensively, viewed in all its relations to the Creator and the creature. Although the Creator had the natural power to prevent all sin in his creatures, yet he could not prevent it wisely, could not prevent it in the best system, could not prevent it consistently with the greatest good of the universal
cessation of the soul's activity is the cessation of its existence." He used the term "efficient" cause as synonymous with "independent" cause, but never maintained that God is the efficient cause of human actions in any sense which implies that men are forced or compelled to act as they do. He believed that justification on the ground of Christ's atonement consists in God's treating believers as forgiven, and not as positively righteous. He believed that at every single moment the renewed man is either perfectly holy or perfectly sinful, but that he does not remain perfectly holy for any considerable time in this life.

3. The "Taste" Scheme. — As Emmons believed that all moral character inheres in "exercises," some of his opponents adopted the theory that all moral character inheres in the "taste." The most noted advocate of this scheme was Rev. Asa Burton, D.D., a pupil of Dr. Levi Hart, who was a favorite pupil and son-in-law of Dr. Bellamy. Dr. Burton instructed not less than sixty theological students, and published, besides various pamphlets, an octavo volume, entitled Essays on Some of the First Principles of Metaphysics, Ethics, and Theology, 1824. When he taught that all moral character lies in the moral "taste," he meant the sensibility as distinct from the will. When he taught that all moral character lies in the moral "appetites," he meant the processes of the sensibility as distinct from the acts of the will. He believed in the natural inability of the regenerate to cease from sin, and repudiated the distinction between natural and moral power. He believed that the divine will is the foundation of virtue. He agreed with some, but radically differed from other, New-England theologians, in maintaining that "holiness is not an absolute good;" that "happiness is the only absolute good;" and he asks, "Of what value is the universe, however holy, if there be no happiness?"

The "Taste Scheme" of Dr. Burton was ably defended by Judge Nathaniel Niles, a distinguished theological pupil of Dr. Bellamy. Dr. Niles, in a letter to Dr. John Taylor, in the American Gospel Review, 1826, maintained that "holiness is an absolute good;" that "happiness is the only absolute good;" and he asks, "Of what value is the universe, however holy, if there be no happiness?"

4. The System of Dr. Taylor. — "Dr. Nathaniel W. Taylor was professor of theology in Yale College from 1822 to 1858 (see Taylor, N. W.). Among the points of doctrine on which he insisted are these: (1) The elective preference, in which character, good or evil, consists, though beginning in an act of choice, is a permanent voluntary state, 'a ruling purpose.' (2) Natural ability involves a continued 'power of contrary choice.' There is previous 'certainty, with power to the contrary,' in regard to moral choices. (3) 'Nature,' in the phrase, 'we are sinful by nature,' includes both the subjective native condition and the outward circumstances of human life, which, as joint factors, give the certainty, but not necessity, of sin from the beginning of moral agency. (4) Regeneration is the change of the pre-dominant elective preference from 'loving the world' to love to God. It is effected by influences of the Holy Spirit, which give the certainty, but not the necessity, of the effect. (5) The involuntary desire of happiness, or 'self-love,' is the subjective antecedent of all choices, whether good or evil. The excellence of virtue is its tendency to produce the greatest happiness of the universe, which is founded in benevolence, which, guided by wisdom, so dispenses grace as to insure the best results. (7) Sin is not the opposite of the greatest good; since it is avoidable by the creature, and is not so good as holiness in its stead, but may not be preventible by the act of God in the best system." — Professor George P. Fisher, D.D.
NEW-HAVEN DIVINITY. See Taylor, N. W.

NEW-JERUSALEM CHURCH. a religious body which holds to the doctrines disclosed in the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg. The first meeting for the organization of this body was held in London in 1783, eleven years after the death of Swedenborg, and consisted of five persons. The next year the doctrines were introduced into America in a course of lectures delivered in Philadelphia by William Glenn. From these small beginnings the church has slowly but steadily increased to the present time (1883), when there are societies in the principal cities and in many of the smaller towns, where the doctrines are taught, worship is held, and the sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Supper are administered. There is no uniform system of church organization, though the tendency is towards the Episcopal. Every society is left in freedom to manage its own affairs. In England the General Conference is composed of societies. In America there is a General Convention, meeting annually, composed of societies in the principal cities and in many of the smaller towns, where the doctrines are taught, worship is held, and the sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Supper are administered. There is no uniform system of church organization, though the tendency is towards the Episcopal. Every society is left in freedom to manage its own affairs. In England the General Conference is composed of societies. In America there is a General Convention, meeting annually, composed of societies. The associations are generally divided by State lines, and comprise about a hundred societies. There are societies in France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Switzerland, Norway, and Sweden, which are centres for the propagation of these doctrines. There are societies in Australia and South Africa. In America there are societies in the principal cities and in many of the smaller towns, where the doctrines are taught, worship is held, and the sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Supper are administered. There is no uniform system of church organization, though the tendency is towards the Episcopal. Every society is left in freedom to manage its own affairs. In England the General Conference is composed of societies. In America there is a General Convention, meeting annually, composed of societies.
5. Life is so given to man that it seems to be his own. This is of the divine love, that man may act in freedom. He could conform himself to love and think and act in every respect as though he were an independent being. He is as free to act within the limits of his power as the Lord Himself. But still it is necessary to the integrity of his nature, that he should live in acknowledgment of his dependence upon the Lord, constantly turn to Him, and reciprocate His love. Hence arose the possibility of his fall. As life seemed to be his own, he was gradually allured by the appearance to claim it as his own. He was seduced by the senses represented by the serpent, first as to his affections represented by the woman; and then to the understanding represented by the man; and he became in his own estimation, as God, knowing good and evil. Being a form receptive of life, his declension, which continued through many generations, consisted in the gradual closure of the higher planes of his nature against influent flux from the Lord, until he lived only in the merely natural plane of his faculties. This was spiritual death caused by the exclusion of life. Man lost his knowledge of God and of his spiritual nature and destiny. His whole organism became perverted, and his union with the source of his life so broken and deranged, that the Lord could only own order, and stood face to face with him on the plane of the senses, in a form which he could apprehend. In that way He gained recognition, and approached the brink of destruction. Then, in the fulness of time, Jehovah took upon Himself man's nature in the way of His own order, and stood face to face with him on the plane of the senses, in a form which he could appreciate. In that way He gained recognition, and got a foothold in human history. But Jehovah was not content to cast down and disable Himself of any power. He simply clothed His divine with a human organism, and made that a medium of bringing His divine power to bear upon man. In this way He could remove obstructions to the influx of life, and, as man received it, He could conform him to Himself. The necessity for this coming lay in man's dying condition, and not in any legal difficulties.

6. The human organism which Jehovah took upon Himself was a disorderly and perverted one. It could be tempted. It was subject to all the laws of the human mind. It could learn, and increase in wisdom. It had a consciousness distinct from the divine which it clothed, and this gave rise to all those expressions which seem to indicate that Jesus Christ was a distinct person from Jehovah. But, by the constant action upon it of the divine within, the imperfect organism received by incarnation was gradually put off, and replaced by a corresponding divine nature, by a process which is called by the Lord "glorification." The Lord's real death was the laying down of this evil life, and not the crucifixion of the material body. By this process of glorification, He ascended to the Father; that is, made his union with His divine nature in the truemeaning of the word. It is composed of every class, degree, and form of substances and objects which are found in the three kingdoms of nature, and many besides, which cannot be formed out of those elements. The spiritual world is the realm of causes; and the material universe, like the material body, is cast into the mould of spiritual forms. Spiritual substances, though they have form and hold relations to one another, are not material, and have nothing but form and external appearance in common with material objects. They are not created in the same way, or subject to the laws of fixed time and space. The spiritual world has three grand divisions, heaven, the world of spirits, and hell. The world of spirits is intermediate between heaven and hell. This is the world which all enter immediately after the death of the body, and where they are prepared for heaven or hell, according to their characters. It is a place of instruction, but not of probation, where every one who will receive it is taught the truth, and led into a heavenly life. It is also a state in which the spiritual faculties, freed from the incumbrance of the material body, are brought under more potent spiritual forces, which develop the ruling love with great rapidity. Every one is left in perfect freedom to go where he pleases,
and to form such associates as he chooses, though every aid is given to lead all to heaven by means of the truth. Here parents and children, husbands and wives, friends meet, and for while live a life similar to that which they lived on the earth. But the scene gradually changes. Those who are not of homogeneous natures separate; and each one goes his own way, and joins himself with those to whom he is akin by nature. All pretense and disguise thrown off, everything which is not in accordance with the ruling love is discarded; and the speech, the actions, and even the form itself, become the perfect embodiment and expression of the character. When the external becomes homogeneous with the internal, the man or woman rises to heaven, or sinks to hell, drawn by the irresistible affinities of his nature, and becomes incorporated into a society of similar character, where he remains forever. In this way, by orderly processes, in which every one is led in freedom, his judgment is effected. Every one goes where he chooses, where he can be at his place and their special function, and there they are welcomed by all: they find their home and the most ample rest is not repose after labor, but the free play of all the faculties. As every one is animated by love of others, each one is helped by all: as all the organic forms of their nature are in harmony with the divine forces which give them their life, they are constantly perfected. The perceptions grow keener, the understanding larger, the affections deeper and more varied and exquisite, and this process of perfectibility will increase forever.

11. The spiritual world being the substantial world, the theatre of all causes, and the ultimate home of every human being, the Sacred Scriptures were given to man to reveal to him its laws and the principles of the divine government. They are also given according to the relation between natural and spiritual things. All material objects, natural actions, and events, are instructed, and led to spiritual causes; and the spiritual causes are the laws of the divine order, and the embodiment of the divine character and purposes. Every natural object is consequently an exponent of some spiritual law or fact. When man had sunk into a condition which rendered it necessary that divine truth should be communicated to him by an outward way, the Lord employed those objects, relations, and human actions, which were the exponents of the truths He desired to communicate, because they were the effects of those truths, and performed the same uses on the material plane that the truths and affection represented on the spiritual plane. Every natural object and act recorded in the Word corresponds to and represents some spiritual principle or fact. While the Word in the letter is written according to the laws of human language, and treats of natural events, every letter, every word, every sentence, and even the natural idea represents; and this spiritual meaning is connected in the most logical manner throughout, from the beginning to the end, according to the harmonies of the Lord's nature, and the order and methods of His work. The Bible is consequently a Divine Book, written in a style impossible to a finite mind. The Lord Himself is its author; and Moses and David, the prophets and apostles, were only instruments in His hands in writing it, as the pen is an instrument in the human hand. Their minds were used, and consequently every one wrote in his own style, but stated the divine truths in correspondent natural forms. From the divine style in which the Word is written, it is adapted to all the wants of every human being in all worlds.

12. The most important service which Swedenborg has rendered to the world consists in the disclosures he has made concerning the spiritual sense of the Word and the divine method of its composition. By the opening of his spiritual senses he was admitted into the spiritual world, introduced into the societies of spirits and angels, was instructed in the laws of spiritual life; and, from his own experience of what he saw and heard, he has made known to men the nature and the reality of human life beyond the grave. His natural senses were not closed while he was in this state: he was consciously in both worlds at the same time, and could see their relations to each other. He could see the correspondence between natural and spiritual things, and was able to reveal the spiritual meaning of the Word. This opening of the genuine meaning of the Word is the means by which the Lord effects His Second Coming. He comes in the power and glory of the spiritual truths revealed to men in the writings of Swedenborg, and derived from the Word. In these truths He is effecting a more powerful influx of life into the minds of men, moving them to greater activity, and conjoining them more
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closely with Him, as branches to the vine from which they derive their life.

The works of Swedenborg devoted to the exposition of the spiritual sense of the Word are Arcana Coelestia, in 32 vols., octavo, The Apocalypse Explained, in 8 vols., and The Apocalypse Revealed, in 2 vols. In these works the spiritual meaning of every word in Genesis, Exodus, and the Revelation, is given, and the interpretation demonstrated by similar passages in other parts of the Word. The most important doctrinal works by Swedenborg are Angelic Wisdom concerning Divine Love and Wisdom, Angelic Wisdom concerning the Divine Providence, Heaven and Hell, Conjugal Love, and The True Christian Religion, containing the Universal Theology of the New Church. The collateral works are numerous, and constantly increasing. Among the most important are Noble's Appeal and Plenary Inspiration, Barrett's Lectures on the New Dispensation, Bayley's The Divine Word opened, Bruce's Commentaries on the Gospels of Matthew and John, Clissold's Practical Nature of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, Illustrations of the End of the Church, Clover's Four Gospels, Clover's Nature of Spirit, Clover's Modern Spiritualism, and Modern Biblical Criticism, Grindon's Life, its Nature, Varieties, and Phenomena, Hayden's Light on the Last Things, Dangers of Modern Spiritualism, Hindmarsh's Rise and Progress of the New Church, Holcombe's Our Children in the Other Life, The Last Trunks of Christianity, The End of the World, Henry James's Secret of Swedenborg, Parson's Essays, Three Series, Dewe Homo, The Infinite and the Finite, Rendell's Antediluvian History, The Last Judgment and Second Coming of the Lord, Silver's The Symbolic Character of the Sacred Scriptures, The Holy Word in its own Defence, Tafel's Documents concerning Swedenborg, Wilkinson's Human Body in its Relation to Man, On Human Science and Divine Revelation. The most important biographies of Swedenborg are, Emanuel Swedenborg, his Life and Writings, by Williams, 1st ed. 1783, 2nd ed. 1790; and 1791; James John Garth Wilkinson, Horace's Life of Swedenborg, and Worcester's Life of Swedenborg. Swedenborg's theological works have been wholly or in part translated into English, French, German, Swedish, and Italian. There are five weekly, two monthly journals, and one quarterly published, in advocacy and exposition of the principles of the New Church; six in America, two in England, one in German, and one in Italian.

CHANCEY GILES
(Father of the NewJerusalem Church, Philadelphia).

NEW LIGHT ANTIBURGHERS, BURGHERS.

See Secede.

NEW SOUTH WALES. See AUSTRALASIA.

NEW TESTAMENT. See Bible Text, Canon.

NEWTON, Sir Isaac, b. at Woolsthorpe, Lincolnshire, Eng., Dec. 25, 1642; d. in London, March 20, 1727. He was a posthumous child, and of very feeble health; but he early evinced great passion and great talents for the study of mathematics and mechanics. In 1660 he entered Trinity College, Cambridge, and in 1665 he took his degree as B.A. In 1667 he became a fellow, and in 1669 he succeeded Dr. Barrow as Lucasian professor of mathematics. In 1666 he was appointed warden of the mint, and in 1699, master; which position he filled with great ability, though his health again became very poor in the last years of his life. The magnificent discoveries, mathematical and physical, by which he entirely changed the reigning conception of the world, he seems to have made at quite an early period of his life. But he was slow in publishing. His Philosophia naturalis Principia mathematica was not given to the world until 1687, and his Analysis per Equationes numero terminorum Infinitas not until 1711. The Cartesian vortex was at that time the commonly accepted scientific theory of the world; and, though not without difficulties, it had been explained into harmony with the views of the theologians. But this theory was completely wiped out of existence by Newton's theory of gravitation; and thus a collision with the theologians became unavoidable, the more so as Newton's whole method with an open protest against the method of scholasticism. Observation and experience were the only scientific basis he acknowledged. Metaphysics he abhorred; hypothesis he despised. No wonder, that, under such circumstances, he found one of his most zealous and most effective disciples in Voltaire. In England, however, the collision was not so very fierce. Newton's ideas were incorporated with the official system of teaching at Cambridge in 1699, at Oxford in 1704. Personally he was not orthodox: he verged towards Arianism. But he was a pious man, and his great interest in the Bible and in Bible-studies he has shown by his Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms amended (1728), Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John (1733), and A Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture, 1754. See Brewster: Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton, London, 1856, 2 vols.

NEWTON, John, b. in London, July 24, 1725; d. there Dec. 31, 1807. In early life, as a sailor (according to the account he gives in his autobiography), he ran a profligate course coupled with sad impiety, which led him to call himself, in his last days, the "Biographe." He was an exceedingly cheerful man, and his great interest in the Bible and in Bible-studies he has shown by his Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms amended (1728), Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John (1733), and A Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture, 1754. See Brewster: Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton, London, 1856, 2 vols.

NEWTON, John, b. in London, July 24, 1725; d. there Dec. 31, 1807. In early life, as a sailor (according to the account he gives in his autobiography), he ran a profligate course coupled with sad impiety, which led him to call himself, in his last days, the "Biographe." He was an exceedingly cheerful man, and his great interest in the Bible and in Bible-studies he has shown by his Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms amended (1728), Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John (1733), and A Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture, 1754. See Brewster: Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton, London, 1856, 2 vols.
He was the main pillar of the Evangelical party in the Church of England, and gathered round him at his simple re-unions in Hoxton, where he resided, Dissenting ministers as well as the Established clergy. He wrote a good deal; and, not to mention other publications included in the edition of his works (1819), his charming letters, entitled Omicron and Cardiphonia, deserve to be, as they are, favorites with the British public and with American Christians. His contributions to the Olney Hymns (348 in number, of which 67 were Cowper's) rank high in English psalmody, and are, some of them, exceedingly touching. The epitaph on his monument, prepared by himself, is very characteristic: "John Newton, clerk, once an infidel and libertine, a servant of slaves in Africa, was, by the rich mercy of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, preserved, restored, pardoned, and appointed to preach the faith he had long labored to destroy."

John Stoughton.

NEWTON, Robert, D.D., Wesleyan pulpit orator; b. at Roxby, Yorkshire, Sept. 8, 1780; d. April 30, 1854. He was received into the British Conference in 1799, and from that time on won reputation, and ultimately great fame, for his oratory. He was six times president of the British Conference, and in 1839 was sent as delegate to the Methodist-Episcopal Church of the United States. Everywhere he went, he was attended by crowds. The British and Foreign Bible Society and Foreign Missions were favorite themes. His Sermons was posthumously published, London, 1856; and his Life was written by Jackson, London, 1855.

NEWTON, Thomas, D.D., b. at Lichfield, Jan. 1, 1704; d. in London, Feb. 14, 1782. He studied at Trinity College, Cambridge; and, after filling several charges in London, was in 1761 appointed bishop of Bristol, and in 1788 dean of St. Paul's. He edited the first critical edition of Milton's Poetical Works, London, 1749-52, 3 vols.; and (very popular) Dissertations on the Prophecies, which have been remarkably fulfilled, 1754-58, 3 vols., 10th ed., 1804, 2 vols. His Complete Works appeared in 1783, 3 vols., and his Life was written by Jackson, London, 1855.

NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION is located on the summit of a beautiful hill in Newton Centre, Mass., about seven miles west of Boston. A more convenient, healthful, and attractive site for a theological seminary, it would be difficult to find in New England. The institution was founded in 1825, and is the oldest seminary established by American Baptists for the purpose of providing graduates from college with a suitable course of theological instruction, occupying three years, — a course beginning with the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, continuing with biblical theology and ecclesiastical history, and concluding with homiletics, pastoral duties, and church policy, but giving special prominence to biblical study. The privileges of the institution have also been offered, from the first, to candidates for the ministry whose education, however gained, was sufficient to enable them to take all the studies of the regular course in class-connection with graduates. Moreover, a few men, approved by the churches, have been received to a purely English course of two years, embracing such parts of the regular course as can be taken by one who does not read either Hebrew or Greek.

The work of the institution began in 1825, with a single professor, Rev. Irach Chase, D.D. In 1826 Rev. Henry J. Ripley, D.D., was associated with Dr. Chase; in 1834 Rev. James D. Knowles was added to the faculty; and in 1836 Rev. Barnas Searls, D.D. Professor Knowles died in 1838, after a short period of brilliant service; and in 1839 Rev. H. B. Dwight, D.D., was made professor of biblical literature and interpretation. All these were eminent scholars and teachers; and the institution, though financially weak, prospered under their care. From 1839 to 1846 the number of professors was four; from 1846 to 1858 it continued the same, with an assistant instructor in Hebrew; but since 1898 there have been five regular professors — one of them president — and a teacher of elocution.

The board of instruction is now (1882) constituted as follows: Rev. Alvah Hovey, D.D., LL.D., president, and professor of theology; Rev. Heman Lincoln, D.D., professor of church history; Rev. O. S. Stearns, D.D., professor of biblical interpretation, Old Testament; Rev. J. M. English, A.M., professor of homiletics, pastoral duties, and church policy; Rev. J. F. Moreton, A.M., professor, pro tempore, of biblical interpretation, New Testament; and Mr. L. A. Butterfield, Alva Woods Lecturer on Elucution. A Newton lectureship has recently been established by a friend of the institution, and it is expected that a sixth professor will soon be added to the faculty.

The institution has a well-selected library of about seventeen thousand volumes, and a commodious reading-room. The library, under the care of John B. House, is open to students six hours every day, except Sundays. It has the income of twelve thousand dollars for the purchase of books and reviews. To meet other expenses the institution has an endowment of more than three hundred thousand dollars, besides twenty-five scholarships of a thousand dollars each (and a bequest of ten more soon to be received) for the benefit of indigent students. It has four public buildings; viz., Colby Hall (containing chapel, reading-room, office, and dormitory), Hawes Hall, which contains the first floor, and three lecture-rooms, with a museum, on the second), Farwell Hall and Stuartvant Hall (which are heated by steam, and have rooms, comfortably furnished, for at least sixty-eight students), and a gymnasium.

About nine hundred students have been connected with the institution, though some of them have not taken the full course. Sixty-two have gone from it to be missionaries in foreign fields. Nearly as many have been made presidents or professors in colleges or theological seminaries, but most of its graduates have become pastors in America.

The institution is controlled by a board of forty-eight trustees, a part of them ministers, and a part laymen. It has had many liberal benefactors, of whom the late Gardner Colby of Newton Centre deserves honorable mention. Alva Hovey.

NEW-YEAR'S CELEBRATION. The Calen-ve January, that is Jan. 1, was celebrated in Rome, and, indeed, throughout the Roman Empire, as a feast of joy, just like the Saturnalia. The first day of the year should be a good omen for the whole year. In the forum, in the shops, and in the houses, business was begun early in
the morning in the usual way, but only pro forma. The first stroke of work done, the year was considered as duly inaugurated, and people gave themselves up to merry-making. The houses were hung with wreaths and draperies; everybody gave his “Happy New-Year” to everybody else; and friends presented each other with sweetmeats and old coins, as omens of a year full of enjoyment and profit. In the public squares female dancers showed their art; and the crowd made merry with games, singing, jokes, and masqueradings of all kinds. Towards this Pagan custom, and all the follies and excesses to which it gave rise, Christianity assumed a decidedly hostile attitude; and the Fathers and teachers of the church took occasion of the debaucheries of the feast to deliver severe penitence-sermons on that day. (See Ambrose, serm. 7; Augustine, serm. 2, 195; Petrus Chrysologus, serm. 155; Maximus Turinensis, hom. 8; Chrysostom, and others.)

The Council of Tours (567) forbade in its fourteenth Can on all merry-making on New-Year’s Day, and made the day a fast-day; and in the eighth century Bishop Atto of Verceil renewed the decree. In the fourth century, however, Dec. 25 was fixed as the birthday of Christ; and Jan. 1, falling on the eighth day after Christmas, thus became, in accordance with Luke ii. 21, the day of the circumcision of Christ. When and by whom that event first was made the occasion for a Christian festival is not known; but the above-mentioned Council of Tours (567) ordered that on Jan. 1 a missa circumanctionis should be celebrated. In the beginning of the eighth century Beda Venerabils wrote a homily on Luke ii. 21, for Jan. 1. In the Roman Sacramentarium, in the Missale Gothicum, and in many old Calendaria, the day is duly noted down as the Festum circumcisionis Domini. The rules of Chrodegang (74), the capellanaries of the Frankish kings (i., c. 158), the synod of Mayence (813, can. 30) speak of the festival under the name of Octava Domini. Of course the circumstance that the festival of the circumcision also was New-Year’s Day was at first completely ignored. But gradually it made itself felt even in the proceedings of the church; and it became customary for the priest to give the congregation his “Happy New-Year” from the pulpit, over the name of New-Year’s ordinance. In the Sermonum Opus Exquisitissimum, by Gottschalk of Osnabruck, 1517, may be found a very curious specimen of this kind of sermons, which, however, again went out of fashion with the Reformation. In the Greek Church Jan. 1 is chiefly celebrated in honor of Basil the Great. See Alt: Der christliche Cultus, Berlin, 1843, ii., 46, 205, 315. H. MERZ.

NEW-YEAR, Feast of. See FESTIVALS, YEAR.

NEW YORK CITY, the most populous city and chief commercial centre of the Western Hemisphere, had a population, in 1880, of 1,206,299. It was originally confined to Manhattan Island, a body of land thirteen miles and a half long, and two miles and a quarter wide at its widest point. The Dutch began the settlement of the island immediately after the discovery of Hudson, in 1609. The town, which was built around a fort, was called New Amsterdam. In 1664 it passed into the hands of the British, who changed the name to New York, in honor of the brother of Charles II., the Duke of York. The town remained in the hands of the British (with the exception of a short interval when it was recaptured by the Dutch, 1673) till after the surrender of Yorktown in 1783.

The first and legal church was the Reformed Church of Holland, and services were conducted both in the Dutch and the French from the beginning. The first church was organized in 1628, with fifty members (Dutch and Walloons), by Rev. Jonas Michaelius, who had just arrived from Holland. The first edifice was built of wood, in Pearl Street, between Whitehall and Broad. The Dutch Reformed Church still holds a position of high honor and influence. The British legalized the Episcopal Church, but tolerated the Dutch Reformed denomination, as also the Lutherans, who built a church in 1609, and had for their first pastor Rev. Jacob Fabritius. They were, however, intolerant to other denominations, Lord Cornbury, especially, signalizing his gubernatorial term in this regard; as, for example, when in 1707 he threw into prison the Presbyterian clergyman, Makenie, for preaching without a license in New York. The first Episcopalian services were held in the church at the fort. Trinity Church was opened Feb. 6, 1697, by the Rev. William Vesey. In 1708 the King’s Farm was granted by Queen Anne to the corporation of Trinity Church, which was the foundation of its great wealth, and still makes it the wealthiest religious corporation in the land. The present edifice of Trinity Church was erected in 1846. The first Baptist Church was organized in 1724, but disbanded eight years later. The so-called First Church was organized in 1745, with Jeremiah Dodge as pastor. The first Presbyterian Church was organized in 1716. The first church edifice was erected in Wall Street in 1719. The first society of the Methodist-Episcopal Church was organized with five members, in October, 1708, by Philip Embury, a local preacher; and the first church edifice, on John Street, was dedicated Oct. 30, 1708. The religious statistics of New York for 1886 were as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Church</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist churches and chapels</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Apostolic church (Irvingite)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational churches and chapels</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples church and chapel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends churches and chapels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Christian church and mission</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish synagogues</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran churches and chapels</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist (African) churches and chapels</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist-Episcopal churches and chapels</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist (Free) church and chapel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravian churches</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Jerusalem church and chapel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian churches and chapels</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian (Reformed) churches and chapels</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian (United) churches and chapels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant-Episcopal churches and chapels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed Dutch churches and chapels</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed Episcopal church and chapel</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed German church and chapels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman-Catholic churches and chapels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Advent churches and chapels</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian churches and chapels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalist churches and chapels</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (churches and chapels)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of the churches to the population is 1 to 2,468.

One hundred and twenty-seven of these organiza-
NEW-YORK COMMITTEE.

1644 NEW-YORK CITY.

The charitable organizations of the city are very numerous, and it is estimated that at least $4,000,000 are distributed by these bodies annually. Space permits us only to give the following figures: Hospitals, Homes, and Asylums (including 4 foundling-asylums), 92, all but 9 of which are sustained by religious denominations; Fruit-Mis-

sions, 3; Benevolent Societies (including societies for the suppression of vice, the prevention of cruelty to children, cruelty to animals, relief organizations, etc.), 41; Industrial Schools, 38; Insti-

tutions for Children (including 4 new boys' lodging-houses, etc.), 48; Dispensaries, 90. These figures give an idea of the charitable work and the number of charitable institutions in New York City, but do not exhaust the number. The most of the churches maintain sewing-schools, distribute alms through special committees, etc.

The American Bible Society has its headquarters in New-York City, occupying the immense building called the "Bible House." The Children's Aid Society, which gathers in destitute children, and provides homes for them in the West, etc., has, in the last twenty-eight years, provided for 56,481 children, and expended $2,958,919.

Official statements place the number of drinking-places at 9,215, the money expended in which may with safety be set down at $60,000,000 a year. There were 67,135 arrests for 1881, and 45,309 persons were held. 32,369 of these persons, or three-fourths, were of intemperate habits. Besides the work done through the churches and hospitals and temperance meetings, there is a Home for Inebriates at 49 East 75th Street.

LIT. — The history of New-York City may be found in the Histories of Mary L. Booth (rev. ed., New York, 1880) and Mrs. Lamb (New York, 1881). For the statistics, see Report of the United-States Bureau : Christian Work in New York (published annually by the New-York City Mission and Tract Society, under the editorial care of Lewis E. Jackson, treasurer, No. 60 Bible House, etc.; Brace : Dangerous Classes in New York, and Twenty Years of Work among them, New York, 1872.

NEW-YORK SABBATH COMMITTEE. The committee was organized in 1857, to promote the observance of the Lord's Day, and especially to secure the enforcement of the laws which protect the quiet and order of Sunday and the right of all classes to the weekly rest. It grew out of a prevalent feeling of the need of some movement to meet the growing public desecration of Sunday, and the alarming proportionate increase of drunkenness, disorder, and violent crimes, on that day. At a conference of prominent and influential citizens, after much deliberation, a permanent committee of twenty was formed, to whom the conduct of the reform was committed, with power to fill vacancies in their own number. The committee was composed of leading laymen, representing the different denominations and the various business and social interests of the community. Mr. Norman White, who had taken the chief part in initiating the movement, was made chairman, to whose eminent zeal, wisdom, and perseverance the success of the committee has been largely due; and an efficient secretary and executive officer was found in the person of Rev. R. S. Cook, who had previously been a secretary of the American Tract Society. The committee, from the beginning, secured the hearty moral and financial support of the Christian community. It adopted, and has always adhered to, these principles in its work: viz., clearly to discriminate between the sabbath as a religious and as a civil institution.
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NEW-YORK SABBATH COMMITTEE. The committee was organized in 1857, to promote the observance of the Lord's Day, and especially to secure the enforcement of the laws which protect the quiet and order of Sunday and the right of all classes to the weekly rest. It grew out of a prevalent feeling of the need of some movement to meet the growing public desecration of Sunday, and the alarming proportionate increase of drunkenness, disorder, and violent crimes, on that day. At a conference of prominent and influential citizens, after much deliberation, a permanent committee of twenty was formed, to whom the conduct of the reform was committed, with power to fill vacancies in their own number. The committee was composed of leading laymen, representing the different denominations and the various business and social interests of the community. Mr. Norman White, who had taken the chief part in initiating the movement, was made chairman, to whose eminent zeal, wisdom, and perseverance the success of the committee has been largely due; and an efficient secretary and executive officer was found in the person of Rev. R. S. Cook, who had previously been a secretary of the American Tract Society. The committee, from the beginning, secured the hearty moral and financial support of the Christian community. It adopted, and has always adhered to, these principles in its work: viz., clearly to discriminate between the sabbath as a religious and as a civil institution.
and carefully to respect the proper limitations of civil intervention in guarding the weekly rest; to keep the one issue distinct from all other matters of reform; to avoid all impracticable measures; to recognize the controlling power of public sentiment, and to take no step until the way shall be prepared for it; to advance one step at a time; to work through the constituted authorities, giving as little prominence as possible to its own agency; and to conduct its work on such broad and just grounds as to secure the co-operation of the widest possible constituency.

The committee undertook successively the suppression of the noisy crying of newspapers on Sunday, the Sunday selling of liquor, Sunday theatrical entertainments, noisy processions and parades on Sunday, unnecessary work upon the public streets, and the encroachments incident to such a city (public and private) upon the rest and quiet of the day. To accomplish these measures new legislation has been found necessary, and has been secured from time to time; not a mere crowding of old measures; to recognize the controlling power of civil intervention in guarding the weekly rest; to keep the one issue distinct from all other matters of reform; to avoid all impracticable measures; to carry its work on such broad and just grounds as to secure the co-operation of the widest possible constituency.

The committee has also successfully opposed numerous attempts to pass laws hostile to the sabbath. Beside its work in this city, the influence of the committee has been widely exerted throughout the State and in other parts of the country. It has acted effectively in behalf of the sabbath during the late war, and secured the issue of President Lincoln's sabbath order to the army and navy in 1862. It aided the closing of the Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia on Sundays, and has secured governmental recognition of Sunday in various instances, especially in the International Electrical Exposition at Paris in 1881. It has assisted in the formation of similar associations. In addition to the personal efforts of the officers and members of the committee, it has secured the preaching of sermons on the sabbath, by eminent clergymen, many of which have been published; it has contributed very largely to the discussion of the subject in the secular and religious journals; and especially has issued a series of carefully prepared original documents, fifty in number, discussing the various aspects of the Sunday question. Of these documents, and of occasional fly-leaves, circulars, etc., several millions of pages have been printed and distributed in English and other languages. Some of the documents have been reprinted in Europe. Six of the original members of the committee, including the chairman, Mr. Norman White, and the secretary (1883) in connection with the committee, after the lapse of twenty-five years, though no longer able to participate actively in its work, Mr. Cook, on his death (1884), was succeeded in office by the Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, whose services were especially valuable in securing the sympathy and co-operation of German ministers and citizens in the work of the committee at home and abroad. Dr. Schaff resigned his position in 1886, and was followed by the Rev. W. W. Atterbury, who has since continued to hold this office.

NEW ZEALAND. The Colony of New Zealand consists of three islands, known as North, South, and Stewart's Islands, together with the small adjacent islands. The North, called by the Maoris Te Ika a Maui, is 500 miles in length and 250 miles at its greatest breadth. The South or Middle Island, called by the Maoris Te Waiata Pouanui, is the same length, but not nearly so broad. Stewart's Island, the Maori name of which is Rakirau, is 30 miles long and 25 miles broad. The area of the group is 105,000 square miles, being approximately the size of Great Britain and Ireland. It is situated in the South Pacific Ocean, 1,200 miles south-east of the Australian Continent, between 34° and 45° south latitude, and between 166° and 178° east longitude.

The earliest inhabitants of the country seem to have been the Maoris, a people believed to be of Malay origin. The first European discoverer was Abel Tasman, the Dutch navigator, who visited it in 1642, after his discovery of Tasmania; but it is not known to have been again visited till 1769, when Capt. Cook landed on it. A few years later, whaling-ships began to call occasionally; and in 1814 the Church Missionary Society established a mission at the Bay of Islands. The Ngapuhi tribe, whose chiefs in 1840 were the first to sign the treaty acknowledging British supremacy. Other missions speedily followed. The colonization of the country may be said to have begun in 1840, when Wellington was settled by the New-Zealand Land Company, who had obtained authority for the purpose from the British Government. Auckland was established the same year, and the year following New Plymouth and Nelson were founded. The most important settlements politically and ecclesiastically were those of Otago and Canterbury. The former took place in 1848, under the auspices of the Free Church of Scotland; and the latter, under the auspices of the Church of England, in 1850.

The country is of volcanic origin, and very mountainous. Some of the heights are covered with perpetual snow, notably Mount Egmont in the North Island, and Mount Cook, which is the highest peak in the southern Alps, and rises to the height of 13,300 feet. The climate, while varying greatly in the different latitudes, is, on the whole, free from extremes. The climate of the North Island has been compared to that of Italy, and the South Island has been compared in this respect to Jersey. New Zealand is rich in minerals. The cereals, fruits, and flowers of temperate climates, grow in abundance, and of good quality. Neither marsupials nor snakes, both of which are common on the mainland of Australia, are found in New Zealand.

The provincial system of government was established in 1852, and continued till 1875, when it was abolished, and the country divided into counties. The constitution is substantially the same as in the other British colonies, and consists of a governor, a legislative council, and a house of representatives. In the latter there are usually several Maori members. The system of education is regulated by the Act of 1877. It is secular and free. The University of New Zealand grants degrees.

The population, according to the census of March, 1878, was 414,412, including 4,893 Chinese, but exclusive of the Maoris. Perhaps it may now be put at approximately half a million, including...
soil. W. BAUDIN.

decided. The rabbins derive the name from a dogs or dog's worship on Assyro-Babylonian identical with the Nebaz of the Mendseans, the demon of the uttermost darkness, has not been as following Mithras, nothing is known of sacred hazi " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very uncertain. Whether that deity was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nib- must have been from some place in Syria or Hebre root," to bark; " but though there was Haz " is very certain. Whether that deity was identical with the Nebaz of the Mendseans, the demon of the uttermost darkness, has not been decided. The rabbins derive the name from a Hebrew root, "to bark;" but though there was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented as following Mithras, nothing is known of sacred dogs or dog's worship on Assyro-Babylonian soil.

NICEA, Councils of. I. The first council of Nicea opens the series of ecumenical councils, and defined the church doctrine of the divinity of Christ, that he is co-essential with the Father. Very properly has a world-wide importance been attached to it, both on account of the Arian profound and metaphysical question it discussed and the influence of its decision upon the doctrinal system of many after-centuries. The council is also very important on account of its other decrees, and the epoch it marks in the relations of the State to the doctrines and polity of the Church. In contrast to many later councils the first council of Nicea has no intricate and tedious secret history. Our sources are the creed, canons, a synodal brief, a number of imperial letters, and various accounts by members of the council or later writers. The principal description is given by Eusebius of Cæsarea, in his Life of Constantine (Vita Constant., iii. 6 sqq.), which, however, seeks unduly to make prominent the services and magnanimity of the emperor. He also gives an account in his letter to the Church of Cæsarea (Ep. ad Cæs. in Thedorett, I. 11). Athanasius is our next most valuable authority (De decreto synodi Nic. and Ep. ad Afr.). But, while he speaks from personal observation, he is a partial judge. A third eyewitness of whom something is preserved is Eustathius of Antioch (see Thedoret, c. 7). The later historians, Socrates (i. 8 sqq.) and Sozomen (i. 17 sqq.), draw from Eusebius, and give credit though not detailed accounts. In the influence of the council, see Arianism. After Constantine had in vain endeavored to quietly settle the doctrinal dispute at Alexandria, he summoned by letter, in the year 325, the bishops of his empire to Nicea in Bithynia [then the see city of that province, but now represented by a Turkish village, Ianik, with a population of fifteen hundred], offering them money to defray the expenses of the journey, and free conveyance. There were thirty bishops (Athanasius, Theodoret), or number were added many presbyters and acolyths. The delegation from the East was in an overwhelming majority. The bishop of Rome, Sylvester I., was prevented from attending by the feebleness of age, and was represented by two presbyters, Vital and Vicentius. The more prominent members were Macarius of Jerusalem, Eustathius of Antioch, Alexander of Alexandria, and his deacon Athanasius, Spyridon of Cyprus, Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicea, Secundus of Ptolemais,— the last four belonging to the Arian party. The miracles, Jacob of Nisibis, was also present; and many confessors who bore in their bodies the
marks of persecution. The month of the year in which the council met is not definitely known, although June or July are usually agreed upon. Some relate that the council was sent to avail themselves of the occasion to settle private disputes, and presented many complaints to the emperor. Constantine, however, conducted himself with much prudence, directed the complainants to the higher and all-wise Judge, and burned the doors of Meletius. The bishops wished to avoid the eloquence and intellect of Athanasius. On the day appointed for opening the convention, the bishops received the emperor standing. He appeared with a commanding yet humble mien, was welcomed by Eustathius, and, after delivering a brief address in Latin (which was interpreted in Greek), gave the assembly into the hands of the president (σποράδος). Their names are not known. The suggestion of Schrckck and Ernesti, who mention Eustathius and Alexander, is much more worthy of confidence than that of Hefele, who, following Gelasius, advocates the claims of Hosius of Cordova.

The great subject of debate in the council was the relation of the Son to the Father. Here we have the accounts of Athanasius, who speaks of two sharply opposed parties, and Eusebius, who speaks of three varieties of opinion. Combing them, we find that there were three wings in the council and three stages in the progress of the debate. In the first stage, the council proposed to define the relation of the Son to the Father by the simple biblical predicates, such as τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, but the Arians were unwilling to have communication, on account of the Saracen invasion. The synod was at once interrupted by the opponents of the use of images. The result was determined upon before the council opened. Biblical and patristic testimonies, legends of the saints, such as the miracles of Simon Stylites and the sacredness of the painter's art, were urged in advocacy of the use of images. The synod of 754 was put in his place. A synod met at Constantinople Aug. 1, 786. It had the consent of Hadrian I., Bishop of Rome, and two monks who were chosen to represent the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, with whom it was not possible to have communication, on account of the Saracen invasion. The synod was at once interrupted by the opponents of the use of images, many of whom were in the army, and belonged to the guard of the palace. It was again convened at Nicea, Sept. 24, 787, and adjourned Oct. 18, after seven sitting. The members numbered three hundred and fifty. There was no freedom of discussion. The result was determined upon before the council opened. Biblical and patristic testimonies, legends of the saints, such as the miracles of Simon Stylites and the sacredness of the painter's art, were urged in advocacy of the use of images.


The twenty-two canons of the council concern the election of bishops, the convention of general provincial synods, the use of relics in the churches, etc. The first council of Nicaea contributed to establish the unity of Christendom. The second belongs to a period when that unity was already threatened. It had only the semblance of an ecumenical character. Among the Greeks it is rather placed in the seventh and last ecumenical council. For literature, see above. 0088.

**NICÆNO-CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED.**

The used in all the Greek and Roman churches, and recognized by most of the denominations of Protestantism, is, according to the generally received opinion, a recension, made at the Council of Constantinople in 381, of the creed formulated by the Council of Nicaea in 325. In the present article we shall discuss, (1) the authentic text of the Constantinopolitan or Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, (2) the Nicean Creed, (3) the origin of the Constitution and Antioch, and that it was promulgated, not as a baptismal formula, but as a rule of faith in Christology. The expressions it omits, compared with the baptismal formula of Cæsarea, are, "one Holy ... church;" (3) The substitution of the word "one" for "one" in the Nicene Creed, and the omission of the anathemas. If we consider the positiveness with which the Nicene Creed excludes all Arianism, and its promulgation as the law of the church, we get some conception of the strength and energy of the Alexandrian party at the Council, and the formulation of the creed, is obscure. But Eusebius is certainly right when he affirms that the Nicene Creed was formed on the basis of the baptismal formula of Cæsarea, which he himself presented. This is confirmed by an investigation of the creed, and the merit of having properly apprehended this point belongs to Hort. The main points with reference to the composition of the Nicene Creed are, that it rests upon the baptismal formula of Cæsarea; differs from it by, (1) omissions and small changes, (2) the introduction of Christological clauses of the Alexandrian Church, and (3) by a revision based upon a comparison with the baptismal formulars of the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch; and that it was promulgated, not as a baptismal formula, but as a rule of faith in Christology. The expressions it omits, compared with the baptismal formula of Cæsarea, are, "the Word of God," "the Word of God being substituted), ἐπιτυπωμένον τὸ τέλος των υἱών τοῦ θεοῦ," "the first-born of every creature," "πρὸ πάντων τῶν οἰκονόμων ἐν τῷ πάτρῳ γεννηθέντα," "the Father before all worlds," ἐκ τοῦ πάτρου και ἐκ τοῦ προφέτου και ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου; and the six anathemas at the close. The other variations of the Nicene Creed from the Cæsarean formula are not of a theological character, and, as they agree with the phraseology of the baptismal formulas of the Jerusalem and Antioch churches, are to be put down as due to the influence of the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch. 10. The second council of Nicaea, at Constantinople in 381, of the creed formulated there as the first oecumenical, are obscure. But Eusebius is certainly right when he affirms that the Nicene Creed was formed on the basis of the baptismal formula of Cæsarea, which he himself presented. This is confirmed by an investigation of the creed, and the merit of having properly apprehended this point belongs to Hort. The main points with reference to the composition of the Nicene Creed are, that it rests upon the baptismal formula of Cæsarea; differs from it by, (1) omissions and small changes, (2) the introduction of Christological clauses of the Alexandrian Church, and (3) by a revision based upon a comparison with the baptismal formulas of the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch; and that it was promulgated, not as a baptismal formula, but as a rule of faith in Christology. The expressions it omits, compared with the baptismal formula of Cæsarea, are, "the Word of God," "the Word of God being substituted), ἐπιτυπωμένον τὸ τέλος των υἱών τοῦ θεοῦ," "the first-born of every creature," "πρὸ πάντων τῶν οἰκονόμων ἐν τῷ πάτρῳ γεννηθέντα," "the Father before all worlds," ἐκ τοῦ πάτρου και ἐκ τοῦ προφέτου και ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου; and the six anathemas at the close. The other variations of the Nicene Creed from the Cæsarean formula are not of a theological character. The creed introduces the Alexandrian clauses τοῦ εὐθυνοῦ τῆς θείας τοῦ πατρὸς; γεννηθέντα τοῦ παρθένου; ὁμοοιότατος τοῦ παταρίου και τῶν οἰκονόμων τοῦ παρθένου τοῦ πατρὸς, and the six anathemas at the close. The other variations of the Nicene Creed from the Cæsarean formula are not of a theological character. The creed introduces the Alexandrian clauses τοῦ εὐθυνοῦ τῆς θείας τοῦ πατρὸς; γεννηθέντα τοῦ παρθένου; ὁμοοιότατος τοῦ παταρίου και τῶν οἰκονόμων τοῦ παρθένου τοῦ πατρὸς, and the six anathemas at the close. The other variations of the Nicene Creed from the Cæsarean formula are not of a theological character.
Ad Constant. Aug. II. 5; Jerome, Ep. ad Damas; Amphilochius, in Migne xxxix. p. 93.) It was reaffirmed at the Council of Sardica in 344; and it is possible to adduce dozens of passages from the acts of councils and the works of the Fathers, between 350 and 450, showing the intense reverence in which the creed was held as an exposition of apostolical teaching, given under the most glorious emperor Constantine, etc.

It remained to employ the Nicene Creed at the rite of baptism. Up to 381, there is no evidence of its having been so used; but after the victory of orthodoxy, with Julian's accession to power, this was accomplished. There were three possible ways by which the Nicene Creed could be utilized for this purpose,—by introducing its emphatic expressions into the old provincial baptismal formulas, by enlarging it, or by using it without change. All of these ways were followed before the Council of Chalcedon, as will be shown in the next section. Among these attempts belongs the creed which is called the Constantinopolitan, or Nicene-Constantinopolitan.

II. Origin of the Constantinopolitan, and its Relation to the Nicene Creed.—According to the traditional view which has prevailed since the sixth century, the Constantinopolitan Creed was formulated at the Council of Constantinople in 381 (called by Theodosius I.), by enlarging the third article of the Nicene Creed, in opposition to the Pneumatomachians: hence it received the name Niceno-Constantinopolitan.

The first thing to shake the confidence of scholars in this tradition was the fact, that the creed given in the Acta of Epiphanius, dated 378-374, is identical with the Constantinopolitan, except in the two clauses τοῦ ἀποστόλου τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας τῶν πατρῶν and τα τι εἰς τὴν ὁμοιότητα τῆς ὑποθεσίας εἰς τὴν γῆν. (See Hort, p. 83, etc.) Different explanations have been given of this fact; and Hefele, following Tillemon and Cellier (Hist. des aut. sacr., v. p. 646), has advocated the view that the Council of Constantinople did not originate the revision of the Nicene Creed, but adopted one already in use; that is, the one which Epiphanius gives. Caspari has advocated this view with his well-known learning, and advances the extraordinary regard in which Kipphanus was held as the reason for the inclusion of this creed in the Ancoratus of Kipphanus, dated 373-374, as well as in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan.

III. Origin of the Constantinopolitan, and its Relation to the Nicene Creed.—According to the traditional view which has prevailed since the sixth century, the Constantinopolitan Creed was formulated at the Council of Constantinople in 381 (called by Theodosius I.), by enlarging the third article of the Nicene Creed, in opposition to the Pneumatomachians: hence it received the name Niceno-Constantinopolitan.

The first thing to shake the confidence of scholars in this tradition was the fact, that the creed given in the Acta of Epiphanius, dated 378-374, is identical with the Constantinopolitan, except in the two clauses τοῦ ἀποστόλου τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας τῶν πατρῶν and τα τι εἰς τὴν ὁμοιότητα τῆς ὑποθεσίας εἰς τὴν γῆν. (See Hort, p. 83, etc.) Different explanations have been given of this fact; and Hefele, following Tillemon and Cellier (Hist. des aut. sacr., v. p. 646), has advocated the view that the Council of Constantinople did not originate the revision of the Nicene Creed, but adopted one already in use; that is, the one which Epiphanius gives. Caspari has advocated this view with his well-known learning, and advances the extraordinary regard in which Kipphanus was held as the reason for the inclusion of this creed in the Ancoratus of Kipphanus, dated 373-374, as well as in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan.

The internal reasons against the traditional view are still stronger. It can be shown that the Constantinopolitan is not an enlarged copy of the Nicene Creed, and that it would have been impossible for the Council of Constantinople to make such a recension as the so-called “Constantinopolitan” Creed” offers. The Constantinopolitan does not only differ from the Nicene Creed by the additions in the third article, but differs also in other respects, which point back to another original. This is plain from the four omissions of words, the omission of the anathemas, the addition of ten clauses, and the five differences in the location of words. In other words, a comparison of the two creeds shows (to follow Hort), that, of the hundred and seventy-eight words in the Constantinopolitan, only thirty-three, or one-fifth, are
the Fneumatomachians, whose definite exclusion part original, so it is said. It is beyond dispute, article on the Holy Ghost, which was for the large ficeto express the energetic advocacy of the di that that council confirmed the Nicene Creed. with the theory of the Nicene basis of the so- of some old formula of baptism which was not ; an enlarged form of the Nicene. It is a revisionj of divinity of the Spirit about 380, and point back to the Son (homoousia) is not expressly confessed; but it was considered sufficient to acknowledge him with the theory of the Nicene basis of the so- called “ Constantinopolitan Creed.”

What, however, are the predicates attributed to the Holy Ghost in the so-called “ Constantinopolitan Creed”? His equality with the Father and Son (homousia) is not expressly confessed; but it was considered sufficient to acknowledge him as the Creator of the Christ, proceeding from the Father,” etc. Such epithets do not su- fice to express the energetic advocacy of the di- vinity of the Spirit about 380, and point back to a date earlier than 381, and probably later than 362.

What, then, are the origin and history of the so-called “ Constantinopolitan Creed”? Thus much we can regard as established: it was prepared before the Council of Constantinople in 381, and it is found substantially in the Anecrouis of Eph- phosphius, written eight years before the council. Ephphaxan did not originate the creed, as Cas- pari has well shown. He himself speaks of it as a venerable confession, and says, ‘’I’llo xaripote tov ouvsmov, kai ev enkkexi tig itis poteis apd oatwv ouvsmov na gar ixhseto tov wonewv.

Although these words are not very clear, it is evident that Ephphaxan completed it by the Council of Philadel- phia as the Apostolic and Nicene. Where did we get it? Gerhard Vossius long ago detected the similarity between it and the creed of the church at Jerusalem. Hort has followed up the idea, and has proved that the so-called “ Constantinopol-
382, to the one held there in 381, as Hefele admits. But, when the patriarchate of Constantinople secured in 451 the supremacy, it considered it to its interest to declare the council of 381, like the Nicene Council, an oecumenical council, because, (1) it was held in the imperial city, (2) called by the second Constantine, Theodosius I., and (3) had accorded the precedence of honor, after the bishop of Rome, to the bishop of Constantinople. In the West, however, the oecumenical character of this council was not admitted till the Roman bishop passed into servile dependence to the Byzantine emperor. Vigilius (538–555) was the first to call it an oecumenical synod. (See on these points Vincenzi, Caspari, and Hort, p. 101 sq.).

2. The date of the recognition of the creed in the West can be pretty accurately established as identical with the recognition of the oecumenical character of the council of 381; that is, about 530. Perhaps Dionysius Exiguus was the first to introduce it from the East, but there is no record of its being held in esteem in the West before the middle of the sixth century. From that time forward, it was introduced as a formula of baptism in Rome and Spain, where, at the Council of Toledo (589), it received the fatal addition, Filioque, and has been put on a level with the Apostles’ Creed; yea, was even designated by this name. (For proofs see Caspari, i. p. 243, etc.) The Reformers usually call it simply the Nicene Creed. The Armenians, Socinians, and Unitarians have expressly rejected it. The Roman Church confirmed it at the Council of Trent. It later history in the churches of the Reformation begins with the Galatian controversies.

3. The facts just brought out indicate that the creed must have been regarded, already in 500, in a part of the East at least, as a revision of the Nicene Creed, made at Constantinople 381. But its position after the canons, instead of before, in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, proves that it was inserted into the Acts of the council not later than the latter half of the fifth century; but it is probable, though not beyond doubt, that it was first read at the Council of Chalcedon (451) as a product of the Council of Constantinople. It was a Constantinopolitan document, who, according to the report, read it on that occasion. Hort has traced indications of a relation between the baptismal formula of Jerusalem, the symbol of Cyril, and the council of 381. Cyril attended this council; but his orthodoxy was not above suspicion, and it is not unlikely that he laid down a confession in order to place this orthodoxy above the reach of reproach.

This would naturally be the baptismal formula of his provincial church. It was accepted, and put amongst the Acts of the synod, as the formula of Caesarea had before been put amongst those of the Council of Nicaea, or that of Philadelphia amongst those of the Council of Ephesus (431). Now, when the Church of Constantinople began to look around for a fuller statement of doctrine than the Nicene Creed offered, it found this baptismal formula of Jerusalem, announced it as the Constantinopolitan Creed, and so used it. Whether, however, it was rapidly introduced and was founded or not, it remains certain that the so-called “Constantinopolitan Creed” is the revised symbol of Jerusalem, made about 383; that the council of 381 gave official confirmation only to the Nicene Creed; and that the thought of passing off the so-called “Constantinopolitan” as the work of the council of 381 was not put into execution till about 450. By 500 it had secured a place at the side of the Nicene Creed, and soon after was employed as a formula of baptism, and began to supplant the Nicene.

Finally, we may mention the radical hypothesis of the Roman theologian Vincenzi (De process. Sp. Sancti, Rome, 1785), who seeks to prove that the Constantinopolitan Creed is a Greek fabrication of the seventh century, for the purpose of dating back the erroneous doctrine of the single procession of the Holy Spirit to the fourth century. It is not necessary to refute this theory; for its author not only starts out with the purpose of proving the antiquity of the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Spirit, but has overlooked many of the most important testimonies, and does violence to others.

The Constantinopolitan Creed is, therefore, an apocryphal work, introduced as an enlarged Apostles’ Creed and the Athanasian. It is at once older and younger than the council of 381. The historical student will compare its contents with the theology of Cyril and Athanasius. After the middle of the fifth century, the Fathers regarded it as an enlarged form of the Nicene, and used it against Apollinaris, Nestorius, and Eutyches. See Caspari: Quellen zur Gesch. d. Taufsymbools (especially vol. i. pp. 1 sq., 100 sqq., 113 sqq., 213 sqq.); Swainson: The Nicene and the Apostles’ Creeds, etc., London, 1875; Lumbry: Hist. of the Creeds, 2d ed., 1880; Hort: Two Dissertations, II.; On the Constantinopolitan Creed and other Eastern Creeds of the Fourth Century, Lond., 1876; [Hefele: Konciliegesc.], i. 314 sqq.; Schaf: Creeds of Christendom, vols. i., ii., N. Y., 1877]. Adolf Harnack.

NICE. See NIC.EA.

NICE CreED. See Niceno-Constanti

NICEPHORUS, b. 758; d. 828; a celebrated Byzantine writer, and patriarch of Constantinople; descended from a distinguished family, strictly orthodox, and ardently devoted to the worship of images. His father, Theodorus, lost his office, and was exiled, for that very reason, but the son saw the complete reversion of affairs, when, under Irene, after the synod of Nicaea (787), the image-worshipers came into power. He did not feel at home, however, in court circles, and retired to a monastery on the Thracian Bosphorus; but in 806 he was recalled to the metropolis, and, though only a monk, elevated to the patriarchal see. Once more, however, he experienced a complete change in the course of affairs, when Leo Armenian ascended the throne in 813, and the iconoclasts came into power: he was deposed, and retired to the monastery of St. Theodoras. His writings are partly historical, — Brevierium Historicum, from 602 to 770, first printed in 1618, and then incorporated in the edition of the Byzantine historians, Venice, 1729; Chronologia compendiaria tripartita, translated into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, printed in Paris 1495,— partly philosophical, in defence of the procession of the Holy Spirit: Antirrhetici libri adversus Iconomachos, in Bibl. Patr. Lugo., xiv.; Disputatio de imaginibus,
NICEPHORUS, Callisti, flourished about 1330, was a monk in the monastery attached to the Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople, and wrote a church history (ending 610), which contains some valuable information. He closes the series of medieval Greek church-historians, and is one of the best of them. His work, which exists only in one manuscript, in the Imperial Library in Vienna, was first printed in a Latin translation by Johann Lange, Basel, 1553 (often reprinted); and his Greek text was edited by Fronto Ducceus, Paris, 1830, 2 vols. GASS.

NICERON, Jean Pierre, b. in Paris, March 11, 1652; d. there July 8, 1738; entered the Society of the Jesuits in 1702, and published Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Hommes illustres dans la république des Lettres, Paris, 1729-45, 45 vols.

NICHOLAS is the name of five popes and an antipope.—Nicholas I. (858-867) stands in the history of the Church as a powerful representative of that tendency which developed in the Roman curia after the death of Charlemagne,—to throw off the yoke of the imperial authority. The ideas of the unity of Church and State, and of the unity of the Christians, are brought into his mind; and he labored with energy and success for their realization. The arbitrary measures of Archbishop Johannes of Ravenna had produced much ill feeling in his diocese, and complaints were made against him in Rome. As from old the Archbishop of Ravenna was the rival of the Bishop of Rome, Nicholas seized with eagerness the opportunity of humiliating that rival: and Johannes was finally compelled to submit to the papal demands,—that no bishop should be appointed in the province of Emilia without the consent of Rome, that every bishop should have a right to appeal to Rome. Of still greater importance was his contest with Archbishop Ilinocmar of Rheims. It was Ilincmar’s dream to elevate his see to the primacy of the entire Frankish Church; and the opposition he met with from below,—as, for instance, from Rothad, bishop of Soissons,— he attempted to break by means of local synods. In 861 Rothad was deposed by the synod of Soissons, but in 865 he repaired to Rome. Nicholas declared in his favor, cancelled the decisions of the synod of Soissons, and reinvested him with his episcopal rights. In the same year he was formally re-installed in his office by the papal legate Arsenius. Ilinocmar was threatened into compliance; and the startling propositions, drawn from the Pseudo-Isidorian decreals,—that no synod could be convened except by the Pope, that every bishop had a right to appeal from his metropolitan to the Pope, etc.—were obtained, if not formal acceptance, at least practical efficiency, in the Frankish Church. Equally successful was his interference in the affairs of the Greek Church. He sided with Ilinocmar whose deposition he refused to recognize; and in 863 a synod of Rome, in which Nicholas himself was present, excommunicated Ilinocmar. At that very moment Christianity was successfully introduced among the Bulgarians by Greek missionaries. But Prince Bogoris, suspecting that too close an ecclesiastical connection with Constantinople might endanger the political independence of the country, opened negotiations with Rome. Nicholas immediately sent Bishop Dominicus of Trivento and Bishop Gringoald of Bomarzo to Bogoris; and in spite of the exertions of Photius and the synod of Constantinople (867), which even went so far as to depose Nicholas, the Bulgarian Church became Latin, and not Greek. The Moravia— he attached, though without the assent of Rome, and less monkish. Only the five first books, however, have been published in a Latin translation by Petrus Morellus (Paris, 1561), and in Bibl. Patr. Lugd., XXV. See ULLMANN: Die Dogmatik der griechischen Kirche im 12. Jahrh. 1885. O.SS.

NICETAS PECTORATUS, monk and presbyter in the monastery of the Studium, near Constantinople; flourished in the middle of the eleventh century; a contemporary of Michael Cerularius; and wrote a violent work against Photius. But when the papal legates, shortly after, arrived at Constantinople, it came to a disputation between him and Cardinal Umberto, in which he was so completely defeated, that he recanted, and consented to the burning of his books,—a circumstance, however, which the Greek sources do not mention. See GRÜBER: Byzantinische Geschichten, Graz, 1877, ili., 529 sq.

NICHE, an architectural term denoting a recess in a wall, generally used as a receptacle for some ornament,—a picture or statuary. Niches are sometimes square, and sometimes semicircular at the back, sometimes perfectly plain, or adorned only with a few mouldings at the front, but sometimes provided with pedestals, canopies, and exceedingly elaborate mouldings.
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Nicholas found himself in a miserable plight. At last he surrendered unconditionally to John XXII., and was kept in prison for the rest of his life. See Raynalduus: Annales eccles. ad annos 1288-80, and other sources, in Böhmer: Fontes Rec. Germ., vols. i. and iv. — Nicholas V. (March 6, 1447—March 23, 1455) distinguished himself in politics, in science, and in art. With Friedrich III. he concluded the concordat of Aschaffenburg, on Vienna, Feb. 17, 1448, by which Germany lost nearly all the advantages which it might have derived from the Council of Basel. The annats, the reservations, the menses papales, were consented to by the king. He was equally successful in healing the papal schism, and wind ing up the affairs of the Council of Basel. April 7, 1449, Felix V. resigned the office; and in 1450 Nicholas V. could celebrate the semi-centennial in Rome with great magnificence and proper dignity. He was a scholar himself, a worthy member of the Humanist camp, and encouraged scholarship. He laid the founda tion of the Vatican Library, and offered a prize of ten thousand gold-pieces for a translation of Homer into Latin verse. He restored the walls of Rome and many of her churches, and entertained an idea of rebuilding the Vatican and the Church of St. Peter. By his Romans, however, he was not appreciated. His last days were saddened by the conspiracy of Porcaro, and still more by the fall of Constanti nople. He formed the League of Lodi between the Italian States for the defence of Italy, but his attempt to rouse Europe to a new crusade was a failure. See his biographies by Manetti, and Vespasianus Florentinus, in Muratori: Rer. Ital. Script., iii. and xxv.; Pietro de Godi: Dialogon de conjuratione Porcaria, edited by Perlbach, Greifswald, 1879.

R. ZOEPFFEL.

NICHOLAS OF BASEL. See John of Chur, and Friends of God. NICHOLAS, Bishop of Methone, the present Monod, in Messenia, flourished during the reign of Manuel Comnenus, 1143-80, and left a number of works on the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, on the use of unleavened bread, on the procession of the Holy Spirit, on the primacy of the pope, on the serpent-skin of Proclus, etc., which belong to the most characteristic productions of Greek theology during the twelfth century. Printed are the work against Proclus (Aναρριής), edited by J. Th. Voemel, Francfort, 1828, and two essays against trinitarian heresies (Διηγηματικ-der rihriechischen Kircheim 12. Jahrhundert, 1883).

GASS.

NICHOLAS, Bishop of Myra in Lycia, a sacred name in the tradition of the Luth, as well as the Greek Church, but hardly any thing mentioned by any contemporary historian. By Metaphrases and the Monologum Genacum a great number of miracles are ascribed to him, — allaying storms, liberating captive soldiers, etc. Balsam flowed from his grave when he was buried, and again,
NICHOLAS.

when, in the twelfth century, his remains were exhumed, and transferred to Bari in Apulia. Many churches were dedicated to him. See his Vita e Metaphraste et alia collecta, in Surius (Dec. 6), and Fabricius: Bibl. Graeca, x., and Teuffel: Memoriae vii.

NICHOLAS, Henry. See Familiats.

NICHOLAS OF STRASBURG was lector in the Dominican monastery in Cologne in the beginning of the fourteenth century, and was in 1326 made a kind of inspector of all Dominican monasteries in Germany. Thirteen sermons by him have been published by Franz Pfeiffer in the first volume of his Deutsche Mystiker: and he is generally reckoned among the older German mystics, though his sermons show no talent for, nor any inclination towards, mystical speculation.

A larger work, De utente Christo, dedicated to John XXII., has not been published. Not to be confounded with him is another Nicholas of Strasburg, or rather Nicholas Kemp de Argentina, monk in a Carthusian monastery in Chemnitz, where he died, a centenary, in 1497. A treatise by him, Dialogus de rei stultiorum, nee ex ordine, has been published by Thilo in the Bibliotheca exotica, vol. iv., Regensburg, 1724. C. SCHMIDT.

NICODEMUS, a Pharisee, and teacher of the law, the nocturnal disciple of the Church Fathers (παντομόρφος μαθητής), who became the open disciple (ξαποιων), was one of the few, who, like Paul, made the transition from the Pharisaic righteousness of works to faith in Christ. We meet him thrice in John's Gospel, and these three passages describe as many phases in the development of his faith. He came to Christ, in the early part of his ministry, by night (John iii. 1-21), aroused by the miracles, and seeking instruction. The conversation which ensued, upon the necessity of the new birth, is one of the richest pearls of the Gospel, full of inexhaustible spiritual import. The second meeting with Christ occurred two years and a half later, when Christ's conflict with the hostile forces was rapidly nearing its crisis (John vii. 43 sq.), and with more boldness demanded that Jesus should be accorded the privileges of the law. A half-year later he appears again, a firm and open disciple, helping Joseph of Arimathaea to bury the body of our Lord (John xix. 38-42). The crucifixion had burst the remaining bonds of his heart, and led him to sacrifice all temporal interests. According to the tradition, Nicodemus was baptized by John and Peter, and excluded from the Sanhedrin.

The apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus (see the text in Fabricius and Thilo, and a translation in Cowper's The Apocryphal Gospels), which was reported to have been written by Nicodemus in Hebrew, at least attests the high esteem in which he was held from the beginning.

GÜDER.

NICOLAI, Philip, Lutheran theologian, preacher, and hymn-writer; b. Aug. 10, 1596, in Mengeringhausen; d. Oct. 26, 1608, in Hamburg. His father, who was a clergyman, dedicated him early "to God and his church." After studying theology at the universities of Erfurt and Wittenberg, he became in 1583 pastor at Herdecke, Westphalia; from which he was obliged to flee at the invasion of the Spanish troops. Finding on his return that the mass had been introduced again in his church, he became pastor of a secret congregation of Lutherans in Cologne, and afterwards at Nieder-Wildungen. He was made doctor of divinity by the university of Marburg; in 1590 he was called to Unna in Westphalia, where the Lutheran clergy expected him to take the lead in the discussions with the Calvinists. In 1601 he accepted a call to Hamburg. Here he exerted an extensive influence, preaching like "another Chrysostom," on Sundays and Thursdays to a crowded church, and commending himself as a faithful pastor and pious man.

Nicolai was a zealous Lutheran, and advocate of the doctrine of ubiquity. He entered with all his soul into the theological controversies of the day against the Calvinists, and sent forth many contributions through the press. Amongst these were the Fundamentorum Calvinianae Sectae Detectio (Tübingen, 1590), the De Contrareverbia ubiqutaria (1590), De duabus Antichristis (1590), and Kurzer Bericht von d. Calvinisten Gott u. ihrer Religion (1598). The last work was one of the coarsest of all the anti-Calvinistic writings of its author, and in general one of the most notorious of the polemical writings of the sixteenth century, verging close to the blasphemous tone of polemics. It is pleasant to turn away to another work, the Freudenpiegel d. ewigen Lebens (Frankfurt, 1599, 1617, 1638, etc., 1854), which was fragrant with the odor of heavenly flowers, and suggested by a terrible pestilence which raged in Unna, where he was pastor. He also published a Commentarium de regno Christi libb. II. (Frankfurt, 1607), a remarkable work, full of chiliastic speculations, and in which he predicted the world's dissolution in 1670. His most important theological work was the Sacro sanctum omnipresens J. Chr. mysterium libri II. solida et perspicua explicatione (1809), in which he seeks to prove the doctrine of Christ's omnipresence, both from his divine and human nature. Attention has recently been called to his Christology again by Thomaüs, Dorner, and others.

That which has given Nicolai a permanent claim to honor and fame in the Protestant Church is his four hymns, especially the bridal song of the Church to her heavenly Bridegroom on Ps. xiv., Wie schön leucht't uns der Morgenstern ("How lovely shines the morning star," by Dr. H. Harbaugh), and a spirited song of the midnight voice which were written in Unna at the time of the pestilence (1599), are among the jewels of German hymnody, and mark an epoch in hymn-composition; for, in their fervor of personal faith and love and their poetic and musical rhythm, characteristics which are foreign to the hymns of the Reformation period. These wonderful songs exercised a powerful influence upon that generation, and were soon adopted far and near. The melody of Wacht auf, ruft uns die Stimme, was composed by Nicolai himself, and perhaps got his idea of the tune from the horn of the night watchman.

Nicolai's works were edited by Deeken, in 2 Latin and 4 German vols., Hamburg, 1811-17. For his life, see Curtze: P. Nicolai's Leben u. Lieder, Halle, 1859; Koch: Kirchenlied, ii. 324 sq.

NICOLAITANS, a party which had some fol-
The Nicolaitans. 1655
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lowing in some of the churches of Asia addressed in the Apocalypse. They are twice mentioned by name, in the Epistles to Ephesus and Pergamos (Rev. ii. 6, 15). In the second epistle they are compared to those who "hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication." The vices of the Nicolaitans are, therefore, not to be explained figuratively (Herder), nor are they to be regarded merely as libertines (Vitringa), but as committing the sins attributed to the Israelites, and as holding principles justifying such practices. This conclusion puts it beyond dispute that the Nicolaitans are likewise meant in the description in the Epistle to the Church of Thyatira (ii. 20 sqq.), where fornication, and eating things sacrificed to idols, are referred to. Here the woman Jezebel does not mean a special individual in the Church of Thyatira. She is the representative of a certain party who do not enter into connection with a heretical sect, but have met with less resistance at Thyatira than at Ephesus and Pergamos. It may also be regarded as certain that the "evil men" and the "false apostles" referred to in the Epistle to Ephesus (ii. 3) were Nicolaitans, and not Judaizing teachers (Zelling). One might be more apt to think of Jewish Christians such as gave Paul trouble in his congregations (Ewald, Gebhardt); but there are none of the peculiar marks of the Judaizing tendency.

The Nicolaitans are to be compared with the Antinomian libertines of the Church of Corinth. Antinomianism had spread in this congregation, in contrast to the narrow legalism of Jewish Christianity, as we learn from Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. They seem to have questioned the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 13 sqq.), desecrated the table of the Lord (xi. 18), grossly abused Paul's principle, that "all things are lawful" (vi. 12, x. 23), by eating flesh offered to idols, etc. The similarity of Nicolaitanism and the Antinomianism of Corinth renders it certain that the two stand in an intimate historical relation. The difference lies here, that the Nicolaitans were not a heretical party. Such a party might well have met with less resistance at Thyatira than at Ephesus and Pergamos. The statement of the Fathers, as well as the evidence of the Apocalypse, that the name was well known, indicate that Nicolao was the founder of the sect, and that the name (from νικολαί, "to take possession," and λαος, "people") was not a symbolical imitation of the Hebrew Balaam (Numbers xxiii. 73, "to take possession," and βαλααμ, "people").

The Nicolaitans were, then, Gentile Christian Antinomians, who abused Paul's doctrine of freedom, but it is not the apostle Paul and his helpers that the rebukes are directed against (Baur, Schwegler, Volkmar, Holtzmann, Renan). Those who hold this view refer to Rev. ii. 9, which speaks of those who say they are Jews, and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan; but these parties (not the Nicolaitans, nor a heretical party within the church, but enemies and persecutors of the Christians). They were Jews who were hostile to the gospel, and unworthy of their name. Nor can the words of Rev. ii. 2 be applied to Paul, for he was already dead, and would no longer be an object of hatred; nor did his collaborators desire to be called "apostles." Moreover, the vicious practices attributed to the Nicolaitans are the very ones that Paul himself likewise deplored (1 Cor. v. 1 sqq., vi. 12 sqq., etc.). Wholly without foundation is the further opinion, recently advanced by Völter, that the false apostles (Rev. ii. 2), Balaamites (ii. 14), and Jezebel were Montanists, and the Nicolaitans (ii. 6, 15).

Gnostics (Ophtes) of the year 180-170 (explanations which are then used to prove that the epistles to the seven churches were inserted in the Book of Revelation in the second part of the second century.)

The Nicolaitans are not mentioned by the Church Fathers until Irenæus, who speaks of them as the followers of Nicolas, one of the seven deacons mentioned in Acts vi. 5 (I. 26, 3). This is to be explained by the fact, that, at an earlier time, not so much stress was laid upon a complete list of the heresies, and by no means proves that the sect had grown up after Justin Martyr and Irenæus wrote. The order in which Irenæus treats them (I. 26, 3; comp. III. 11, 1) indicates that they flourished before Cerinthus, while they anticipated his doctrines. He, however, does not know of any Nicolaitans of his own day; for he does not bring them into connection with any of the heresies he mentions after Basilides (I. 28, 2).

What Tertullian says about them (Pros. c. 33; Adv. Marc., i. 29; De Pudicit., 10) is evidently taken from the Apocalypse. The statements of Hippolytus (Philos., 7, 30) are based upon those of Irenæus. He says that the name (from νικολαίων, "to take possession," and λαος, "people") is to be explained by the fact, that, at an earlier time, not so much stress was laid upon a complete list of the heresies, and by no means proves that the sect had grown up after Justin Martyr and Irenæus wrote. The order in which Irenæus treats them (I. 26, 3; comp. III. 11, 1) indicates that they flourished before Cerinthus, while they anticipated his doctrines. He, however, does not know of any Nicolaitans of his own day; for he does not bring them into connection with any of the heresies he mentions after Basilides (I. 28, 2).

What Tertullian says about them (Pros. c. 33; Adv. Marc., i. 29; De Pudicit., 10) is evidently taken from the Apocalypse. The statements of Hippolytus (Philos., 7, 30) are based upon those of Irenæus. He says that the name (from νικολαίων, "to take possession," and λαος, "people") is to be explained by the fact, that, at an earlier time, not so much stress was laid upon a complete list of the heresies, and by no means proves that the sect had grown up after Justin Martyr and Irenæus wrote. The order in which Irenæus treats them (I. 26, 3; comp. III. 11, 1) indicates that they flourished before Cerinthus, while they anticipated his doctrines. He, however, does not know of any Nicolaitans of his own day; for he does not bring them into connection with any of the heresies he mentions after Basilides (I. 28, 2).

What Tertullian says about them (Pros. c. 33; Adv. Marc., i. 29; De Pudicit., 10) is evidently taken from the Apocalypse. The statements of Hippolytus (Philos., 7, 30) are based upon those of Irenæus. He says that the name (from νικολαίων, "to take possession," and λαος, "people") is to be explained by the fact, that, at an earlier time, not so much stress was laid upon a complete list of the heresies, and by no means proves that the sect had grown up after Justin Martyr and Irenæus wrote. The order in which Irenæus treats them (I. 26, 3; comp. III. 11, 1) indicates that they flourished before Cerinthus, while they anticipated his doctrines. He, however, does not know of any Nicolaitans of his own day; for he does not bring them into connection with any of the heresies he mentions after Basilides (I. 28, 2).

What Tertullian says about them (Pros. c. 33; Adv. Marc., i. 29; De Pudicit., 10) is evidently taken from the Apocalypse. The statements of Hippolytus (Philos., 7, 30) are based upon those of Irenæus. He says that the name (from νικολαίων, "to take possession," and λαος, "people") is to be explained by the fact, that, at an earlier time, not so much stress was laid upon a complete list of the heresies, and by no means proves that the sect had grown up after Justin Martyr and Irenæus wrote. The order in which Irenæus treats them (I. 26, 3; comp. III. 11, 1) indicates that they flourished before Cerinthus, while they anticipated his doctrines. He, however, does not know of any Nicolaitans of his own day; for he does not bring them into connection with any of the heresies he mentions after Basilides (I. 28, 2).

What Tertullian says about them (Pros. c. 33; Adv. Marc., i. 29; De Pudicit., 10) is evidently taken from the Apocalypse. The statements of Hippolytus (Philos., 7, 30) are based upon those of Irenæus. He says that the name (from νικολαίων, "to take possession," and λαος, "people") is to be explained by the fact, that, at an earlier time, not so much stress was laid upon a complete list of the heresies, and by no means proves that the sect had grown up after Justin Martyr and Irenæus wrote. The order in which Irenæus treats them (I. 26, 3; comp. III. 11, 1) indicates that they flourished before Cerinthus, while they anticipated his doctrines. He, however, does not know of any Nicolaitans of his own day; for he does not bring them into connection with any of the heresies he mentions after Basilides (I. 28, 2).
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ment representatives of Jansenism. He translated Pascal's *Provinciales* into Latin, and accompanied the text with very sharp notes and commentaries (1658). In connection with Arnaud he wrote *Logique de Port-Royal*, 1659. Among his original works are the so-called *Petite perpétuite* (1664) and *Grande perpétuite* (1669-76, 3 vols.), in defence of Jansenism, the *Imaginaires* (1664) and *Visionnaires* (1665-66, a kind of imitation of Pascal's *Provinciales*), *Essai de Morale* (1671, 14 vols.), several polemical treatises against Calvinism, etc.

His Life, by Goujet, is found in the last volume of his *Essai de Morale*. See also the histories of Port-Royal by Besogene, Dom Clemencet, and Sainte-Beuve.

C. PFENDEL.

NICOPOLIS was the name of several cities in Asia, Africa, and Europe. That Nicopolis in which Paul determined to winter (Tit. iii.12) must have been either that of Thrace or that of Epirus. The letter *Nicopolis* (which, however, is a later addition, decides for the former, having "Nicopolis of Macedonia"; but most commentators have, with Jerome, decided for the latter, as best agreeing with the travelling-plan of the apostle. The Nicopolis of Epirus was built by Augustus, in commemoration of his victory at Actium, B.C. 31.

NIEBUHR, Carsten, b. in Hanover, March 17, 1733; d. at Meldorf in Holstein, April 26, 1815; studied mathematics at Göttingen; entered the Danish service, and accompanied a Danish expedition to Arabia in 1761. The other members of the expedition died: but Niebuhr carried out its plan with great energy and success; and after his return to Copenhagen, in 1797, he published his *Beschreibung von Arabien* (1772) and *Reisen in Arabien* (1774-78), which are still of value. He is the father of the great historian of Rome, Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1778-1831).

NIEDNER, Christian Wilhelm, one of the most distinguished modern church historians, son of a minister; was b. in Oberwinkel, Saxony, Aug. 9, 1797; d. in Berlin, Aug. 13, 1865. He studied theology in Leipzig; became privatdocent there with the motto: "Nisi dominus, nescio," in 1829, and doctor of theology and ordinary professor in 1838. The same year appeared his work on Hermes, *Philosophie Hermesii Bonennis nocar. rer. in theologia excerpta explicatio et existimatio*. He combined an interest for philosophy and theology, and his lectures on church history were pervaded with the philosophical spirit. After Hildebrand's death (1844) he undertook the presidency of the historical and theological society, founded in 1814, and the editorial care of the *Zeitschrift für die hist. Theologie*. After much hesitation he published a manual of church history, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* (1 vol., Leipzig, 1846, 2d ed., Berlin, 1860). Baur very properly praised the comprehensiveness of this work, the careful investigations of the author, and the clear selection of his material, but deplores the scholastic and ponderous style. Niedner at once took a place at the side of Neander, Gieseler, and Hase, and is distinguished by his philosophical treatment of the details, but falls behind them in the vivid portrayal of character, clear summarization, and skill of arrangement. Niedner held a middle position in theology, and had as little sympathy with Strauss and Baur as with strict confessional orthodoxy. His last published work during his Leipzig residence was *De subsistentia τοῦ Θεοῦ* apud Philonem tributa (Leipzig, 1849). After the revolution of 1848 he resigned his professorship, retired to Wittenberg, where he remained till 1855, when he followed a call to Berlin as professor and Consistorialrat. He was one of those who protested against Scheuchel's *Charakterbild Jesu*. At his death the editorial supervision of the *Zeitschrift für d. hist. Theologie* passed into the hands of Kahnis, who retained it till 1875, when the periodical was superseded by Brieger's *Zeitschrift*. (There was privately printed his *Einleitung in die Geschichte der Philosophie u. Theologie christlicher Zeit, als Wissenschaft u. Lehre.*)

Niedner was a man of almost childlike piety, humble and modest, and thankful for the least attention. He possessed a remarkable industry, at times allowed himself sleep only every other night, seldom took a walk, and "had no time" to get married. In spite of all his immense book knowledge, however, he knew little about the real world, and took no interest in art. He was a great historical investigator, but no writer of history.

P. M. TZSCHIRNER.

NIEMEYER, August Hermann, b. at Halle, Sept. 1, 1754; d. there June 7, 1825. He studied theology in his native city, and was appointed professor there in 1778, and director of all the Franke institutions in 1779. He was a very prolific writer on practical theology and education: *Christliche Religionslehre* (1790), *Grundsätze der Erziehung* (1790), etc. His stand-point was that of a mild rationalism. His son, H. A. Niemeyer, edited the symbolical books of the Reformed churches: *Collectio Confessionum in ecclesiis reformatis publicatum, Lipsiae, 1840*. The Westminster standards were first overlooked, but afterwards published in an appendix (the Latin version, but not the English original).

NIHILISM (from nihil, "nothing") denotes in theology the view that the human nature of Christ had no independence, no individuality, no true subsistence; that, indeed, the human nature of Christ was not consubstantial with the divinity, and was ascribed to Petrus Lombardus. It was condemned in 1179 by Alexander III.

NIKON, b. in a village near Nizhnei-Novgorod, 1606; d. Aug. 17, 1631; was educated in a monastery, and ordained priest; married (which is not against the order of the Russian Church), but separated from his wife after ten years, and lived for some time as a hermit in an island of the White Sea. Appointed archimandrite of the monastery of Novazaskoi by the Czar Aleksi Michael-ovitch, he was, in 1647, made metropolitan of Novgorod, and in 1652 patriarch of Moscow. He was a man of great practical ability, and occupies a prominent place in the history of the Russian Church. Among his principal reforms are the introduction of the Greek Church music, and the revision of the Russian Liturgy, Prayer-Book, and Confession of Faith. Originally adopted from the Greek Church, and simply translated into Old Russian, the very translation was not perfect; and in the course of time a great number of deviations had crept in by the carelessness of copyists, by arbitrary changes, etc. In 1654 Nikon induced the Russian clergy to undertake a revision. The learned apparatus was gathered,
a committee appointed, etc. The work, however, did not meet with universal favor, but gave rise to the sect of the Raskolniks, or Old Believers. In 1658 Nikon fell into disgrace, and retired to the monastery of Woskresenak. In 1666 he was summoned before a synod in Moscow, and formally condemned and deposed. Shortly before his death, a new case against Nikon was called the verdict of the synod, and recalled Nikon; but he died on his way to the monastery. See J. Backmeister: Beiträge zur Lebensgeschichte des P. N., Riga, 1788. [See the graphic account in STANLEY: Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, London, 1861, 2d ed., 1862, reprinted New York, 1862, pp. 497-490; also W. Palmer: The Patriarch and the Tsar; Replies of the humble Nicon, by the mercy of God, Patriarch, against the questions of the Boyar Simon Strehnev; and the answers of the Metropolitan of Gaza Paisius Ligaries, translated from the Russian, London, 1871-75.

NILUS, The, is not mentioned in the New Testament, but often in the Old Testament, though not under its native name. It is called Sihor, or Shihor, “the black stream” (Josh. xiii. 3; Isa. xxiiii. 3; Jer. ii. 18; 1 Chron. xiii. 5); or Year, which in plural form means, not only the river itself, but its affluents, arms, canals, etc. (Ps. lxxvii. 9, 84; Ezek. xxix. 3, xxx. 12); or “the flood of Egypt” (Amos vii. 8, ix. 5); or simply “the river” (Gen. xli. 1; Exod. i. 22, ii. 3). Though intimately connected with the earlier history of the Hebrews (Exod. ii. 3, vii. 20; Num. xi. 5; Ps. cv. 29; Jer. xlv. 7; Zech. xiv. 17), the Nile does not seem to have made so deep an impression on them as the Euphrates.

The Nile proper is formed by the junction of the Atbara or the Black Nile, at Khartoom, in Lat. 15° 40’ N., and the Blue Nile, at Khartoom, in Lat. 17° 45’ N., the Nile descends the Nubian terraces in a very rapid course, forming its last cataract at Assouan, in Lat. 24° 10’ N., on the boundary between Nubia and Egypt. With an average fall of two inches to a mile, and a mean velocity of three miles an hour, it then flows through Egypt to the Mediterranean, separating its affluents, arms, canals, etc. (Ps. lxxvii. 9, 84; Ezek. xxix. 3, xxx. 12); or “the flood of Egypt” (Amos vii. 8, ix. 5); or simply “the river” (Gen. xli. 1; Exod. i. 22, ii. 3). Though intimately connected with the earlier history of the Hebrews (Exod. ii. 3, vii. 20; Num. xi. 5; Ps. cv. 29; Jer. xvi. 7; Zech. xiv. 17), the Nile does not seem to have made so deep an impression on them as the Euphrates.

The Younger Nilus, or Nilus Rossanensis, a Greek by descent, but born at Rossano in Calabria, lived in the tenth century, and represents a very severe form of asceticism. He was a friend of Archbishop Philagotus of Piacenza, the rival of Gregory V., and the victim of Otho III. A life of Nilus, written by M. Caryophylus (Rome, 1824), is found in Act. Sanct., xxvi.

Nilus the Archimandrite (surnamed Doxopatrius) lived for some time in Sicily, and wrote, at the instance of King Roger, his Symagma de quinque patriarchibus chronis, 1149, edited by...
NIMBUS, The, or Glory (sometimes a ring, and sometimes a disk, sometimes of gold and sometimes of some bright color), was placed behind the head of a person, in order to indicate symbolically that luminous irradiancy which was supposed to surround the head of a saint or divine being, and that it was used among the Hindoos and in Egypt, among the Greeks and in Rome, where it finally came to denote simple power. By the Christians it was adopted in the fifth century as a symbol of sanctity. It was first applied to Christ alone, then to the angels, and finally to Mary and the saints. In representations of God, the nimbus is sometimes made triangular, with a reference to the Trinity. The nimbus of persons still living when painted, was square. In the eighth century the apparel was universally used in Christian art.

NIMROD (נִמְרוֹד, Nēmrōd in the Septuagint, Nāmrōd in Josephus) was, according to Gen. x. 8-12 and 1 Chron. i. 10, a son of Cush, a grandson of Ham, and a great-grandson of Noah, a mighty hunter before the Lord, and a great ruler upon the earth, the founder of an empire. The beginning of his kingdom was Babel, together with three other cities in the land of Shinar, — Erech and Accad and Calneh. Out of that land he went forth to Assur, where he built Nineveh and three other cities, — Rehoboth and Calah and Resen, — which finally were united to Nineveh, the whole forming one huge city. The first nine verses of the eleventh chapter of Genesis tell us how the Tower of Babel was erected, and how it was destroyed; the result of which, such as it presented itself in the time of Moses, is laid before us in the table of nations, contained in the tenth chapter. When an old Oriental tradition, which we know from fragments of Berosus, places the building of the Tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues in the tenth generation from Noah, that account agrees perfectly with the chronology of Moses; and when Berosus identified Nimrod with Y�ublus and Artapnus, and some other name, identify him with Bala, it seems quite probable that the glory which surrounded Nimrod made his name Nim, a surname or title of the head of a person, in order to indicate symbolically that luminous irradiancy which was supposed to emanate and surround a divine being. Thus it was adopted in the fifth century as a symbol of sanctity. It was first applied to Christ alone, then to the angels, and finally to Mary and the saints. In representations of God, the nimbus is sometimes made triangular, with a reference to the Trinity. The nimbus of persons still living when painted, was square. In the eighth century the apparel was universally used in Christian art.

NINEVEH.

NINEVEH AND ASSYRIA. I. Opposite the present Mosul, on the eastern bank of the Tigris, rise two artificial hills. The northern one, partially occupied by a Turkish village, is called Kouyunjik. The southern hill is popularly called Nebi Yunus, with reference to the mosque erected on it to the prophet (Nebi) Jonah, but is known by the custodians of the mosque as Nineveh. The distance between the two hills can be walked in a quarter of an hour. The two hills are united on the western side by a wall, which, extending beyond them, terminates at both ends at the channel of the Tigris, which in this locality bends out towards the west. The western wall is two miles and a half long; the northern wall one mile and a third, the eastern wall three miles and a quarter, and the southern wall half a mile.

1 The importance of the following article has seemed to justify the editors in giving it at length, in spite of some repetitions of the article Assyria, vol. i.
The eastern wall is intersected by the River Choser [Khosr], which, flowing through the ruins, passes under Kouyundjik, and empties into the Tigris. South of the Choser, at the point where the road to Bagdad intersects the eastern wall, there are two hills, which without doubt mark the site of the east gate, and will offer a rich reward to some future investigator. Four other walls, and three water-ditches outside of the eastern wall, made that part of the city especially strong. The walls are said to be still fifty feet high in some places. Xenophon found this locality in about the same condition as Botta and Layard, who spent the years 1845-47 and 1849-51 on the spot, discovered the palace of Sennacherib, — the largest yet discovered, with seventy-one rooms and halls. Rassam, in the northern part of the hill, discovered in 1854 the palace of Assurbanipal (the Greek Sardanapalus), whose highly finished bas-reliefs, and rich library of several thousand clay tablets, now form the most precious part of the Assyriological collection in the British Museum. In 1872 George Smith had the good fortune to discover, in the British Museum, upon the clay tablets found piled up in the so-called Lion-hunt room, the Babylonian account of the creation and the flood. Valuable tablets are continually being unearthed; and, in spite of the fact that the British Museum employs many diggers, a hundred years will yet be required, in the judgment of Rassam, to transport all the monuments to England.

The excavations on Nebi Yunus were checked, on account of its being the site of the mosque and a graveyard. Rassam, however, came to an understanding with the custodians of the mosque, and conducted investigations on a limited scale. He has traced three royal palaces,— of Ramannirari III., Sennacherib, and Easarhaddon.

The cuneiform inscriptions furnish us with the following results concerning Nineveh's name and history. The name of the city was Ninua, or Ninus, and was derived from the sacred Name of Babylon, which the Assyrians delighted to use, down to the latest times, to designate temples and palaces. The second syllable, na or nu (lengthened forms nna or nnu), signifies resting or dwelling place. The meaning of the first, ni, is not so clear. Usually the word signifies "fatness," "abundance." At any rate, thus much is plain, that Ninua, or Ninus, has no etymological affinity with the Assyrian nahu ("fish"). As regards the founding of Nineveh, the cuneiform inscriptions say nothing; but it could not have happened long after that of the city of Assur. The third oldest Assyrian king of whom we in any manner have information, the famous Ninurta-nadin-ea (about 1760 B.C.), erected a temple in Nineveh, or rather "restored" it. A temple of Nebo and Merodach was also built at Nineveh at an ancient period, and perhaps by Ramannirari. According to Smith, Salmanassar I. (about 1300 B.C.) built a palace here, and made it the seat of government. Assur-nazirpal and his son, Salmanassar II., rebuilt temple and palace; and, at the close of the latter's reign, Nineveh rose at the head of twenty-six other cities, including Assur, against him, following the lead of his son, Asur-dannin-pal. Salmanassar's other son, Samsi-Raman III., put down the rebellion, ascended the throne, and adorned the temple of Istar. His son, Ramannirari III., built a new temple for Nebo and Merodach. All these buildings were erected on the site now occupied by the hill Kouyundjik. Ramannirari III. built the first palace at Nebi Yunus. Tiglath-Pileser II. built a palace at the bend of the River Choser. Sargon built a new royal city, but rebuilt the temple of Nebo and Merodach, as bricks bear record. Nineveh's most glorious period is associated with the name of his son, Sennacherib. In a cylinder inscription he calls Nineveh the, "lofty city, the darling city of Istar, where all the precious things (?) of the Land are kept, the continuing spot, the eternal foundation, the place adored with art, where every kind of work of art, all that is precious and beautiful, is gathered, where, time out of mind, the kings, the ancestors of my fathers, exercised rule over Assyria, and received the annual tribute of princes from the four quarters of the globe." He continues to speak of these public works, which he began in 702 B.C., and on which he employed an immense body of prisoners of war. Tearing down the old palace, he rebuilt it on a much larger scale, with gold and silver, alabaster and ivory, palm, cedar, and cypress wood, and encompassed it with a park, with trees and fountains, and a lake. He dug canals to supply the park with water. In 691, in spite of his campaigns, he instituted water-works on a grand scale to supply the city with water. Eighteen canals were dug leading into the Choser; so that its stream was very appreciably augmented. Sennacherib also encircled the city with high walls,— "which were not before that time,"— built a second palace where Nebi Yunus now is, and another large building for his chariots, etc. Easarhaddon finished, not later than 673, a new palace, and rebuilt Sennacherib's stables. Assurbanipal, the last Assyrian king but one, enlarged and adorned the Bit rešît, or royal harem at Kouyundjik, the palace in which Easarhaddon was born, but avoided building the terrace too high, out of reverence for the temples of the gods." This sketch of the buildings of Nineveh may be closed with the mention of the great eastern city gate, through which many triumphal processions passed, and the suburb Rēbit Ninâ ("city Rehoboth," Gen. x. 11) which was outside the walls.

The houses of the people were probably huts of clay covered with gypseum, such as are found now in Mosul. Clay formed the chief article in...
the composition of the palaces. Nineveh was also not far removed from quarries of marble and alabaster, and in this respect enjoyed a great advantage over Babylon. The architecture of Nineveh was copied after that of Babylonian. The height of her palaces has been much discussed. Rassam has recently expressed himself in favor of the view that they were two stories high, and believes the walls of the lower story were four or five feet thick, and made of bricks plated with tablets. The inner rooms, like the library of Assurbanipal, either were destitute of windows altogether, or had them in the roof.

II. CALAH [spelt by Delitzsch, Kelach]. — This was another principal city of Assyria. It is now represented by an imposing wall, with traces of fifty-eight towers on the north side alone, and an artificial hill in the southern corner, four hundred by six hundred yards. A village in the vicinity bears the name Nimrod. The distance from Kouyunjik is twenty miles. In the northwestern corner of the hill are the ruins of the great temple tower, laid bare by the excavations of Layard. A ditch separated it from the northwestern palace of Assurbanipal, one of the most perfect of the Assyrian structures, and adorned with well-preserved sculptures, which now adorn the British Museum. The immense winged bulls and lions at the entrance, and other sculptures, were left by Layard, and may still be seen. Another palace — the central palace — is near by, and in it was found the celebrated black obelisk of Salmanassar II. Not far off is the southwest palace of Esarhaddon, which has been much injured by fire. There is also the south-east palace of the last Assyrian king, Assur-etil-ilani-akini. It is much smaller than the others. Rassam found underneath it the ruins of an older building. In 1878 the same Assyriologist discovered the temple of Assurbanipal close by the northwest palace, but in complete ruin. Calah (Gen. x. 11, 12) was built, according to the cuneiform inscriptions, by Salinanassar I. (1300 B.C.). His successors abandoned it until Assurbanipal (about 880 B.C.) introduced its golden period by the construction of a temple and palaces.

III. The plain on which Nineveh and Calah are situated is sown with small hills full of ruins. The following points are furnished, by the Arab found in this locality, to the name Keremlis, Birtelleh, and Bellawat. The last place, which is fifteen miles east of Mosul, and nine miles north-east of Ninmod, has sprung into importance since Rassam's excavations in 1878. An Arab found there in 1876 some bronze tablets containing Assyrian pictures and inscriptions. They contain an illustrated history of the first nine centuries of the reign of Salmanassar II. (860-823), which are of inestimable value for the insight they afford into the civil life, military organization, etc., of the time. They also inform us that the site of Balawat was occupied by the Assyrian city Imgur-Bel, and was founded by Assurbanipal. The city of Rees, mentioned in Gen. x. 12 as being between Nineveh and Calah, is, in my opinion, to be identified with the hill Selamijeh. The name has not yet been discovered on the inscriptions.

IV. ASSUR. — Assyria Proper extended from the beginning farther south; and its oldest capital, Assur, was a good deal farther down the stream, about sixty English miles from Mosul, and on the right bank of the Tigris. Its site is now marked by the large hill Kileh-Shergat (Rassam, Kala-Shergat). The ruins are in the utmost confusion, but it would require unlimited means and great labor to investigate them thoroughly. English and French parties have instituted several different excavations, but Rassam (1853) is the only one who has met with success. He discovered the palace of Tiglath-Pileser (about 1120 B.C.), and three octagon clay prisms, whose inscriptions are the oldest accounts of any length, dating from early Assyrian times. The oldest temple in Assur was built by the first Assyrian king, Belkapsakapu (about 1870 B.C.), as bricks from its foundations state. Samas-Raman I. built, in 1818 B.C., the Anu and Raman temple, which Tiglath-Pileser rebuilt six hundred years later, Rammannirari I. and Salmanassar I. likewise built palaces there. Tiglath-Pileser's son, Asurbelkala, resided in Assur; and Assurbanipal restored the great palace of Sargon II., which outlived the Assyrian kingdom, from a cylinder of Cyrus, which mentions it in the list of the cities he conquered. The Old Testament does not mention Assur, and its identification with Elasr (Gen. xiv. 1) is usually discarded. Wherever the term Asshur is used, it designates the country.

The following points are furnished, by the cuneiform inscriptions, in respect to the city and country of Assur. The oldest Assyrian settlement founded by Babylonian colonists, probably only a few centuries before 2000 B.C., was designated with a name of the sacred language of Babylonia, Ausar, which probably means "a watered, or well-watered meadow," — a name which the banks of the Tigris at Kileh-Shergat fully merited. The god of this settlement would naturally be their principal divinity; and it early passed into the good god Assur, a good Semitic word, from 'atar ("to go out, go forward, succeed"). An additional s was inserted to compensate for the length of the vowel. The name of the god Assur occurs twice in the Old Testament — in the compounds, Esarhaddon and Assnapper (Ez. iv. 10 = Asturbanipal).

V. The impression which Genesis (x. 8-12) leaves, that the Assyrians were a colony from the Babylonians, is fully confirmed by the excavations. We will here give the main reasons for the assumption that the Assyrians were Semmites and Babylonians. The classification of Assur as Shem's second son is corroborated by the statues and relief pictures, which represent the Assyrians with facial contour quite similar to that of the Jews and Arabs of to-day (Kiepert). A second proof is the Assyrian language, which is pure Semitic, though not Arimantic. The active commerce, from the ninth century B.C., of the Assyrians with nomadic tribes speaking Arimantic, accounts for Rabshakeh (2 Kings xvii. 26) understanding Hezekiah's commissioners; and it is expressly stated in the cuneiform inscriptions, that Assyrians high in office understood the Arimantic as well as their own tongue. The As-
NINIAN.
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NITZSCH.

Syrian characters are likewise the same as the Babylonian; not merely cuneiform, but derived from the oldest Babylonian cuneiform style, and, for the most part, wholly identical with it. The Assyrian architecture was likewise derived from the Babylonian. And, finally, one of the most important proofs is the religion. The Assyrian pantheon, Assur alone excepted, is identical with the Babylonian. The gods Bel, Dagon, Samas, with which the oldest royal Assyrian names are compounded (Belkapkapu, Isgam-Dagan, Samsi-Raman), were well known in Babylon. Ramanirari (about 1300 B.C.) calls his helpers Anu, Assur, Samas, Raman, and Istar. Tigitla-Piloens I. invokes Assur, Bel, Sin, Samas, Raman, Adar, and Istar, "the great gods which rule heaven and earth." Salmanasar II. glorifies, in his obelisk inscription, Assur, and then (following the Babylonian list), Anu, Bel, Ašš, Sin, Samas, Raman, Marduk, Adar, Nergal, Nusku, Beltis, and Istar. The religious customs and conceptions of the Assyrians were also substantially those of the Babylonians.

For further details and for the history, I must refer the reader to the art. SENNACHERIB. [For the lit. see Assyria.] FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH.

NINIAN, or NINIVAS, the 7th poet of the Southern Picts; went, according to the Act. Sanct. Sept., vol. v. p. 318, to Rome in 370, and was ordained by Pope Siricius in 394. The words of Bede, however (Hist. Eccl., iii. 4), allow a somewhat later date for the activity of Ninian; and historical circumstances seem to fix it at the middle of the fifth century.

NIÓBA. See Monophysites.

NIRVANA. See Buddhism.

NIŠAN. See Year, Hebrew.

NIŠROCH (Hebrew, יִשׁרוֹךְ; the Sept., 'Aqoph, 'Aqoph, 'Aqoph, etc.; Josephus: Ant., X. 1, 5, 'Aqoph) is mentioned in 2 Kings xix. 37 and Isa. xxxvii. 38 as a divinity worshipped at Nineveh at the time of Sennacherib. In his temple, and while praying to him, Sennacherib was killed by his own son. The derivation of the name is very uncertain. It does not occur in the cuneiform inscriptions. As a curiosity, it may be mentioned, that the rabbins know that the idol of Nisroch was present also at the first Moravian ordination on American soil, administered by Nitschmann; and the great simplicity, as well as solemnity, of the act, made him forget the seventeen hundred years between, and imagine himself in one of those assemblies over which Paul the tent-maker or Peter the fisherman presided (Wesley's Journal, i. p. 20). In the course of his subsequent life, Bishop Nitschmann undertook many journeys on land, and fifty voyages on sea, in the interests of the church of his fathers and for the spread of the kingdom of God. He labored in different parts of Germany, in Livonia, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, in Great Britain, in Georgia, North Carolina, New York, and Pennsylvania. "The walk," says Zinzendorf, "was single, his character upright, his authority over against the world great, his zeal a witness of Jesus untiring, and his success in organizing churches remarkable." Cf. SCHWEINITZ: Fathers of the American Moravian Church, Bethl., 1881. E. DE SCHWEINITZ.

NITSCHMANN, John, a bishop of the Moravian Church; b. in Schönau, Moravia, 1708; d. May 6, 1772. He was made bishop in 1741, and labored in America (1749-51), England (1752-57), Germany, and Holland. He was simple in his habits, effective as a preacher, and wise as an administrator.

NITZSCH, Karl Immanuel, one of the most distinguished representatives, in the nineteenth century, of the school of theology occupying an intermediate position between the old supernaturalism and rationalism (Fermittungstheologie), and, next after Schleiermacher, the first (in time, at least) of the systematic writers on practical theology; was b. at Borna, Saxony, Sept. 21, 1787; d. in Berlin, Aug. 21, 1868. His theological training was secured at Wittenberg, where his father, Karl Ludwig Nitsch (see below), was professor; and he became dean in 1810 with his dissertation, De testamantia divodem patriarcharum, lib. v. test. pseudograph., and in 1811 was ordained as assistant pastor of the Schlosskirche. He remained uninterruptedly at his post during the siege and bombardment of the town by the French in 1813. In 1817 he was appointed professor in the recently founded seminary at Wittenberg, and in 1822 accepted a call to the university of Bonn. He had received the degree of D.D. from Berlin in 1817; the occasion being his fine scholarship, and some dissertations in the Theologische Studien, which he edited (1816). In 1829 he published his System der christlichen Lehre (6th ed., 1851), of which an English translation was made by Robert Montgomery and Hennen, Edinburgh, 1849. This work defined his position towards rationalism, supernaturalism, and Schleiermacher. He said himself that he had "learned more from his father, Daub, and Schleiermacher than from any other teacher, but had been obliged to draw
back from them all more or less.” While he differed from Schleiermacher in the doctrine of God’s relation to the world, the divine attributes, etc., he also substituted for Schleiermacher’s “Christian consciousness” the Word of God itself. Notwithstanding these differences, however, he was willing to be placed at the side of Twesteu as the principal representative of Schleiermacher’s theology; and he was never tired of magnifying that theologian’s services in making a sharp distinction between metaphysics and theology. In this period, Nitzsch wrote his able reply to Möhler’s work on symbols (Eine protestant. Beantwortung der Symbolik Möhlers), and made valuable and frequent contributions to the Theolog. Studien u. Kräften, under the editorial care of Ullmann and Umbreit. The most of these dissertations appeared, after the author’s death, under the title Gesammelte Abhandlungen von Dr. K. I. Nitzsch, Gotha, 1870.

During the Bonn period (1822–47), Nitzsch also acted as university preacher, and took a very active participation in ecclesiastical affairs, such as the revision of the Liturgy, and the measures looking to the union of the Lutheran and Reformed communions. Of such he was heartily in favor, and in its interest wrote, among other things, Urkundenbuch d. evang. Union (Bonn, 1853) and Würdigung d. von Dr. Kuhnis gegen d. evang. Union u. deren theol. Vertreter gerichteten Angriffe (Berlin, 1854).

Nitzsch was called in 1847 to the university of Berlin, where he continued to labor as professor till his death. He was also honored with a seat in the highest ecclesiastical council (Oberconsistorium, changed in 1852 to the Oberkirchenrat) and was elected a representative to Parliament in 1849. In 1854 he was appointed provost of St. Nicolai Church, — a valuable sinecure. On June 16, 1860, he was permitted to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of his theological activity, and on June 24, 1868, his golden wedding. The most important literary work of the Berlin period, yearly of his entire life, was his Practical Theology (Praktische Theologie), begun in 1847, and finished in 1867 (second ed. 1859). The first book treats of the theory of church life; the second, of the practice at the present time. Besides these various works, volumes of sermons also appeared from his pen, a complete revised edition in 1867.

Nitzsch was a theologian “from the crown of his head to the sole of his feet.” He was not brought up in pietistic circles, and so did not develop the theory of Christianity out of his experience, but vice versa. Niebuhr once said to him, “I would willingly give all my learning if I had your faith.” To this Nitzsch replied, “To me, from a moral point of view, Thomas stands as high as Peter.” See Breytshlag: K. I. Nitzsch eine Lichtgestalt d. neueren deutsch-evang. Kirchengeschichte, Berlin, 1872.

NITZSCH, Karl Ludwig, professor of theology at Wittenberg; b. in Wittenberg, Aug. 6, 1751; d. there Dec. 5, 1831. He studied at the university of Wittenberg, and, after filling several pastorates, was appointed, in 1790, professor of theology there, and pastor of the city church. He was an ardent follower of Kant, and vigorously opposed the supernaturalists by regarding the essence of Christianity as consisting in its being a moral and rational religion, and faith in Christ as a subordinate matter. His principal treatises were collected in two volumes, De discrimine revelationis imperatoriae et didactice prolusionis academicae, Viteb., 1830.

NO (Ezek. xxx, 14), or, more completely, No-Amon (Nah. iii. 3). The biblical name of the old famous city of the “hundred gates” (Homer: Iliad., 9, 388), in Upper Egypt, which the Greeks called Thebes. The biblical name is formed after the Egyptian nu-amen (“the place of Amon”), the place in which Amon was worshipped, and is aptly rendered in the Septuagint by Μανων, or Σιαμων, as the Greeks liked to compare their Zeus with the Egyptian Amon. The Greek name is formed after the Egyptian ταμώ (“head”), or τε-απί (“the great”). Thebes was one of the oldest cities in Egypt: its foundation is never spoken of. In the dawn of history, it was the centre of a sacerdotal kingdom. With the twelfth dynasty, the first Theban, it comes to the foreground; and the twentieth dynasty, the second Theban, ruled not only in Thebes and Upper Egypt, but also in Memphis and Lower Egypt: its members were called “kings of both Egypt.” During the third dynasty, the invasion of the Hyksos brought on a period of decay; but in the seventeenth century B.C., Amosis of Thebes, the founder of the eighteenth dynasty, liberated the country from the barbarian invaders. Thebes then became the splendid centre of a magnificent kingdom. Situated on both sides of the Nile, at a point where the valley forms a plain of about ten miles breadth, it covered an area of a hundred and forty stadia in circumference, and contained a number of the most stupendous architectural constructions,—the temple of Amon, the royal tombs, the catacombs, etc. With the twenty-first dynasty, however, the royal families from Lower Egypt succeeded those from Thebes; and when, about one thousand years B.C., the residence of the Pharaohs was moved to the Delta, the splendor of the city was gone. It still continued a holy city, a city of glorious monuments and magnificent institutions; and its actual decay did not begin until the days of the Persian conquest. At the time of Strabo it began to fall into ruins, and at present all that is left of it is some huge mounds of débris. See Calloign: Voyage à l’Oasis de Thèbes, Paris, 1821; Wilkinson: View of Ancient Egypt and Topography of Thebes, London, 1835.

RUTSCHE.

NOACHIAN PRECEPTS. See Noah.

NO’AH AND THE FLOOD. Noah, the son of Lamech (Gen. v. 28 sq.), was the tenth and last in the list of the Sethite line. His father gave him the name “Noah” because of his piety. On the day that Noah saw that the destruction of the Flood was about to come he gathered together all the animals of the earth, twelve couples of each kind, and put his family aboard. Noah’s life fell in a time of general degradation and vice. God determined to destroy that generation, and limited its continuance to a period of a hundred and twenty years from the time he informed Noah of his purpose. This is the meaning to be put upon Gen. vi. 3. The Flood took place when Noah was six hundred years old (Gen. vii. 11); so that, at the time of receiving this revelation, he was four hundred and eighty years old. According to the Hebrew text, this event took place 1,656 years after the
creation: according to the LXX., 2,442; according to the Samaritans, 1,907. Noah was a "just man" (Gen. vi. 9), consecrated to God with his whole heart, and the fact seems to have implied in 1 Pet. iii. 20 (comp. Heb. xi. 7). The wonderful structure on which he worked was itself a sermon. If he communicated with all his generation about the coming evil, he must have preached repentance; but his message found no reception.

The ark, which was divided into three stories, was 300 cubits long, 50 cubits broad, and 30 cubits high [or, allowing 21 inches for a cubit, as Professor Perowne does in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, 525 feet long, 87 feet wide, and 52 feet high]. The dimensions of "The Great Eastern" were 681 feet long (on deck), 99 broad, and 89 deep. To him in his Commentary on Genesis, has calculated that the cubic contents were 3,600,000 feet, and shown, that, if nine-tenths of the space was set apart for the fodder (Gen. vi. 21), 6,600 pairs of animals could be stowed away, with 54 cubic feet for each pair. In 1609 the Mennonite P. Tiele, in his Commentary on Genesis, has calculated that the cubic contents were 3,600,000 feet, and shown, that, if nine-tenths of the space was set apart for the fodder (Gen. vi. 21), 6,600 pairs of animals could be stowed away, with 54 cubic feet for each pair. In 1609 the Mennonite P. Tiele, in his Commentary on Genesis, has calculated that the cubic contents were 3,600,000 feet,

The ark was not built for sailing, but for carrying freight. [Sir Walter Raleigh said, "It is very probable that the ark had fundum planum (a flat bottom), and was not rayed in form of a ship, with a sharpness forward to cut the waves for the better speed." The same author made an elaborate calculation of the stowage, and found that the ark afforded room for eighty-nine distinct species of beasts, or, lest any should be omitted, for a hundred several kinds. All the beasts, he thought, "might be kept in one story or room of the ark, in their several cabins, their meat in a second, the birds' and their provision in a third, with space to spare for Noah and his family and all their necessaries.

Noah entered into the ark, with his wife, his three sons and their wives, on the tenth day of the second month of the sixth hundredth year of his life. On the seventeenth day of the month the "fountains of the great deep were broken up" (Gen. vii. 11). The Flood had begun. The rain continued to fall for forty days, and the rise of the waters continued a hundred and fifty days (Gen. vii. 17-24). Noah stepped out upon the ground that its summit is covered with scoria on the flanks of Mount Ætna, which show no marks of water action, the probability that certain classes of marine animals now living could not have continued to exist at so great a depth of water as the flood would have necessitated, etc. There are other difficulties in the way of a universal flood; such as the difficulty of including all the kinds of animals now existing in the freight of the ark, the peopling of the entire earth with animals, etc.]

On the first day of the tenth month the tops of the mountains became visible. Noah sent out a raven, which did not return; a dove, which found no rest for her feet; a second dove, which flew back with an olive-leaf in her mouth; and a third dove, which did not return. On the twenty-seventh day of the second month, a year and ten days after the beginning of the rain, Noah received the commandment to leave the ark. The account of the Flood in Genesis consists of an Elohistic and a Jehovistic record, but they agree perfectly with each other.

An important confirmation of the biblical record is furnished in the traditions of other nations. The most interesting of these records was found by George Smith, among the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions of the British Museum, which is much more full than the account of Berosus, and be-
trays a striking coincidence with the record of Genesis. Fragments of three copies of this original account, dating from 600 B.C., are also preserved. They belonged to the library of King Assurbanipal. The inscription of Smith is assigned by this scholar to the seventeenth century B.C. Siat (Hasiadra), an old Chaldaean king, takes the place of the Xisuthros of Berosus and the Noah of Genesis. He describes the godlessness of the world, the divine command to build an ark, its construction, the flood, the resting of the ark upon a mountain, the despatch of the birds, including the raven, etc. In these points the Chaldaean account agrees with the record of Genesis. But there are certain differences which are very suggestive. Like the other accounts, the Chaldaean ascribes the scene to a locality connected with its own special habitation, and brings it into close relation with its national origin. The biblical account is in these respects more general, but, on the other hand, alone gives the indications of time, month, day, and year when it began, when it ended, etc.; and these marks of time stand in no relation whatever to the feasts of the Jews. In these omissions and additions we have a strong pledge of the accuracy of the historian.

(Nägelsbach, in the first edition of Herzog, thus summarizes the traditions of the Flood, and refers to the literature. (1) The West Asian Traditions. — The Chaldaean (see above), Syrian (Lucian., De Dea Syria, xiii.), Phoenician (San-chuniathon, ed. Orelli, p. 32 sq.), Phrygian, in the legends of Annakus (Zenob., Proc, 6, 10; Stephan. Byzant., De Urbibus), and on the celebrated coins of Apamia. These coins have the picture of the emperor (Severus, Macrinus, or Philip) on one side, and on the other the picture of an ark or chest rocking upon the water, with the inscription NU (“No”). A man and a woman are standing in the ark, and looking out of a window in the roof; on the outside, another man and woman are standing, in the attitude of having left the ark. Two birds are also depicted,— one flying towards the ark with a branch in its claw; the other resting on the ark. (2) The East Asian Traditions. — The Persian is little known. It is doubtful whether the Chinese have any tradition of a universal flood. Some, however, recognize in it the flood of Jao. The Indian tradition is the most elaborate. The oldest form is given in the Catapatha-Brahmana. Man is saved in an ark from a flood which covers the whole earth. The Divine Being, to whom he owes his escape, appears to him in the form of a fish. Later forms are found in the Mahabharata. See Néve: La tradition hindoue du déluge dans sa forme la plus ancienne, Paris, 1831. (3) Traditions of the Classic Nations. — The Greeks knew of several great floods. Two are especially noteworthy, that of Ogyges (Varro, De rust., iii. 1; Servius, Virg. Eclog., vi. 14;Jul. Africanus, in Euseb. Prep. Ec., x. 10, etc.), and that of Deucalion and Pyrrha (Pindar, Od., ix.; Ovid, Metam., i. 290–415, etc.). Plato, in the Timaeus, speaks of the Egyptians as likewise knowing about the Flood. (4) Traditions of Other Nations. — The Celts had the tradition that all except Dwiran and Dwirach were forsaken at the Flood. Noah lived 350 years after the Flood, and died 950 years old. Thereafter the length of human life gradually diminished. Shem was 600 years old at his death; Arphaxad, his son, who was born after the Flood, only 438. Peleg, in the fifth generation, only attained to the age of 299; and after him there is no example of any who reached a higher age than 200.

NOMOCANON. In the Greek language, κώστος or κώστος κώστος meant the legislation by the church: νόμος, the legislation by the secular government, — the emperor. As the imperial legislation concerning the church grew very large and very important, it became necessary, or at least convenient, to combine all νόμος of ecclesiastical import with the κώστος, thereby producing a complete collection of ecclesiastical legislation, — a nomocanon. The first collection of this kind was made in the sixth century; a second was begun in the seventh, completed in the ninth by P. Simon, bishop in the same locality, and was eminent as a preacher and philanthropist. He published sermons: Notes of a Tour in Switzerland, Essay on Christian Baptism (1849), Letters on the Church of Rome (1851), and sundry others, besides A Selection of Psalms and Hymns (1852, enlarged, 1853), and Hymns about Jesus (1869). Many of these were his own. F. M. BIRD.

NOEL, Hon. and Rev. Gerard Thomas, an elder brother of the above; was b. Dec. 2, 1782; and d. at Romsey, Feb. 24, 1851. He studied at Edinburgh and Cambridge, and was settled at Redwell, Herts; Rainham, Kent; and Richmond, Surrey. In 1834 he was canon of Winchester, and in 1840 vicar of Romsey. He published sundry sermons, a hymn-book, and Arendelt, sketches and poems. Two of his hymns are very graceful, and have been widely used. F. M. BIRD.

NOELLES, Louis Antoine de, b. May 27, 1751; d. May 4, 1799; was educated for the church, and made bishop of Cahors 1779, bishop of Chalons 1800, archbishop of Paris 1805, and cardinal 1790. In 1693 he accepted the Réflexions morales of Quesnel, but in 1696 condemned the Exposition de la foi, by Barcet. The bull Unigenitus he at first openly opposed; and for some time he stood as one of the leaders of the Jansenist party. But in 1720 he assented to a compromise, and in 1728 he accepted the bull. See S. PERE AU Vibrancy: Mémoires chronologiques el dogmatiques, Paris, 1730; VILLEFORE: Aneéolales ou mémoires sur la constitution Unigenitus, Paris, 1750; BAUSSET: Histoire de Fénelon, Paris, 1808; Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire eccles. pendant le 18 siècle, Paris, 1806-15.

NOBLE, Samuel, Swedenborgian, b. in London, March 4, 1779; d. there Aug. 27, 1833. In 1810 he was one of the founders of the London society for publishing the works of Swedenborg. In 1820 he left his profession of engraving for the Swedish ministry in London. He issued two noticeable original books, originally lectures, — Pienary Inspiration of the Sermon, and An Appeal in behalf of the Doctrines of the New Church, 2d ed., 1838, — and a translation of Swedenborg's Heaven and Hell.

NOCTURNS. See Canonical Hours.

NOD (height), a city of the priests in Benjamin (1 Sam. xxii. 19), north of, and so near to, Jerusalem, that the Holy City was visible from it (laid out by them for a tabernacle, there, and there Ahimelech gave David the shew-bread and the sword of Goliath). Saul was so enraged by this conduct, that he destroyed all the inhabitants of the city, with the exception of Abiathar, who escaped (1 Sam. xxii., xxii.). There were, possibly, some Nobs; but the one meant in the narrative cannot be identified with any existing place; yet its site seems indicated by some cisterns and old graves upon the ridge to the north of the Upper Kidron valley. Cf. Mührlin, in Riehm's Handwörterbuch.

NOAILLES, Louis Antoine de, b. May 27, 1751; d. May 4, 1799; was educated for the church, and made bishop of Cahors 1779, bishop of Chalons 1800, archbishop of Paris 1805, and cardinal 1790. In 1693 he accepted the Réflexions morales of Quesnel, but in 1696 condemned the Exposition de la foi, by Barcet. The bull Unigenitus he at first openly opposed; and for some time he stood as one of the leaders of the Jansenist party. But in 1720 he assented to a compromise, and in 1728 he accepted the bull. See S. PERE AU Vibrancy: Mémoires chronologiques el dogmatiques, Paris, 1730; VILLEFORE: Aneéolales ou mémoires sur la constitution Unigenitus, Paris, 1750; BAUSSET: Histoire de Fénelon, Paris, 1808; Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire eccles. pendant le 18 siècle, Paris, 1806-15.

NOAILLES, Louis Antoine de, b. May 27, 1751; d. May 4, 1799; was educated for the church, and made bishop of Cahors 1779, bishop of Chalons 1800, archbishop of Paris 1805, and cardinal 1790. In 1693 he accepted the Réflexions morales of Quesnel, but in 1696 condemned the Exposition de la foi, by Barcet. The bull Unigenitus he at first openly opposed; and for some time he stood as one of the leaders of the Jansenist party. But in 1720 he assented to a compromise, and in 1728 he accepted the bull. See S. PERE AU Vibrancy: Mémoires chronologiques el dogmatiques, Paris, 1730; VILLEFORE: Aneéolales ou mémoires sur la constitution Unigenitus, Paris, 1750; BAUSSET: Histoire de Fénelon, Paris, 1808; Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire eccles. pendant le 18 siècle, Paris, 1806-15.

NOAILLES, Louis Antoine de, b. May 27, 1751; d. May 4, 1799; was educated for the church, and made bishop of Cahors 1779, bishop of Chalons 1800, archbishop of Paris 1805, and cardinal 1790. In 1693 he accepted the Réflexions morales of Quesnel, but in 1696 condemned the Exposition de la foi, by Barcet. The bull Unigenitus he at first openly opposed; and for some time he stood as one of the leaders of the Jansenist party. But in 1720 he assented to a compromise, and in 1728 he accepted the bull. See S. PERE AU Vibrancy: Mémoires chronologiques el dogmatiques, Paris, 1730; VILLEFORE: Aneéolales ou mémoires sur la constitution Unigenitus, Paris, 1750; BAUSSET: Histoire de Fénelon, Paris, 1808; Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire eccles. pendant le 18 siècle, Paris, 1806-15.
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NONCONFORMISTS, The, in the narrower sense, those clergymen of England who were ejected from their livings, and suffered other hardships, after the restoration of the Stuarts, in 1660. The designation is also applied to all members of sects in England and Wales as opposed to the members of the Church of England, because they do not conform to the religious usages of the national ecclesiastical body. In this sense the term is synonymous with dissenters. After the restoration, Charles II., in spite of promises to the contrary, and his Parliament, proceeded to insist upon conformity to the doctrines and practices of the Church of England. Four acts completed the legislation against all who refused to conform. In 1662 the Act of Uniformity was passed, requiring all clergymen to give their assent to the Book of Common Prayer. In 1664 the Convocation Act was passed, declaring it to be unlawful to be present at any religious meeting, not conducted according to the usages of the Church of England, where more than five persons in addition to the family were convened. In 1665 the most oppressive of these edicts, the Five-Mile Act, was passed, which enjoined upon nonconformists an oath against taking up arms against the king, or attempting any alteration of government, either in Church or State, and forbade all who refused to come within five miles of any corporation represented in Parliament, or place where they had preached, on penalty of a fine of forty pounds and six months' imprisonment. The Test Act of 1673 incapacitated every person from holding any public office who had not publicly taken the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the usages of the Church of England. These acts occasioned great hardship. The bulk of the great living throughout the country were deprived of their benefits, and among them were some of the most pious, learned, and eminent divines of the day; such as John Howe, Baxter, Flavel, and Philip Henry. The court bishops fully sympathized with this legislation. The bishops of Norwich and of Stillingfleet condemned it. The severity of these odious laws was relaxed by James II., who was anxious to secure toleration for the Roman Catholics, William, and subsequent sovereigns. In 1687 the Declaration of Indulgence was passed, suspending the penal laws against the nonconformists. Two thousand clergymen were released from jails, and restored to their flock. Under Walpole, in the first half of the eighteenth century, the other laws against the nonconformists remained inoperative, though he dared not or cared not to repeal them. The parliamentary legislation of recent times has relieved not only the Protestant nonconformists, but also the Roman Catholics (1829), and Jews (1858), from their disabilities.

NONJURORS, those members of the Church of England who refused the oath of allegiance to William and Mary in 1689, on the ground that they were bound by their oaths to James II.
and wrote, among other volumes, Reason and Religion, Christian Blessedness, Practical Discourses, and A Philosophical Discourse concerning the Immortality of the Soul. His Miscellaneous, consisting of Poems, Essays, etc., the Preface is dated 1878, and nine editions appeared from 1837 to 1730. According to Mr. Cattermole, "few have equaled Norris in the union of learning and sensibility, metaphysical and logical, with sublime piety."

NORTH AMERICA. See Canada, Mexico, United States.

NORTH, Brownlow, a distinguished evangelist of the Free Church of Scotland; the son of a clergyman of the Church of England, and grandson of Brownlow North, brother of Lord North, and Bishop of Winchester; was b. Jan. 6, 1810, at Chelsea; d. Nov. 9, 1875, at Tullibehewan, near Edinburgh. He spent six years at Eton, where he was known as an inveterate smoker; and during the period when Thebes was the residence of his in-laws he was a great and splendid city for many centuries, even during the period when Thebes was the residence of the living has been so utterly destroyed, the very site became uncertain, until fixed by the Serapeon, the Apeis tombs, and the numberless graves, with their inscriptions and reliefs, still remain. See Lepsius: Denkmäler aus Aegypten, ii. 1; and Ebers: Aegypten, 1879-80, i. 183, ii. 172, 174, etc. RÜSTOSCHI.

NORTHERN, Isaac, Ph.D., eminent Jewish scholar, b. at Memeladorf, near Erlangen, Germany, 1809; d. in New-York City, Nov. 3, 1842. He took his degree at the University of Munich, 1834. Coming to New York, 1835, he was that year appointed professor of Oriental languages at the University of New-York City; and from 1838 to 1841 was instructor in Hebrew in the Union Theological Seminary in that city, notwithstanding his persistent maintenance of his Hebrew faith. He was one of the best Hebrew scholars America ever had, as is evidenced by his works: Hebrew Grammar, New York, 1838-41, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1842; Chrestomathy, 1838; and pt. 2 of a Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance, 1842 (in connection with Dr. S. H. Turner). NORMAN ARCHITECTURE. See Architecture.

NORRIS, John, a Platonic divine and poet; b. 1657; d. at Bemerton, in Wilts, 1711. He was a fellow of All Souls' College in Oxford. In 1692 he was rector of Newton St. Loe in Somersetshire; and, latterly, of Bemerton, where George Herbert had been one of his predecessors. He was one of the ablest Unitarians, and Bishop of Winchester; was b. Jan. 6, 1810, at Chelsea; d. Nov. 9, 1875, at Tullibehewan, near Edinburgh. He spent six years at Eton, where he was known as an inveterate smoker; and during the period when Thebes was the residence of his in-laws he was a great and splendid city for many centuries, even during the period when Thebes was the residence of the living has been so utterly destroyed, the very site became uncertain, until fixed by the Serapeon, the Apeis tombs, and the numberless graves, with their inscriptions and reliefs, still remain. See Lepsius: Denkmäler aus Aegypten, ii. 1; and Ebers: Aegypten, 1879-80, i. 183, ii. 172, 174, etc. RÜSTOSCHI.

NORTHERN, Isaac, Ph.D., eminent Jewish scholar, b. at Memeladorf, near Erlangen, Germany, 1809; d. in New-York City, Nov. 3, 1842. He took his degree at the University of Munich, 1834. Coming to New York, 1835, he was that year appointed professor of Oriental languages at the University of New-York City; and from 1838 to 1841 was instructor in Hebrew in the Union Theological Seminary in that city, notwithstanding his persistent maintenance of his Hebrew faith. He was one of the best Hebrew scholars America ever had, as is evidenced by his works: Hebrew Grammar, New York, 1838-41, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1842; Chrestomathy, 1838; and pt. 2 of a Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance, 1842 (in connection with Dr. S. H. Turner). NORMAN ARCHITECTURE. See Architecture.

NORRIS, John, a Platonic divine and poet; b. 1657; d. at Bemerton, in Wilts, 1711. He was a fellow of All Souls' College in Oxford. In 1692 he was rector of Newton St. Loe in Somersetshire; and, latterly, of Bemerton, where George Herbert had been one of his predecessors. He was one of the best Hebrew scholars America ever had, as is evidenced by his works: Hebrew Grammar, New York, 1838-41, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1842; Chrestomathy, 1838; and pt. 2 of a Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance, 1842 (in connection with Dr. S. H. Turner).
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NORTH, Brownlow, a distinguished evangelist of the Free Church of Scotland; the son of a clergyman of the Church of England, and grandson of Brownlow North, brother of Lord North, and Bishop of Winchester; was b. Jan. 6, 1810, at Chelsea; d. Nov. 9, 1875, at Tullibehewan, near Edinburgh. He spent six years at Eton, where he was known as an inveterate smoker; and during the period when Thebes was the residence of his in-laws he was a great and splendid city for many centuries, even during the period when Thebes was the residence of the living has been so utterly destroyed, the very site became uncertain, until fixed by the Serapeon, the Apeis tombs, and the numberless graves, with their inscriptions and reliefs, still remain. See Lepsius: Denkmäler aus Aegypten, ii. 1; and Ebers: Aegypten, 1879-80, i. 183, ii. 172, 174, etc. RÜSTOSCHI.
his critical opinions, yet a believer in the supernatural, and an opponent of Theodore Parker. His book upon the Gospels (The Evidence of the Gospels, Boston, 1837-44, 3 vols. 2d ed., Cambridge, 1848, abridged ed., 1867, 1 vol.) is a standard work in America and England. He demonstrates to the satisfaction of most scholars that the Gospels were written at the received dates and by their accepted authors, and therefore are trustworthy documents. Besides his great work, he wrote A Statement of Reasons for not believing the Doctrine of Trinitarians concerning the Nature of God and the Person of Christ, Cambridge, 1835, new ed., with Memoir by Dr. W. Newell, Boston, 1856, 11th ed., 1876; On the Latest Form of Infidelity, 1839; Tracts concerning Christianity, Cambridge, 1852. Two posthumous publications deserve mention,—Internal Evidence of the Genuineness of the Gospels, Boston, 1855; and A Translation of the Gospels, with Notes, ed. by his son, 1855, 2 vols. (not thought successful). But these titles display only a portion of his literary activity. Among the publications with the highest esteem, the most important is his Review, Christian Examiner, and other periodicals. He was a poet of no mean order of merit; and "his few hymns, which appeared at intervals from 1809 to 1833, have been," says Professor Bird, "highly esteemed and largely used." Specimens of his poetical gifts will be found in Gniswold's Poets and Poetry of America. He edited the Miscellaneous Writings of Charles Eliot, 1814, and of Levi Frisbie, with Memoir, 1823. See Memoir, in Statement of Reasons, etc., mentioned above, and art. in Allibone's Dict. Eng. Lit., vol. ii. s. v.

NORTON, John, b. at Stortford, Hertfordshire, Eng., May 6, 1808; d. in Boston, Mass., April 5, 1863. He was educated at Cambridge; took holy orders; embraced Puritanism, and emigrated to Plymouth, New England, October, 1835, and preached at Plymouth, Ipswich, and Boston. He wrote against the Quakers, The Heart of New England rent at the Blasphemies of the present generation (Cambridge, 1859), by which they were greatly exasperated.

NORWAY comprises an area of 122,279 square miles, with 1,802,172 inhabitants, of whom 1,794,968 are Lutherans, according to the last census of 1876. Christianity was introduced in the country in the tenth and eleventh centuries by Olaf Trygvason (995-1000) and St. Olaf (1014-31), both of whom had received baptism in Ireland. But, as the principal means of propaganda was the sword, the people remained Pagan at heart long after they had officially become Christian. In 1152 the country obtained its own metropolitan,—the Archbishop of Nidaros (the present Trondheim), who had four suffragan bishops under him,—Oslo, Bergen, Stavanger, and Hainner. In the twelfth century the title was introduced; in the thirteenth, the practice of celibacy: but the Roman-Catholic Church never became very powerful in the country. As Norway was united to Denmark from 1387 to 1814, and, during the last three centuries, governed as a Danish province, the two countries had for that period church and church history in common. The Reformation was introduced in Norway in 1536. The Norwegian Church became a State establishment, an exact copy of the Danish. A prominent feature of it was its intolerance. No other denomination than the Lutheran was tolerated. When Norway separated from Denmark, in 1814, and was formed into an independent kingdom in union with Sweden, its new constitution did not liberalize these articles of organization of the Church. It continued to be necessary to belong to the Lutheran Church in order to hold any kind of government office; and conversion from Lutheranism to another denomination was punished with exile. Later changes, however, point in a more liberal direction. By a law of July 16, 1845, other Christian denominations obtained freedom of worship: by a law of July 21, 1851, the Jews were admitted, etc. The chief spiritual movements within the pale of the Norwegian Church were due to H. N. Hauge and N. F. S. Grundtvig, which articles see.

NORWICH (city of England, ninety-eight miles north-east from London) became the seat of a bishopric transferred from Thetford, 1094. Its cathedral was commenced in that year by Bishop Herbert Losinga, and completed by Bishop Perry in 1096. Its tower was restored in 1856. It is chiefly distinguished for the historical importance of its present bishop, of which the writer of this dissertation is Hon. and Rt. Rev. J. T. Pelham, D.D., who was consecrated 1857; and his stipend is £4,500.

NOSSEL, Johann August, a learned theologian; b. at Halie, May 2, 1734; d. at Halie, March 11, 1807. After studying at the university of his native town, where he came more especially under Baumgarten's influence, he travelled for two years, and, returning to Halie, was made professor in 1760. In 1779 he was elected to preside over the theological seminary. His principal department was the New Testament. He published a defence of the truth and divinity of the Christian religion (Vertheidig. d. Wahrheit u. Göttl. christl. Religion, Halle, 1786, 5th ed., 1783), but in later years withdrew from the orthodox standpoint, and denied the necessity of satisfaction. His reputation as a scholar was enhanced by the purity of his character. His modesty interfered with his becoming a prolific author. See Niemeyer: Leben Nosselt, Halie, 1809. HEINRICH DÖRING.

NOTKER, the name of several distinguished monks of the convent of St. Gall. —I. Notker Balbulus was b. about 840, in the vicinity of Thur, and not in Eng. as the untrustworthy Life of Notker (Vita s. Notkeri), by Ekkehart V. in the thirteenth century, states; d. April 6, 912, at St. Gall. He is the author of the Martyrologium which goes under his name, and which he based upon a similar work of Ado of St. Gall. His fame rests upon his Sequelae, many poems of high merit, and written in a peculiar measure. Forty-one of these are found in the St. Gall Codex, No. 484, of the tenth century. Between 881 and 887 he dedicated the Sequences to Bishop Liutward of Vercelli, chancellor of Charles III., in a letter giving interesting details of their composition. A miniature portrait of Notker, dating from the tenth century, is preserved by the Zurich Antiquarian Society. He was canonized in 1513. See Meyer von Knobau: Commentary to Ekkehart IV: Causa s. Galli. The Sequences are given by Pez: Thesaurus monast., 1. 18-42. —II. Notker Medius, or Pipus (Crus,白衣修士), who wrote an account of his severe discipline, hospitarius in St. Gall 965; d. Nov. 12, 975. His medical attainments were so great, that he was called to the
court of Otto I. He was also known as a poet and painter, and was distinguished as “the most be-
dignor doctor.” — III. Notker, Provost of St. Gall, Bishop of Lüttich in 912, a
statesman as well as a scholar; d. April 10, 1008.
— IV. Notker Laber, the most famous teacher and
scholar of the St. Gall convent; d. of the plague,
June 29, 1022. He wrote the Libri expositionum,
a series of expositions and translations of bibli-
tical, theological, and classical writings. Among
these were the De consolatione and De trinitate
of Boethius, Virgil’s Bucolics, Aristotle’s Categories,
Job, the Psalms, etc. His translations won for
him the title Transonicus; and, according to Wack-
ernagel, his German style is pure and flowing.
[See SEQUENCES.] MEYER VON KNONAU.
NOTRE DAME (our lady), the French de-
signation of the Virgin Mary; and therefore a fre-
quently a name for Roman-Catholic churches in France.
One of the finest specimens of Gothic archite-
cture in the world is the cathedral of Notre Dame in
Paris.
NOTT, Eliphalet, a distinguished American
clergyman and educator, president of Union Col-
lege; was b. of poor parents in Ashford, Conn.,
June 25, 1773; d. at Schenectady, Jan. 29, 1860.
His parents, who were farmers, died while he was
a boy. While he lived with his brother, the
Rev. Samuel Nott of Franklin, Conn., he stud-
ed the languages and mathematics, and taught
school. At the age of seventeen he entered
Brown University, and at twenty-two was licensed
with eminent dignity and ability. When he en-
tered upon his duties, the institution had only
fourteen students, and was in great pecuniary
straits. Under his management it became one of
the strongest literary institutions in the country,
and thirty-seven hundred students graduated dur-
ing his presidency. DURING his time it be-
came the most awful supernatural events looked quite
ordinary to his eyes. His best works, however,
are his GeistlicheLieder, in which the peculiar
sweetness and tenderness of his nature, the early
prudence and natural science at Jena, and held
for some time a position in the Thuringien
salines, but afterwards retired from practical
life, partly on account of ill health, and devoted
himself exclusively to literature. He was an in-
timate friend of Tieck and Schlegel; and his
unfinished romances,— Heinrich von Ofterdingen
and Die Lehrlinge zu Sais,— and his Hymnen an
die Nacht, represent him as one of the extreme
leaders of the Romantic school, seeing a miracle
in the most common natural occurrences, while
the most awful supernatural events looked quite
ordinary to his eyes. His best works, however,
are his GeistlicheLieder, in which the peculiar
sweetness and tenderness of his nature, the early
teachings of the Moravian Brethren, to whom he
belonged, his intimate intercourse with Zinzen-
dorf and Lavater, and the esthetic principles
and tendencies of the Romantic school, are in-
cluded into perfect harmony. They were trans-
lated into English (Spiritual Songs) by George Mc-
donald, London, 1876. His complete works were
edited by Tieck and Schlegel, Berlin, 1862, with
an addition, 1874. See CARLYLE’S ESSAY ON NO-
VALIS, in his Miscellanies Writings, ii.
NOVATION. The whole Latin tradition, with
the exception of those theologians of the fourth
century who stood under Greek influence (Dama-
 dus, Prudentius, the Decr. Gelats., etc.), calls the
great schismatic Novatianus; while by Greek
authors his name is generally written Nocatianus.
Only Dionysius of Alexandria calls him Nocatia-

Notre Dame, 1669

NOVATION.

According to Philostorgius (Hist. Eccl., viii. 16),
copies are strongly opposed to duelling.” This
sermon has been republished in Fish’s Pulpit
 Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century, 1857. Dr.
Nott published Counsels to Young Men (New York,
1810, and often) and Lectures on Temperance (Al-
bany, 1847, new edition by McCoy, 1857), the
Resurrection of Christ, with notes by Professor
Tayler Lewis (new edition, New York, 1872). He
was a prominent advocate of the temperance
cause; and of his Lectures on Temperance Dr. Pea-
obody said, “These lectures constitute the most
able, thorough, and efficient argument that has
yet been constructed for the disuse of all intoxic-
ating liquors” (North-American Review, xxxiv).
See Memoirs of Eliphalet Nott, D.D., LL.D., by
Van Santvoord, revised by Professor Tayler
Lewis, New York, 1876.
Novatian was a native of Phrygia. Probably, however, this notice rose from the circumstance that he afterwards found many adherents in Phrygia; or perhaps it was purposely manufactured in order to give a connection between him and the Montanists. With respect to his life before the schism, we depend entirely upon the spiteful and mendacious letter of Cornelius (Ep. ad Fabiam Antioch.). Cyprian, Pseudo-Cyprian, and Socrates give very little, and Eulogius is wholly unreliable. The plain facts seem to be these: during a severe illness, which even made the aid of an exorcist necessary, Novatian received the clinical baptism without any consecutive episcopal confirmation. Such a form of baptism, however, was not generally recognized as valid; and, when he was ordained a presbyter by a bishop of Rome (either Fabian or his predecessor), his ordination, we are told, met with great opposition, both among the clergy and the laity, on that account. Otherwise he enjoyed great reputation in the congregation for learning and eloquence, as may be gathered from the letters of Cyprian (55, 24; 51, 2; 60, 3; 49, 2); and his official activity, as well as his private life, must have been without blemish, since Cornelius found only one dark spot to point to. At the time, he tells us, when the persecution was at its height, Novatian kept himself shut up in his house; and, when the deacons admonished him to come to the aid of those who were in danger, he became angry, and threatened to resign his office, alleging at the same time, as an excuse for his behavior, that he belonged to "another philosophy." The story is proved false by the simple fact, that after the martyrdom of Fabian (Jan. 29, 230), Novatian took charge of the official correspondence of the congregation. And, as for the equivocal expression, "another philosophy," it later on became a favorite trick among his adversaries to represent his conceptions of sin and penance as the outcome of the Stoical philosophy, simply in order to cover up their own deviation from the principle hitherto held by the church. In reality he had as little to do with the Stoical philosophy as they themselves. The origin and further development of his views are not doubtful. Idolatry, adultery, fornication, murder, were punished in the Catholic Church by formal excommunication. This practice was first broken by the peculiar power which was ascribed to the confessors,— in accordance with an archaic idea which lived on to the end of the third century,— and then by an edict of Pope Calixtus I., which spoke of re-admittance into the church as a possibility. The edict caused the schism of Hippolytus; but, as the schism was healed towards the middle of the third century, it seems probable that the successors of Calixtus returned to the old, more rigorous practice. At all events, it must be observed that the new and milder views were applied only to sins of the flesh. As none who in the peaceful period between 220 and 250 relapsed into Paganism was likely to ask for re-admittance into the Christian Church, idolatry was left entirely out of consideration. But, with the outbreak of the Decian persecution, a great change took place. The number of the lapsed became so great, that the very existence of the congregations was endangered. It was, however, by no means a simple practical consideration which compelled the church to change its practice. The dogmatical development led it in the very same direction. If, namely, the church, with its institution, were an indispensable means of grace extra quam nulla salus, how could it be hoped that God would ever re-admit into grace a sinner to whom the church had refused absolution and reconciliation? Indeed, when individual man could enter into relation with God only through the priest, his salvation became absolutely dependent on his connection with the clergy and the church. Now, it is very true that these ideas did not reach their full development until the end of the Decian persecution (see Cyprian: De unitate ecclesiae and De lapsis); but it is also true that the whole doctrinal and constitutional development of the church had for a long time tended towards that point. The very practice (generally adopted throughout the church in 250) of absolving the penitent lapsed immediately before death was a move, perhaps unconscious, in the direction indicated; and there is absolutely nothing which indicates that originally Novatian was either theoretically or practically opposed to the movement. After the death of Fabian, in the beginning of the Decian persecution, no new bishop was elected in Rome. As he could probably not be elected without his being given to the police (Cyprian: Ep. 55, 9), he would be sure to be immediately put to death; and thus it happened that the see remained vacant for fifteen months. During the interval, the congregation was represented and governed by the college of presbyters and deacons, which, when complete, consisted of fifty-three persons (Eusebius: Hisc. Eccl., VI. 43, 11). Among those members of the college who are known to us, Novatian stands in the first rank; while the name of the later bishop, the presbyter Cornelius, is never heard of. Of special interest for the history of this interval are the three letters which the Roman clergy issued, and which have come down to us in the correspondence of Cyprian (8, 30, 36). The second of those letters is certainly written by Novatian, and it may be plausibly assumed that he also wrote the two others. In the first, the Roman clergy state, that, though they have separated from the lapsed, they have by no means abandoned them. On the contrary, if any penitent falls sick, and wishes to enter again into communion with the church, they re-admit him. Cyprian recognized the maxim as authoritative. In Ep. 15-17 he never speaks of the dying; but in Ep. 18 he acknowledges, and quotes the letter from Rome in his support, that the dying must be re-admitted. Thus it was Rome which first turned the Bishop of Carthage in the direction of mildness and forbearance. In the second letter, the Roman clergy state, that, in agreement with other bishops present in Rome, they have adopted a middle course with respect to the lapsed, and that no new disciplinary measures will be adopted until after the election of a bishop; which implies, that, from principle, Novatian, the writer of the letter, was not opposed to the introduction of new measures. The three letters show, as does the correspondence between Cyprian and the Roman confessors Moses, Maximus, etc., that at that time there reigned perfect
agreement, both in Rome itself and between Rome and Cyprian. Indeed, down to the spring of 251, not the slightest foreboding can be found of the coming schism in Rome.

But in March, 251, Cornelius was elected bishop of Rome. He was elected by a majority, and, as it would seem, in accordance with all accepted rules. Nevertheless, there was in Rome a minority, composed of several persons of the highest standing and most revered confessors, which was unwilling to accept the issue of the election, but put forward Novatian as anti-bishop, and had him ordained by three Italian bishops. Thus the schism began. It is evident, however, that though Cornelius represented the lazer, and Novatian the stern, portion of the congregation, there was, in the beginning of the contest, no theoretical point of controversy, but simply a conflict between two persons. On the one side, a theoretical difference between Cornelius and Novatian is, in the correspondence between Cyprian and Cornelius (Ep., 43, 58), even not hinted at until Ep. 54; and from the beginning to the end Cyprian confines himself to lamenting the fact of the schism, without entering upon a condemnation of the theory of the schismatics. On the other side, it has been shown above, that Novatian was not from principle opposed to the re-admittance of the lapsed; and this is furthermore proved by the letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to Novatian (Eusebius: Hist. Eccl., VI. 45) and by Pseudo-Cyprian (Ad Novatianum, 14). The contest began as a merely personal conflict, and Cornelius proved the more fortunate. In the spring of 251, even before he could leave his place of refuge, and return to his congregation, Cyprian was, by the schism of Felicissimus, compelled to abate his rigor, and consent to the re-admittance of the lapsed. This step naturally placed him on the side of Cornelius, though Novatian and the confessors Maximus and Moses had hitherto been his supporters in Rome. He recognized Cornelius, though not in so precise and unqualified terms as the latter wished. Their friendship, however, soon became firmly cemented by the arrival of Novatus in Rome. Novatus was a zealous adherent of Felicissimus, and one of the most decided partisans of the schismatics. The reason he in Rome joined Novatian, though on the point in question he held the very opposite views, cannot now be made out; but the circumstance contributed much to bring Cornelius and Cyprian nearer to each other. In the summer of 251 the confessors left Novatian, and returned to the Catholic Church; not, as Cyprian says, deceived by the cunning, lies, and perjuries of the schismatical and heretical beast Novatian, but, as they say themselves, in order to restore peace and unity to the church. The loss was, nevertheless, of great effect on the position of the schismatical community in Rome. In other countries, quite a number of bishops rejected the laxer practice. Some joined Novatian, though without breaking with the church: others simply declared in favor of him. In Fabius of Antioch he found a very warm friend; but he died just before the great Oriental synod convened at Antioch, and the milder views were adopted by that assembly. Nevertheless, the schism gradually assumed very dangerous proportions in the East, the views of Novatian finding many adherents in Egypt, Armenia, Fontus, Bithynia, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Syria, Arabia, and Mesopotamia.

In the beginning of the controversy the question was not about the casus moris, or the sacrificing, or the relation of the bishop to the presbyters and confessors, or the efficacy of penitence, etc. It is simply a stubbornly repeated calumny, that Novatian or his party ever declared that the church could not abandon the lapsed to the world, to heresy, and to schism; that the excommunicated could not be saved, the calumny appears to have had its reason. Though all those questions were raised and answered during the progress of the schism, the true principle at stake in the controversy was that of the power of the keys. The great ruling party received its theory from Cyprian, though that theory was fully developed only in the West, and not until the time of Augustine. In a general way the party argued, that Scripture enjoined mercy and love; that the church could not abandon the lapsed to the world, to heresy, and to schism; that the excommunicated could not be saved, that it was unjust to demand penitence without promising absolution, etc. But none of those arguments were decisive to Cyprian. His argument was, that, since salvation could be obtained only through the church, every one who was definitely severed from her must necessarily perish. Consequently, to refuse the communion of the church to any one who had not definitely separated himself from her would be an anticipation of the judgment of God; while the re-admittance of a lapsus could in no wise prevent God from still refusing him salvation. On the other side, when Novatian considered it the right and the duty of the church to exclude forever all heavy sinners, and denied her power to give absolution to the idolater, it is apparent that his idea of the church, of the absolution of the church, of the right of the priest, in short, his idea of the power of the keys, is another than that held by his adversaries. The church is to him, not the conditio sine qua non for salvation, an institution educating mankind for salvation, but the congregation of saints, whose members are the very existence is for what reason he in Rome joined Novatian, though on the point in question he held the very opposite views, cannot now be made out; but the circumstance contributed much to bring Cornelius and Cyprian nearer to each other. In the summer of 251 the confessors left Novatian, and returned to the Catholic Church; not, as Cyprian says, deceived by the cunning, lies, and perjuries of the schismatical and heretical beast Novatian, but, as they say themselves, in order to restore peace and unity to the church. The loss was, nevertheless, of great effect on the position of the schismatical community in Rome. In other countries, quite a number of bishops rejected the laxer practice. Some joined Novatian, though without breaking with the church: others simply declared in favor of him. In Fabius of Antioch he found a very warm friend; but he died just before the great Oriental synod convened at Antioch, and the milder views were adopted by that assembly. Nevertheless, the schism gradually assumed very dangerous proportions in the East, the views of Novatian finding many adherents in Egypt, Armenia, Fontus, Bithynia, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Syria, Arabia, and Mesopotamia.
either in miserable delusion, or in bursting asunder the whole existing Christendom.

According to Socrates (Hist. Eccl., IV. 28) and some later Cathari (see Eulogius in Photius: Biblioth., 208, 280), Novatian suffered martyrdom. But the report is doubtful; and the acts, dating from the sixth century, are spurious. During the next two generations, after the Dacian persecution, the Church of the Cathari became consolidated. Many Manichaean congregations joined it, especially in Phrygia. In constitution and doctrine, the Church of the Cathari became consolidated. The difference between the Catholic Church and the Church of the Cathari was very small.

Besides the question of discipline,—which the Novatian bishops Asclepiades formulated thus, “For deadly sins the Catholics excommunicate clergymen, but we also laymen,”—the question of the second marriage also acquired some importance, especially in regions formerly occupied by the Manicheans. Novatian himself never forbade it, and in the West it was generally allowed. With respect to the extension of the schismatic church, notice, for Spain, Pacian; for Gaul, the polemical work of Bishop Reticius of the fourth century; for Upper Italy, Ambrose (De paenitentia); for Rome, where, in the fifth century, the Novatians had a bishop and many churches, Socrates (Hist. Eccl., V. 14, VII. 9, 11); for Mauritania, Alexandria (where they also had a bishop and several churches), Syria, Paphlagonia, Phrygia, Bithynia, Scythia, etc., Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. In Constantinople they had three bishops, with the principal events of their lives. At the Council of Nicea the Novatian bishop Arians was present. He accepted the decisions of the council concerning the faith and the Easter controversy, and was treated with much regard by the council. But the emperor did not succeed in alluring him and his party back into the bosom of the church. Ten years later, however, when Constantine had somewhat changed his theological views, he placed the Novatians in rank with the Manichæans and Valentinians, forbade the Novatians to worship in public, and ordered their books to be burnt. During the Arian controversy the relation between the Novatians and the Catholic Church was generally good, as the former showed no inclination toward that heresy. But the danger was hardly over, before the Catholic Church began persecutions. In Rome, Innocent I. closed their churches, and Celestine I. forbade them to worship in public. In the East, however, the party lived on until the sixth or seventh century.

Lit. — Novatian was the first theologian of the Church of Rome who developed a comprehensive literary activity in the Latin language; but of his works, only his De Sabbato, De Circumcisione, and De Trinâtâ have come down to us. Of great importance for the history of the schism are the Letters of Cyprian, Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., VI. 43—VII. 8.), Socrates (who was at one time suspected of having been a Novatian), the polemical work of Eulogius, of which large extracts are found in Photius (Cod. 182, 208, 280). Of modern representations, the best is still Walch: Ketzerhistorie, ii. 185—298. Adolph Harnack.

Novatianus, Novatus. See Novatian.

Novice. See Novitiate.

Novitiate denotes the term of initiation and probation in a religious house before taking the vows. According to Con. Trid., Sess. xxv. c. 15, de regul. et mon., it shall last a full year or more; vows taken earlier are not valid. As long as the vows have not been taken, the novice has a right to go back into the world, and the monastery has no other claim on the property of the novice than what is necessary for the re-imbursement of its expenses. During the novitiate the novice cannot dispose of his or her property in favor of the monastery; and, if he or she dies, the monastery is not the heir.

Nowell, Alexander, Dean of St. Paul's, and one of the most eminent ecclesiastics and preachers of the Elizabethan period; was b. at Read Hall, Whalley, County of Lancaster, 1507 or 1508; d. in London, Feb. 13, 1602. He was educated at Middleton, near Manchester, and at Brasenose College, which he entered at thirteen. He was the “chamber-fellow” of Foxe the martyrologist, and was made bachelor of arts in 1536. In 1543 he was appointed master of Westminster School, London, he being the second incumbent of that position; was licensed to preach in 1550; preached in some of the “notablest places and auditoriums of the realm;” and in 1551 received a stall at Westminster. He adopted the principles of the Reformation, and, at the accession of Mary, fled to the Continent, where he tarried at Strassburg and Frankfurt, in intimate intercourse with the exiles, who subsequently became eminent under Elizabeth. Returning to England at Elizabeth's accession, he was made archdeacon of Middlesex, and canon of Canterbury in 1550; was appointed one of the commissioners to visit several of the dioceses, and dean of St. Paul's. It was during his incumbency, on June 4, 1551, that the spire of the cathedral was burned. Nowell was henceforth regarded as one of the first scholars in the realm, and took a prominent part in all ecclesiastical matters. In 1563 he was chosen prolocutor of the convocation of Canterbury, and presided over those sessions which revised and settled the Articles of Religion. In 1565 he had a controversy with Dorman, who attacked Jewell’s Apology. His services were in great demand on all public occasions and at the funerals of eminent men. He was chosen to make the first public announcement from the pulpit of the destruction of the Armada before the lord-mayor, aldermen, etc. Izaak Walton says Nowell was “noted for his meek spirit, deep learning, prudence, and piety,” and mentions with sympathetic approval his devotion to angling, in which he is said to have spent one-tenth of his time. Nowell is the author of one or more catechisms, which were “allowed and approved” by Parliament. In 1563 The Catechism was presented to the upper, and a Catechismus puerorum to the lower, house of convocation. Whether these were identical, or two different catechisms (and in this case both written by Nowell), it is difficult to determine. Churton holds to the latter view. In 1571 a catechism by Nowell was printed in Latin. It was prescribed by Archbishop Parker to be taught; and it heads a list of books for the extirpation of heresy, which the University of Oxford prescribed in 1579. It is also probable that Nowell was the author of The Church Catechism. See
NOWELL, Laurence, brother of the former, and Dean of Lichfield; entered Brasenose College, 1536; d. October, 1576. He was a learned Anglo-Saxon scholar, and left a dictionary of Anglo-Saxon in manuscript.

NOYES, George Rapall, D.D., Unitarian, b. in Newburyport, Mass., March 6, 1798; d. in Cambridge, Mass., June 3, 1868. He was graduated at Harvard College 1818; studied theology there, and was licensed 1822; pastor at Brookfield and Petersham, Mass.; from 1840 till his death, Hancock professor of Hebrew and other Oriental languages, and Dexter lecturer on biblical literature in Harvard University. He was a fine scholar, especially in sacred philology, and published original translations, with notes, of Job (Cambridge, 1827, 2d ed., Boston, 1838), Psalms (Boston, 1831, 2d ed., 1846), the Prophets (1833-37, 3 vols., 2d ed., 1843), Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles (1846), the New Testament, from Tischendorf's text (7th and 8th editions, 1865). The latter was complete in manuscript at the time of his death; but its publication was partly posthumous, as the proofs were read by its author only as far as Philippians. Dr. Ezra Abbot carried it through the press, and edited the remainder of the translation, appending a few notes. The text is divided into paragraphs, but not into verses, which are merely indicated by numerals upon the margin. The translation is characterized by critical exactness, good taste, and a reverent spirit.

NUMBERS. See Pentateuch.

NUN, NUNNERY. The word “nun” is most probably derived from the Coptic nonnas (“holy”), which in early medieval Latin was applied both to monks (nonnas) and to nuns (nonna). Other appellations were mona, monacha, monialis, etc. Even in the first century of its history, the Christian Church had its female ascetics, as well as its male ones. They were called virgines Deo sacrata (“virgins consecrated to God”), and lived with their families, though in retirement, and devoting themselves to practical piety in the service of the poor and the sick. They were consecrated by the bishop, who received their vow, and presented them with their peculiar garments,—the sombre-colored mantle, the veil, and the gold-embroidered head-dress (mitrel). The transition from asceticism to monasticism took place at the same time and in the same manner among the female ascetics as among the male ones, and associations of female ascetics, or nuns, occur in the times of Jerome and Ambrose. They stood under the supervision of the bishops, from whom they also received their rules. Their daily worship they performed in a domestic oratory, and only on Sundays they visited the neighboring church. In the sixth century, however, they obtained their own cloister-churches, in which service was performed by a special priest; and absolute or almost absolute seclusion from the world gradually became one of the most prominent features of female monasticism. At the head of the nunnery stood an abbess, a prioress, or a mother-superior. See Monastery.

NUCIO. See Legate.

NUREMBERG, The Religious Peace of. At the close of the diet of Augsburg (Nov. 19, 1530), it was apparent that the emperor, Charles V., had decided to regulate the religious affairs of Germany according to his own will, even though it might be necessary to use armed force. Consequently, early in 1531, the Protestant princes met at Schmalkald, and concluded there an alliance for armed defence. In a short time, however, the situation was completely changed. The Protestant princes sought and found support in France; and the Turks, under Soliman, threatened to invade Hungary and Austria. Without the aid of the Protestant princes, the emperor could not hope to make any successful defence against the Turks; and in the spring (1532), he opened negotiations with them. Those negotiations led to the so-called “religious peace of Nuremberg” (July 28, 1532), by which the status quo was confirmed and guaranteed until a general council could be convened. For the Protestant cause, this peace was a decisive victory.
of the Jordan. The third kind is found, but smaller. The second is the Valonia oak, with a massivetrunk, and great height. Of this kind were the famous "oaks of Bashan" (Isa. ii. 12, 13; Zech. xi. 2). Its acorns are very large, and are eaten by the poor; and their cups, which are used by tanners, are exported. This oak is found only in Northern Palestine, and east of the Jordan. The third kind is found, but rarely, in Samaria and Galilee.

Oaks are present in the religious practices of Oriental and Occidental nations. Idols were made of oak (Isa. xiv. 14), and oak marked places of sacrifice (Hos. iv. 18; Isa. i. 29), and also of burial (Gen. xxxv. 8; 1 Sam. xxxi. 13). To-day the evergreen oak is usually found near the Welles, or prophets' tombs. In the lands of the Goths and the Cossacks the oak was venerated, and Winfred excited intense horror by cutting down an enormous oak sacred to Thor. So above all other trees. Oak-groves were their temple, and indeed the very name Druid probably means strong. There are three species of oak in Palestine,—Quercus pseudo-coccifera, Q. agllops, and Q. infectoria. The first is the prickly evergreen oak, of which a fine specimen is "Abraham's oak," near Mamre, which is twenty-three feet in girth; but the tree ordinarily is not higher than twelve feet: its leaf is like the holly's in shape, but smaller. The second is the Valonia oak, with a massivetrunk, and great height. Of this kind were the famous "oaks of Bashan" (Isa. ii. 12, 13; Zech. xi. 2). Its acorns are very large, and are eaten by the poor; and their cups, which are used by tanners, are exported. This oak is found only in Northern Palestine, and east of the Jordan. The third kind is found, but rarely, in Samaria and Galilee.

Oaks play a part in the religious practices of Oriental and Occidental nations. Idols were made of oak (Isa. xiv. 14), and oak marked places of sacrifice (Hos. iv. 18; Isa. i. 29), and also of burial (Gen. xxxv. 8; 1 Sam. xxxi. 13). To-day the evergreen oak is usually found near the Welles, or prophets' tombs. In the lands of the Goths and the Cossacks the oak was venerated, and Winfred excited intense horror by cutting down an enormous oak sacred to Thor. So above all other trees. Oak-groves were their temple, and indeed the very name Druid probably means strong. The oak was the symbol of the Supreme Being,—Hesus. The mistletoe, which grew upon the oak, represented man in his dependent state; and it was cut with imposing ceremony in December of each year.

OATES, Titus, the inventor of the famous Popish Plot; b. at London about 1619; d. in London, July 23, 1705. The son of a Baptist clergyman, he studied at Merchant Taylors' school and Cambridge, and entered the Baptist ministry; afterwards took orders in the Church of England; was a chaplain in the navy; and entered the Roman-Catholic Church, tarrying for some time in the Jesuit houses of Valladolid and St. Omer. He was expelled from these institutions for misconduct: but, while he was an inmate, he had heard of a meeting of Jesuits held in London; and "on his expulsion," as Mr. Green says, "this single fact widened in his fertile brain into a plot for the subversion of Protestantism and the death of the king." About this time (1678) there was a great deal of suppressed anxiety among the Protestants of England in view of the machinations and activity of the Roman Catholics, and the well-known sympathy with them of Charles II., and especially the Duke of York, heir to the throne. Oates took advantage of this state of the public mind, and claimed to have evidence of a huge Popish Plot for the extirpation of Protestantism. He brought the matter to the notice of the king, who probably smiled at it, and made public affidavit to the alleged facts before Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, declaring he had been intrusted with letters touching the Jesuit plans. The excitement over the revelations was intense. Lord Shaftesbury, who had just been released from prison, for political reasons fell in with the popular feeling, and exclaimed "Let the treasurer cry as loud as he pleases against Popery, I will cry a note louder." The popular agitation was increased to frenzy by the murder of Godfrey, which was construed into an attempt to stifle the plot. The two houses of Parliament instituted an investigation of the matter. Five peers, including Arundel and Bellasays, were sent to the Tower. Patrols guarded the streets; chains were drawn across them, the houses supplied with arms, etc. Parliament at the end of the year (1678) passed a bill excluding Roman Catholics from both houses, which was left unrepealed for a century and a half. The excitement was beginning to subside, when one Bedloe, stimulated by the reward which had been offered, appeared on the scene, and again aroused the national frenzy to its former intensity by more circumstantial and aggravating revelations than those of Oates. He swore to a plot for the landing of an army and the massacre of the Protestants. Oates had been treated like a hero, and assigned rooms at Whitehall, with a pension of twelve hundred pounds. But a revulsion of public feeling took place after the execution of Stafford in 1680; and the Duke of York, whom he had severely accused, secured a verdict for defamation of character. Oates was condemned to pay a fine of a hundred thousand pounds, and sent to prison. On the accession of the duke to the throne, he was further punished by being put in the pillory, and whipped from Oldgate to Newgate, and from thence to Tyburn. It is said his back received seventeen hundred lashes. Taken back again to prison, he recovered, and, at the accession of William and Mary, the conviction of Oates was declared to have been illegal, and he was not only pardoned, but granted an annual pension of four hundred pounds.

There is no doubt that there was an intense activity on the part of the Roman Catholics to re-affect their supremacy in England in the latter years of the reign of Charles II. Not only the Duke of York, but Charles himself, sympathized with the movement. But that there was any well-defined conspiracy to land an army in England, and massacre the Protestants, is usually denied by historians, and Titus Oates declared a shameless impostor. See the histories of England, especially Green: History of the English People, iii. 421 sqq.
symbolical customs connected with the oath can hand under the thigh " (Gen. xxiv. 2, xlvii.29). And it may refer to the peculiar sacredness of that number: notice the offering of seven animals in the patriarchal period (Gen. xxi. 28); the seven planets (Pausan., Deut. xxxii. 40) ; and thence the phrase, "to lift the hand," gradually became synonymous with "swearing" (Exod. vi. 8). Whether the Hebrew word פורפワイン ("to swear") has reference to any other symbolical customs connected with the oath cannot now be made out. Its root is פורה ("seven"), and it may refer to the peculiar sacredness of that number: notice the offering of seven animals in the patriarchal period (Gen. xxi. 28), the seven witnesses and plagues of the Arabs (Herodot., 3, 8), the worship of the seven planets (Pausan., 3, 20, 9), etc. A special emphasis the oath received in the patriarchal days by placing "the hand under the thigh" (Gen. xxiv. 2, xlvii. 29).

In later times the Essenes refrained altogether from swearing (Josephus: Bell. Jud. 2, 8, 6), while the Pharisees seem to have treated the oath with frivolous superciliousness. In later times women were not allowed to take an oath (Philo: Op., ii. p. 274); but originally the law knew no such restriction (Num. v. 18, xxx. 4). See Staudlin: Geschichte der Vorstellungen vom Eide, 1824. 

II. In the New Testament. — Among the subjects which Christian ethics has to treat is also the oath. It is sometimes treated in the chapter on truthfulness, as if the principal question were, whether by the oath truth was made still more obligatory to the Christian. But its proper place is in the chapter on our direct relation to God; and the principal question is, whether such a use of the name of God as is required by the oath is permitted.

James declares altogether against the use of oaths (v. 12), and a similar prohibition is given in the words of Jesus (Matt. v. 33-37). The passage has been differently interpreted; but, without destroying its true logical articulation, it can be construed only in one way. Over against the commandment of the old dispensation, not to swear falsely, Jesus places the commandment of the new dispensation, not to swear at all: and when, in his enumeration of the various formulas of oaths, he omits the direct appeal to God, he could do so without incurring the risk of being misunderstood, partly because his condemnation of all the usual indirect formulas involves a still severer condemnation of the direct one; partly because the latter was still more likely to be the object of the Pharisees, the Jews, on account of their shyness for mentioning the name of God. If, however, the passage is thus interpreted as a definite prohibition of swearing, it comes into conflict with other passages of the New Testament. The words of Paul in Rom. i. 9, Phil. i. 8, Gal. i. 20, Eph. ii. 5, and 2 Coll. i. 28, have certainly the character of the oath. And when Jesus condescends to answer the question of the high priest (Matt. xxvi. 63), though it is couched in the very formulars which were employed when oaths were taken in the courts, he allows his own words to assume the same character; not to mention that the passage Heb. vi. 18 could never have been written if swearing had been absolutely prohibited among the first Christians. But how is this contradiction to be solved? In exactly the same way as the contradictions between the other prohibitions of the Sermon on the Mount, — not to be angry, not to scold, — and the very actions of Jesus himself when in holy wrath he rebukes the Pharisees. Only when issuing from the lower egotistical affections and impulses of human nature, anger and reproach, etc., are forbidden; that is, under circumstances, which, for instance, would make an oath simple profane swearing. Quite otherwise when the same act is performed for the sake of the highest ethical interests; as, for instance, when the civil authorities demand an oath in order to reach the truth, and make justice safe.

In this way the doctrine of the New Testament concerning oaths was conceived by the Reformers of the sixteenth century. In many recent Protestant systems of ethics (Wuttke, Palmer, Schmid) the oath is considered as a necessary evil, — necessary on account of the holiness of the human race. When the Waldenses, the Bohemian Brethren, the Mennonites, and the Quakers absolutely reject the oath, it is not so much on account of a too literal conception of Holy Writ, as because of a shyness of conscience with respect to the awful responsibility of the act. 

J. KÖRTZLIN.
means of ascertaining the truth (assertory oaths), and as a means of securing the fulfilment of duty (promissory oaths). But, in account of the religious origin and character of the institution, it was quite natural that the Church should exercise a considerable influence on its organization, and even wish to exercise a kind of control over its proceedings. Thus the medieval Church not only conquered the verbal aspect of oath in juridical propositions, which from the canon law were transferred to the civil law, but she also demanded that this whole sphere should be placed under her jurisdiction. The subject is principally treated in Decretum Gratiani, Causa XXII., the collection of decretales of Gregory IX., 2, 24, the Liber Sextus, and the Clementines. Of special interest is the decretal of Innocent III. (c. 26, X. de jurisjur.). which, following Jerome, defines the proper use of the oath and its misuse under the three heads, — vertias in mente, judicium in jurante, and justitia in objecto.

Proceedings. Thus the mediaeval Church not only demanded that this whole sphere should be placed under her jurisdiction, but she also treated in Decretum Graliani, Causa XXII., the justicia in objecto, finally, demands that the object of the oath must not be sinful, encroaching upon other men's rights, or compelling to acts otherwise forbidden, in which cases the oath becomes a perjurium, to be punished with ecclesiastical penalties. But as, in most cases, the Church is the only competent judge of the justicia in objecto, she also has the power (referens juramentum) to cancel an oath. See GÜSCH: Der Eid, etc., Berlin, 1837; STRIPPELMANN: Der Gerichtseid, Cassel, 1835-57; 3 vols. SCHRÜRL.

OBAD'IAH (יהוה, "servant of Jehovah"), the smallest book of the Old Testament canon. Nothing whatever is known about the prophet's life. Tradition, however, was busy in filling up the gap, and represented him as a converted Idumean (Carpzov: Introdr., iii. 338), or as born in Shechem, a pupil of Elijah, "the third captain of fifty" (2 Kings i.13), whom Elijah spared, and husband of the woman of the pit, Eliza blessed. (See DELLITZ: De Habacuci proph. vita atque aetate, p. 60.) The prophecy is directed against Edom, and declares it to be God's intention to destroy it (Obad. 1-9), announces as the reason Edom's act of violence upon Jacob (10-19), and portrays the future triumph of Judah over all his enemies, and especially Edom (17-21). This vision of the future includes a reference to the Messianic kingdom, as is especially evident from the last words, "the kingdom shall be the Lord's." The main question concerns the date of the prophecy, and has given rise to much difference of opinion. Passing by the view of Augusti, Krahmer, Ewald, and others, that Obadiah reproduces an older prophecy, some, as Hofmann (Weissag. u. Erfüll., i. 201), Delitzsch, and Keil, regard it as the oldest of the prophetic books, and written before Joel, under Joram, between 889 and 884 B.C.; others, as Jäger, Caspari, and Hengstenberg, refer it to the times of oath tribulations, and others still, as Aben Ezra, Luther, Schnurren, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Maurer, etc., hold the prophet to have been a contemporary of Jeremiah. Hitzig held the view that he was an Egyptian Jew, who wrote, 812 B.C., in view of a campaign Antigonus was reported to have undertaken against Petra. The settlement of the question depends upon whether the prophet looks upon the occupation of Jerusalem (ver. 11) as a thing of the past or the future. If he regarded it as a thing of the future, he may have had the occupation by Nebuchadnezzar in view; but it is difficult, on this supposition, to explain verse 21. On the general supposition that he regarded the occupation of the city as a thing of the past, the reference can hardly be to (1) the occupation of Nebuchadnezzar, for the prophet speaks in a tone of warning (ver. 12 sq.), and was evidently used by Jeremiah (xxix. 7-22); nor (2) the occupation under Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii. 5 sq.), for it was not against Petra. The settlement of the question depends upon whether the prophet looks upon the occupation of Jerusalem (ver. 11) as a thing of the past or the future. If he regarded it as a thing of the future, he may have had the event in mind when he charged the Philistines and Syrians with selling the Jewish captives to Edom, and Obadiah's language resembles Joel's (comp. Joel iii. 7, 14, Obad. 15; Joel ii. 3, Obad. 18; Joel iii. 7, 14, Obad. 15; Joel iii. 7, 14, Obad. 17). Joel could only have had this event in mind when he charged the Philistines and Syrians with selling the Jewish captives to Edom, and Obadiah's language resembles Joel's (comp. Joel iii. 7, 14, Obad. 15; Joel ii. 3, Obad. 18; Joel iii. 7, 14, Obad. 15; Joel iii. 7, 14, Obad. 17). Joel seems to have prophesied under Jehosh (877-888 B.C.); and it is probable that Obadiah prophesied before him, but not more than twenty years earlier. Obadiah's language also favors this early date; for, as Umbreit has said, "it comes as from the clefts of the rocks. It is hard and earthy, that can find no expression, no ornament and figurative description. It is as if the prophet had hewn his prophecy into the rock of Selah."
OBER-AMMERGAU.

Obedience of Christ, The, to the will of the Father, is represented as obedientia activa et passiva,—active in his doing, and passive in his suffering. To each has been ascribed a separate value in relation to his redemptive work. But the distinction, although scriptural in idea, is something artificial. As Van Oosterzee says:—"The very doing of the Lord was also, to a certain extent, a suffering; his suffering, on the other hand, in some respects, his highest form of action. His obedience is as the cost without seam, which may not be rent, and either avails wholly, or not at all, for him upon whom it is conferred." Hence, as Charles Hodge says, "This distinction is not so presented in Scripture as though the obedience of Christ answered one purpose, and his sufferings another and a distinct purpose. The same effect is ascribed to the death of the Lord as to the precepts of the Law.

The Ammerthalers took every precaution to protect their valley from the dread contagion, but without avail. A native of Ammertal, who worked during the summer in Eschlohe [an infected place] as a day-laborer, evaded the quarantine, and entered the valley by a secret path, in order to celebrate among his family an annual church festival. He carried the infection with him, and on the second day after his arrival he was a corpse. In three weeks eighty-four of the small community were carried off; and the mourning and terrified survivors, despairing of human succor, made their supplication to God, and registered a solemn vow, that if they heard their cry, and removed the plague, they would represent every ten years from that date downwards " (MacColl, p. 43; VIll. 4, 5).

In the year 1633 there raged in the neighborhood of Ammertal ('valley of the Ammer') a deadly plague, which threatened to depopulate the districts infected. The Ammertalers took every precaution to protect their valley from the dread contagion, but without avail. A native of Ammertal, who worked during the summer in Eschlohe [an infected place] as a day-laborer, evaded the quarantine, and entered the valley by a secret path, in order to celebrate among his family an annual church festival. He carried the infection with him, and on the second day after his arrival he was a corpse. In three weeks eighty-four of the small community were carried off; and the mourning and terrified survivors, despairing of human succor, made their supplication to God, and registered a solemn vow, that if they heard their cry, and removed the plague, they would represent every ten years, 'for thankful remembrance and eternizing contemplation, and by the help of the Almighty, the sufferings of Jesus, the Saviour of the world.' The prayer was heard; 'for not a single person died of the plague after the vow was made, though many were infected with it.' In the following year the first fulfillment of the vow was made, and the second in 1644, and so on decennially until 1674. It was then thought better to divide the representations decennially. Accordingly, the next representation was in 1680; and it has been acted regularly every ten years from that date downwards " (MacColl, pp. 42, 43, and viii.).

But the present Passion Play is very different from the rude performance once given. Down to 1830 it was always acted in the churchyard. It is now given upon a stage, in a building built especially for it, and with his forty-five hundred. The performance is introduced, and accompanied at intervals, by music, and is, on the whole, one of the most elaborate theatrical representations in existence. Every dweller in Ober-Ammergau is liable to be called upon to play; and the preparatory drilling consumes much time in the years next preceding the decennial performance. The credit of the present play is due to Ottmar Weis (d. 1843), a monk of the Ettal monastery in the neighborhood, and subsequently pastor, to his pupil Anton A. Daisenberg, and to Rockus Dedler (b. 1779, d. 1822), who for the last twenty years of his life was the schoolmaster at Ober-Ammergau. The present play is modelled upon the Greek drama, and therefore the chorus is an integral part of it. It comprehends the events of our Lord's life from Palm Sunday to Easter. The text is mainly scriptural; every word attributed to our Lord or to his disciples, friends, and foes, during the week referred to, being interwoven in the text. The principal players are persons of local consequence and of high character; and there is no doubt that the villagers themselves and the peasants around regard the Passion Play as a solemn religious rite. It is therefore indissolubly connected by the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which is administered to the players and to the majority of the intending spectators very early on the day of the play. The acting, considering the limited education of the players, is marvelously realistic. Of late years much money has been spent upon costumes, scenery, and stage properties. The number of players is said to be about six hundred, but this includes many children. The tableaux vivants, which are illustrations of the historical allusions in the chorus, are particularly fine, being revelations respecting the possibilities in tableaux. The interest of the play centres, of course, in the character of Christ. Shocking as the bare thought of such a representation is to the reverent mind, the dignified bearing of Joseph Maier, who played the part in 1870-71 and 1880, goes far to reconcile the spectator to the possibility of its being given without conscious blasphemy. The play was given more than thirty times from May 17 to Sept. 26, for many weeks three times. The performances last from eight to five, with an intermission of an hour and a half.

The Ober-Ammergau Passion Play has been suffered to pursue a nearly untroubled course. Permission to give it has to be obtained from the King of Bavaria, who has always readily given it. In 1780 it was the only passion play allowed in Bavaria, and in 1810 it triumphed over even ecclesiastical opposition. The profits, which are of course very large, since the wrong of visitors numbers thousands, are religiously devoted to charitable purposes after the payment of a small sum to the players. The charges of admission are very moderate, ranging from one to eight marks (twenty-five cents to two dollars). Altogether the Passion Play is a curious and, in its way a unique, relic of the piety of the middle ages. Its days are probably numbered, for a secular spirit among the players would be fatal to it, and destroy the simple piety out of which it sprang. Those who have seen it once would not care to see it in any other place.

In New York City two attempts have been made (1881 and 1882) to perform a passion play, in imitation of that given in Ober-Ammergau; but such a proceeding was severely criticized by the reputable press, and vigorously opposed by prominent citizens, and finally prohibited by the mayor.
of the city, on the ground that it was prejudicial to good morals and obnoxious to the religious community.

Let.—The text of the Passion Play in an English translation was published (in London, 1871) as part of a volume containing numerous photographs of the place, the players, and the play. A good description of the play is given by Rev. M. MacColl: The Ober-Ammergau Passion Play, London, 1880.

OBERLIN, Jean Frédéric, the pastor and Reformer of the Steinital, a "saint of the Protestant Church" (Hase); was b. at Strassburg, Aug. 31, 1740; d. at Fonday in the Steinital, after a pastorate of sixty years, June 1, 1826. After studying at the gymnasium and university of Strassburg, he gave private instruction for several years, and was appointed pastor of the Steinital in 1767. The Steinital (Ban-de-la-Roche) is a barren tract on the borders of Alsace and Lorraine, whose population early accepted the Reformation. Oberlin entered with enthusiasm upon his work among this poor and ignorant people, and gave himself up to elevating their condition with an unselfishness worthy of all admiration. He was a man of imposing and military bearing, iron health, much will-power, and a religious devotion bordering sometimes on fanaticism. He soon married Fräulein Witter, a daughter of one of the Strassburg professors, who died in 1783.

Oberlin was active in promoting both the spiritual and temporal welfare of the people. He built schoolhouses; introduced improved methods of agriculture; went at the head of the people with spade and hoe to build roads, and erect bridges; established stores, savings-banks, and agricultural associations for the distribution of prizes; induced the heads of factories to remove to the Steinital, etc. Liberal himself, he was very successful in exciting the liberality of others for his enterprises, even beyond the limits of his parish. In the pulpit and as a pastor his influence was patriarchal. His sermons were distinguished by an unbounded sympathy for the needs of his hearers, and simplicity. Three sabbaths he preached in French, the fourth in German. Three-tenths of his income he devoted to benevolent objects; and sold his silver, and donated it to the missionary committee, as soon as he heard of the interest in missions at Basel. He was tolerant in spirit, and admitted Catholics to the Lord's Table. He shared the views of Lavater and Jung-Stilling about eternity, hung up a map lent objects; and sold his silver, and donated it to the missionary committee, as soon as he heard of the interest in missions at Basel. He was tolerant in spirit, and admitted Catholics to the Lord's Table. He shared the views of Lavater and Jung-Stilling about eternity, hung up a map

Oberlin welcomed the French Revolution, and saw in it the little stone destined to break the power of antichrist; that is, the aristocracy and the clergy. The national festivals he celebrated with his congregation with great pomp. He declared himself an enemy of royalty, and recognized, without any limitations, the sovereignty of the people. Oberlin's church was closed for a time; but he the more often came to the aid of the oppressed, and generously for all who fled to the Steinital for refuge. His merit was recognized. On the 16th Fructidor, year 2, the National Assembly passed a vote of thanks. When the allied armies invaded Alsace, his name secured immunity for the Steinital from military oppression; and in 1819 he received the medal of the Legion of Honor. Celebrated men visited him, and Lavater maintained a correspondence with him. He lies buried under the shadow of the church at Fonday, but will continue to be remembered in the Protestant Church as a man who combined humanitarian activity with mystic views, and who restored the omnipotence of Christ's love at a time when that love had grown cold in many hearts. He was the first foreign member of the London Bible Society, and took a deep interest in its work. See LUTTEROTH: Notice sur Oberlin, Paris, 1828; SCHUBERT: Züge aus d. Leben O., 4th ed., Nürnberg, 1832; SARAH ATKINS: Memoirs of Oberlin, London, 1849; STÖRER: Vie de Oberlin, Strasbourg, 1831; BOSEMANN: Oberlin nach s. Leben u. Wirken, Stuttgart, 1855, 3d ed., 1879; SPACH: Oberlin, Strasbourg, 1860; [Mrs. JOSEPHINE BUTLER: Life of Jean Frederic Oberlin, London, 1827.]

OBERLIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY is a department of Oberlin College, supported partly from the general fund, and partly by special endowment. In the First Annual Report of the college, issued in 1834, a theological department is spoken of as a hope to be realized by the association. During that year a large number of students in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, became dissatisfied, because the trustees of that institution refused them liberty to discuss the subject of slavery, and withdrew in a body. At this time Rev. Charles G. Finney was at the height of his influence in New-York City, and had just withdrawn from the presbytery to be installed pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church. Arthur Tappan proposed to Mr. Finney that he go to some point in Ohio, and take charge of the education of these students. Rev. Asa Mahan, a Presbyterian pastor of Cincinnati, and one of the trustees of Lane, was elected president of Oberlin, and Professor John Morgan of Lane was elected to the chair of New-Testament literature. These students agreed to go to Oberlin if President Finney would accept the chair of theology there. He accepted, and they went. The Catalogue of 1835 reports 35 theological students on the ground; in 1840 the number was 64; in 1883, 44. The number of alumni in 1882 was 570.

The seminary is provided with a commodious and elegant building, containing chapel, lecture-rooms, reference-library, and private rooms for seventy students. Members of every denomination are welcome. Applicants for admission are expected to furnish satisfactory evidence of Christian character, and of such scholarship as will enable them successfully to pursue the course.

The majority of the students have always been college graduates. The Bible is studied in the original languages. The professors are not compelled to sign a creed, but are elected by the trustees from such as are known to be in sympathy with evangelical faith, and with the traditional interest of the founders of the institution in the advancement of religion and of moral reforms. So far the professors have all been Congregationalists, and the theology taught has been New-School Calvinism of the Edwardian type. (See NEW-ENGLAND THEOLOGY.) For details of this the-


OBERLIN THEOLOGY. See Finney, C. G. OBLATION. See Offerings.

OCCAM, William (Guilelmus Occamus, or Ochamus), b. about 1280, in the village of Occam (Ockham, or Okham), in the county of Surrey, Eng.; d. in Munich, April 10, 1347 (or 1349). As the principal source to his life (the pars iii. tract. 8, of his Dialogus in tres partes distinctus) has perished, many details, especially of his earlier life, are very uncertain. He is said to have studied at Merton College, Oxford, and to have obtained in 1300 the advendicacy of Stowe in Lincolnshire, besides other ecclesiastical benefices, which, however, he resigned on entering the order which had been sole ruler in philosophy since the time of Anselm and the Victorines, he encountered much resistance. In 1330 his views were even forbidden to be taught in the university of Paris. But he also found many, enthusiastic friends, such as Marsilius of Padua, Jean de Janvry, John Buridan, and others. At what time he returned to England is not known, but in 1322 he was provincial of his order there, and as such when he was summoned to Avignon on the 31st of May, 1322, to the general council of Perugia. In 1322, he, together with the general, Michael of Cesena, and the brother, Bonagratia of Bergamo, vindicated, against the decision of the Pope, the strict view of the order, that Christ and the apostles had never held property. They were all three summoned to Avignon on the 31st of May, 1322, to the general council of Perugia. In 1322, he, together with the general, Michael of Cesena, and...
very between the Franciscan order and the Papsacy, and the contest between the emperor, Lewis the Bavarian, and the Pope John XXII., Benedict XII., and Clement VI. The maxim resulting from his theological criticism, that, in the Christian Church, the highest, the absolute authority is vested in the Bible, led him to a crushing criticism of the manifold pretensions, dogmatical and political, made by the Pope. As above mentioned, the Pope's answer to the former charges of the Capuchins against the Pope on the state of the departed souls before the resurrection, afterwards incorporated with the third part of his Dialogus, first printed at Lyons, 1495; Tractatus de dignitatis Johannis XXII., written in 1333-34, against a sermon of the Pope on the state of the departed souls before the resurrection, afterwards incorporated with the second part of his Dialogus, Compendium errorum Joannis XXII., Paris, 1478, Lyons, 1495, written between 1335 and 1338, after the death of the Pope; Epistola defensoria, Venice, 1513; Decisiones oculo questionum, written after 1339, first printed at Lyons, 1496, and answering the questions, whether the highest spiritual and the highest secular power can be united in one person, whether the secular power has its origin directly from God, whether the Pope has the power of jurisdiction also in secular matters, etc.; Dialogus in tres partes distinctus, his chief work in this line, written probably in 1342-43, first printed in Paris, 1478, 2 vols. fol., but not complete; De jurisdictione imperatoris in causis matrimonialibus, De electione Caroli, etc. A collected critical edition of Ocham's works does not exist (several of them are still in manuscript); nor has there been written any satisfactory monograph on his life and doctrines, though the latter exercised so decisive an influence in the period of the Reformation, especially in England, from the Duchess Renata, and speedily left the country, arriving at Geneva in October, 1542. He here preached to the Italian fugitives. His life was severe and pure, and won from Calvin (letter to Farel, October, 1548) the praise that Ochino was a "great man in every respect." Not forgetting Italy, he published in this city six volumes of Italian sermons (Fredicic, 1542-44, 2 ed., Basel, 1552). Twenty-five of these were published in an English translation at Ipswich, 1548. These sermons are simple, pungent, and evangelical.

In 1545 Ochino went to Augsburg, where he ministered to the Italian congregation. In 1547 the emperor demanded that he should be delivered up; but, with the connivance of the authorities, he escaped to Strassburg, where he met Peter Martyr, and started with him for England. He became the pastor of the congregation of Italian refugees in London. A work appeared under his name in London, 1549, with the title, A tragedy or dialogue of the unjust usurped primacy of the Bishop of Rome. At the accession of Mary, he fled to Geneva, which he was obliged to leave on account of public utterances in which he expressed disapproval of the execution of Servetus. He went to Zürich. About this time he published two volumes on the Lord's Supper,—Sincera doctrina de cena Domini defensio contra libros tres J. Witschi, Zürich, 1556, and Disputa in torno alla presenza del corpo di Gesù Cristo nel Sacramento della cena, Basel, 1561. He advocated the Calvinistic view, but his views were beginning to assume a Socinian tinge. His catechism (Il Catechismo, overo institutione christiana, Basel, 1601) contains many speculations ill fitting a book of its character; but in his 30 Dialogi in due libros divis, quorum primus est de Messia, secundus est, cum de rebus variius, tum potissimum de Trinitate (Basel, 1563) different doctrines about Christ's person and work, and the Trinity, were treated in the style of a dialogue, and many doubts thrown but in no irreligious order of sermons, to the Franciscans, and in 1534 joined the still stricter order of the Capuchins. He became an earnest preacher, and his eloquence won for him a very extensive reputation. In 1536 he preached the Lenten sermons at Naples; and Charles V., who heard him, said, "This man could move the stones themselves." In this city he came in contact with the Spanish mystic, Juan Valdes, and formed the friendship of Peter Martyr. His preaching in Venice and other cities was attended by such large crowds, that the churches could not hold the people. John XXII., Benedict XII., and Clement VI. chose him for his confessor, and in 1538 the Capuchins at Florence elected him general of their order. He was accused of heresy in Naples, where he preached in 1540,—laying emphasis upon justification, and ignoring indulgences, purgatory, etc.—but was, notwithstanding, chosen a second time general of the order. But in 1541 Venice now became the scene of his labors; and it was probably here that he wrote his Dialogi VII. sacri, dove si contiene, nel primo dell' inamorarsi di dio, etc. (1542). He was cited to appear in Rome, and started on the journey to obey the summons, but at Florence was induced by Peter Martyr, who was himself about to leave Italy, to flee the country. Hurrying to Ferrara, he received letters from the Duchess Renata, and speedily left the country, arriving at Geneva in October, 1542. He here preached to the Italian fugitives. His life was severe and pure, and won from Calvin (letter to Farel, October, 1548) the praise that Ochino was a "great man in every respect." Not forgetting Italy, he published in this city six volumes of Italian sermons (Fredicic, 1542-44, 2 ed., Basel, 1552). Twenty-five of these were published in an English translation at Ipswich, 1548. These sermons are simple, pungent, and evangelical.

In 1545 Ochino went to Augsburg, where he ministered to the Italian congregation. In 1547 the emperor demanded that he should be delivered up; but, with the connivance of the authorities, he escaped to Strassburg, where he met Peter Martyr, and started with him for England. He became the pastor of the congregation of Italian refugees in London. A work appeared under his name in London, 1549, with the title, A tragedy or dialogue of the unjust usurped primacy of the Bishop of Rome. At the accession of Mary, he fled to Geneva, which he was obliged to leave on account of public utterances in which he expressed disapproval of the execution of Servetus. He went to Zürich. About this time he published two volumes on the Lord's Supper,—Sincera doctrina de cena Domini defensio contra libros tres J. Witschi, Zürich, 1556, and Disputa in torno alla presenza del corpo di Gesù Cristo nel Sacramento della cena, Basel, 1561. He advocated the Calvinistic view, but his views were beginning to assume a Socinian tinge. His catechism (Il Catechismo, overo institutione christiana, Basel, 1601) contains many speculations ill fitting a book of its character; but in his 30 Dialogi in due libros divis, quorum primus est de Messia, secundus est, cum de rebus variius, tum potissimum de Trinitate (Basel, 1563) different doctrines about Christ's person and work, and the Trinity, were treated in the style of a dialogue, and many doubts thrown but in no irreligious order of sermons, to the Franciscans, and in 1534 joined the still stricter order of the Capuchins. He became an earnest preacher, and his eloquence won for him a very extensive reputation. In 1536 he preached the Lenten sermons at Naples; and Charles V., who heard him, said, "This man could move the stones themselves." In this city he came in contact with the Spanish mystic, Juan Valdes, and formed the friendship of Peter Martyr. His
the decree (Aug. 6, 1584) banishing all foreigners who were not Catholics from Poland, and died on his return to Germany. He was a man of splendid gifts, but died a victim of the intolerance of the day and his own brooding. Later writers, Zunz (De tribus Ebstadt., Neuaufl. 1889) and Sandius (Bibl. Antitrinitar.), regarded him as one of the chief founders of the antitrinitarian school. Zeza refuted his discussion of polygamy in his Tractatus de polygarnia appended to his De repu-
diis (Geneva, 1657).

Among Ochino’s works not already mentioned are Apologi nelle quali si scorrano gli abusi, etc., Geneva, 1543; an Italian exposition of Romans (Geneva, 1545) and Galatians (Augsburg, 1546).


OCTAVE, a term belonging to the Liturgy of the Roman-Catholic Church, denotes the celebration of the seven days immediately following them. The missal prescribes the “preface” proper to Christmas Day, Easter Day, Ascension Day, and Whitsunday, for the seven days immediately following them.


ODO, St., fifth abbot of Clugny; b. in Auvergne, 909?; d. at Louvigny, Jan. 1, 1049; ruled his monastery with such a success that even bishops are said to have resigned their sees in order to become monks at Clugny. He wrote a life of his predecessor, St. Moisul, and also one of St. Adelhaid, the wife of Otho I., found in Bibliotheca Cluniensis. His own life was written by Jottald, in Act. Sanct. Jan. 9.

ODO, St., second abbot of Clugny; b. in Maine, 879?; d. at Tours, 943; carried through to the severest rules in all the monasteries connected with Clugny, but contributed thereby immensely to the prosperity of the institutions. He wrote, besides the Tractatus de reversione B. Martini, and Collationes on the sacrament of the Eucharist, found in Biblioth. Cluniensis and Bibl. Max. Patr. (Lyons, xvii., together with his own life, written by Jean le Moine. His works were published also by Migne: PatroL Lat., tom. 136; reprinted, Paris, 1881.

ECOLAMPIADIUS, John, the distinguished Reformer of Basel, whose real name was Huesgen (Heusgen); was b. 1482, in Weinsberg, a town in the present kingdom of Wurtemberg; d. Nov. 24, 1531, at Basel. There are several illustrations in the period of the Reformation, that the Lord delights to send out his disciples in pairs when he has a great work to accomplish. Luther stood side by side with Melanchthon, Calvin with Beza, and Ecolampadius with Zwingli; and, although the last two belonged to different churches, they were intimately associated together as friends, and participants in a common work. The life of Ecolampadius falls into two periods,—his development into the Reformer (1482–1522), his reformatory activity (1523–31).

His parents were people of means; his mother, a pious and benevolent woman. After studying at Heilbronn, he followed his father’s wishes, and went to Bologna to study law. The merchant to whom his money was confided misappropriated it; and, for this and other reasons, he returned home, determining to exchange the law for theology. In 1499 he entered the university of Heidelberg; and, although he rather avoided the Scholastic theology — Stendel, Pentecost, Christmas, and Epiphany — during eight consecutive days, with a special emphasis on the first and the last. The missal prescribes the “preface” proper to Christmas Day, Easter Day, Ascension Day, and Whitsunday, for the seven days immediately following them.
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His parents were people of means; his mother, a pious and benevolent woman. After studying at Heilbronn, he followed his father’s wishes, and went to Bologna to study law. The merchant to whom his money was confided misappropriated it; and, for this and other reasons, he returned home, determining to exchange the law for theology. In 1499 he entered the university of Heidelberg; and, although he rather avoided the Scholastic theology — Stendel, Pentecost, Christmas, and Epiphany — during eight consecutive days, with a special emphasis on the first and the last. The missal prescribes the “preface” proper to Christmas Day, Easter Day, Ascension Day, and Whitsunday, for the seven days immediately following them.
ECOLAMPADIUS. 1682

appearance there before the cardinal legate, Cajetan; and he at once took sides with the bold monk whose career he had been following with deep interest. In his work Canonici indoci, which appeared anonymously in 1519, he espoused the doctrine of justification by faith alone, emphasized the good work Luther had done, and rebuked Eck's presumption and pride.

In April 23, 1520, Ecolampadius surprised all his friends by entering the convent of Altenmunster, near Augsburg. He gave his reasons for this course in a letter to Erasmus, which unfortunately has been lost. But he was not contented in the convent. In 1520, shortly after Dr. Eck's return from Rome with the bull excommunicating Luther, he passed a very favorable judgment upon Luther, in the course of which occur the words, "Luther stands nearer the truth of the gospel than his adversaries," etc. This judgment, which Capito published, appeared first in Latin, then in German. Other favorable judgments of Luther appeared in the Latin edition, as that of Erasmus. Of more importance were two sermons published by Kratander in Basel (1521); the one denouncing the doctrine that divine honors are to be paid to Mary, the other denying the doctrine of transubstantiation. It was, however, his work on the confessional which excited most attention. It was, however, his work on the confessional which excited most attention (Luther to Melanchthon, July 13, 1521). He does not give it up entirely, but points out its abuses, and denies that Christ meant all special saints to be confessed to a priest. Luther, in a letter to Spalatin (June 10, 1521), thus expresses his esteem for Ecolampadius: "I am surprised at his spirit, not because he fell upon the same theme, but because he has shown himself so liberal, prudent, and Christian. God grant him growth!"

Ecolampadius left the convent in February, 1522, and went to Heidelberg, and from there to Ebernburg, near Creuznach, the refuge of several men of the new opinions, having refused in the mean time a professorship in the university of Ingolstadt, which was offered on the condition of his renouncing his Lutheran opinions, and receiving a dispensation from the Pope. At Ebernburg he acted as chaplain. On Nov. 16, 1522, he arrived in Basel, where he was probably invited by the printer Kratander, in the name of the friends of the gospel. Here the second period of his life begins.

The first and principal thing for us to notice at this point is the activity which Ecolampadius developed in Basel. This city was at this time the most important intellectual centre in Switzerland, the seat of its only university (founded 1460), and the residence of its most extensive printers. Here Erasmus lived, surrounded by a circle of learned men, to which Bishop von Uttenheim belonged. This all, however, shows that the Roman-Catholic cause was nowhere so well represented in Switzerland as here, and the university was the defender of the traditional faith and church fabric. The Reformation had made some progress among the citizens, and it was a thing of great importance that such a man as Ecolampadius was able to bring to the city his influence. In 1522 he opened a correspondence and his friendship with Zwingli. He began preaching as vicar at St. Martin's, and in 1523 was appointed by the city council reader of the Holy Scriptures at the university; the university authorities, however, refusing with deep interest. In his work Canonici indoci, which appeared anonymously in 1519, he espoused the doctrine of justification by faith alone, emphasized the good work Luther had done, and rebuked Eck's presumption and pride.
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self to the perfection of a system of church government, differing from his friend Zwingli herein, that he advocated the principle of keeping the Church and State separate. He was opposed to confining the interests of the former wholly to the hands of the latter, and he secured the passage of a measure creating a synod which held two meetings annually.

The views of Oecolampadius on the Lord's Supper cannot be commended in every respect. In his work on the interpretation of the words, "This is my body," among the Fathers (De genuine verborum Domini: hoc est corpus meum, justa ae multis auiores expositione liber), he urges with a great deal of force the arguments against the literal interpretation, and in favor of the metaphor contained in the word "body" (corpus). But, in the attempt to remove the errors of the Roman-Catholic interpretation, he unfortunately went so far as to state that believers partook of the Lord's Supper more for the sake of others than for their own; so that the sacrament was turned into an object-lesson. Still, he was not able to deny the great importance of the Lord's Supper as a sacrament, and, at the close, says that God accomplishes through the sacraments nearly all that he otherwise accomplishes through the Word. He saw to it, that in Basel the Lord's Supper was administered much more frequently than in any of the other Reformed churches, or dioecesan synods, by being representative of the whole church. They were convened by the emperor. At the convocation of the first two ecumenical councils, no regard whatever was paid to the Bishop of Rome; and his influence on the matter does not become visible until the convocation of the fourth. They were, at least so far as the general conduct of their business was concerned, controlled by the emperor or his representative. The second and the fifth ecumenical councils, at which the emperor was not represented, were presided over not by the Bishop of Rome, but by the Patriarch of Constantinople; though in these, as in all other similar cases, the papal legates were treated with great respect. They were finally confirmed by the emperor; that is, their resolutions or canons became imperial laws by receiving his signature; of a papal confirmation nothing is heard until after the fourth ecumenical council. There are, in this sense of the words, seven ecumenical councils recognized both by the Eastern and the Western churches, besides three councils whose claim of being ecumenical is contested either by the Eastern or by the Western Church. These seven councils were all Greek. Their business was transacted, and their canons confirmed, in the Greek language; and the persons attending them were, with very few exceptions, Greeks. The Latin Church was represented only by the papal legates and three or four bishops. They were the first and second councils of Nicaea (325 and 787), the first, second, and third councils of Constantinople (381, 553, and 881), the council of Ephesus (431), and the council of Chalcedon (451). The three contested councils are those of Sardica (344), the Trullan Council (Quinisextum) (692), and the fourth council of Constantinople (680). After the complete separation, however, between the Eastern and Western churches, and the perfect development of the Papacy, the idea of an ecumenical council received quite a different definition. The pope took the place of the emperor. The pope claimed the right to convene a council, to reside over

Oecolampadius was not as original and able a theologian as Zwingli and others; but he held an independent position over against Zwingli, as is clear from his views on predestination. He did not enter into Zwingli's, Luther's, and Calvin's minute analysis of this doctrine. His views were well expressed in his reply to the Waldensian, Morel (1530), "Our salvation is of God; our perdition, of ourselves" (salus nostra ex Deo, perdition nostra ex nobis). He was moderate and irenic in his spirit. His earlier views on the Lord's Supper gave way to sounder views, which regarded it as a means of grace for the Christian life. If some accused him of depreciating the written Word, the best answer will be found in his extensive works on the exposition of the Scriptures. It is to be regretted that no collected edition of his works has ever appeared. My biography gives a list of his writings. See Hitzig: Lebensgespr. Dr. J. Oekolampads, Zürich, 1791; HERZOG: D. Leben Oekolampads u. d. Reformation d. Kirche zu Basel, Basel, 1843, 2 vols.; Hagenbach: Oekolampads Leben u. ausgewählte Schriften, Elberfeld, 1856. HERZOG.

ECUMENICAL COUNCILS are, as indicated by the name (from oekos, "empire"), distinguished from merely provincial councils, or dioecesan synods, by being representative of the whole church. They were convened by the emperor. At the convocation of the first two ecumenical councils, no regard whatever was paid to the Bishop of Rome; and his influence on the matter does not become visible until the convocation of the fourth. They were, at least so far as the general conduct of their business was concerned, controlled by the emperor or his representative. The second and the fifth ecumenical councils, at which the emperor was not represented, were presided over not by the Bishop of Rome, but by the Patriarch of Constantinople; though in these, as in all other similar cases, the papal legates were treated with great respect. They were finally confirmed by the emperor; that is, their resolutions or canons became imperial laws by receiving his signature; of a papal confirmation nothing is heard until after the fourth ecumenical council. There are, in this sense of the words, seven ecumenical councils recognized both by the Eastern and the Western churches, besides three councils whose claim of being ecumenical is contested either by the Eastern or by the Western Church. These seven councils were all Greek. Their business was transacted, and their canons confirmed, in the Greek language; and the persons attending them were, with very few exceptions, Greeks. The Latin Church was represented only by the papal legates and three or four bishops. They were the first and second councils of Nicaea (325 and 787), the first, second, and third councils of Constantinople (381, 553, and 881), the council of Ephesus (431), and the council of Chalcedon (451). The three contested councils are those of Sardica (344), the Trullan Council (Quinisextum) (692), and the fourth council of Constantinople (680). After the complete separation, however, between the Eastern and Western churches, and the perfect development of the Papacy, the idea of an ecumenical council received quite a different definition. The pope took the place of the emperor. The pope claimed the right to convene a council, to reside over
it, and to confirm its resolutions. Ecumenical councils of this kind, representing only the Roman-Catholic Church, are the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth councils of the Lateran (1123, 1139, 1179, 1215, 1274); the councils of Lyon (1245 and 1274), the councils of Vienne (1121), Constance (1414–18), Basel (1431–39), Trent (1545–63), and the Vatican (1567–70). Contested are the councils of Vienne, Pisa, Constance, Basel, and Lateran V. See the general article on Councils, the special articles on the more prominent councils, and Hefele: Concilien-geschichte, i. (2d ed., 1873).

Oehler, Gustav Friedrich (later von Oehler, by the decoration of the order of the Württemberg crown), one of the most distinguished Old Testament theologians and influential teachers of the century; b. June 10, 1812, at Ebingen, Württemberg; d. Feb. 18, 1872, at Tübingen. His mother, who died when he was nine years old, left upon his heart an indelible religious impression. He was remarkably precocious; and in his ninth year was not only studying four other languages, but perfectly was conversant with Arabic under the tuition of an aged pastor in the vicinity. His university studies were pursued at Tübingen, where he came more particularly under the influence of Schmid and Steudel, and was confirmed, especially by the former’s lectures on the theology of the New Testament, in his strong and positive faith. In 1834 he accepted a position as teacher in the missionary institute at Basel, and frequently occupied pulpits in the city and neighboring towns. Leaving this position at the end of three years, and by the advice of Steudel and Schmid (who were anxious he should pursue an academical career), he spent a summer term — under the Orientalists Bopp, Petermann, and Schott — in Berlin, and in 1837 went to Tübingen as repetent. During this period he edited, by request of the family, Steudel’s theological lectures on the Old Testament, Berlin, 1840. His hopes of being appointed professor of Oriental languages at this time were blasted by the call of Ewald in 1839. The transition of Dorner to Kiel again awakened expectations in his mind, which were again blasted by the opposition of Baur, who disliked his pietism. In 1840 he was made professor at the seminary, and pastor in Schömthal. Here he married a daughter of the deceased Professor Steudel, who survived him, and published in 1845 an Introduction to the Theology of the Old Testament — Prolegomena zur Theologie d. A. T. The same year he received calls to Marburg and Breslau, and, accepting the latter, gradually won the confidence and ear of the students. He was also, in 1845, honored with the title of D.D. by Bonn.

At Tübingen, as at Breslau, Oehler took sides against the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, then being agitated; and, while he did not join the old Lutheran party, declared himself in favor of confessional Lutheranism. In 1846 he refused a call to Rostock, but in 1852 returned to Tübingen to fill the position of epchorus (director of the seminary), lately made vacant by Hoffmann’s transition to Berlin, and as professor of Old Testament theology at the university. In 1867 he received the call to Erlangen, successor to Frans Delitzsch, which he declined.

At Tübingen, as at Breslau, Oehler developed a wonderful industry and a most conscientious performance of the duties of his lectureship. He insisted upon a thorough training of the students, and used often to quote Luther’s words: “In proportion as the gospel is dear to us, let us demand accuracy in the languages.” He sought, however, to do more than quicken an interest in study in his pupils,—to impress them with a sense of the importance of the one thing needful. He lectured more particularly on the theology of the Old Testament, but also on Isaiah, Job, the Psalms, Messianic Prophecy, the Minor Prophets, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and Christian Symbolics. The introductory words to his lectures on Old Testament theology (which he delivered first in Breslau in 1846, and repeated ten times in Tübingen) were concluded with the remark, “To point you to Him, the one Master, is the holiest and most responsible obligation, but also the consecration and joy, of the theological lecturer. The teacher of theology dare indulge no higher wish than that he should have scholars who say, ‘Tota veritas est in Christo;’ and, not on account of the rich content of the Old Testament, and that were intended to counteract the antipathy for the Old Testament, which was due largely to Schleiermacher. He laid his foundations in severe philosophical investigations. His conception of the Old Testament was that of a progressive and growing revelation towards the standard of the New Testament. The Old and New Testaments are parts of one organic history by reason of an inherent plan of the Divine Mind. The Old Testament was to him a record of revelation, in which the plan of God was realized in part, the New Testament forming the consummation. He adopted some of the results of modern criticism, and acknowledged the existence of several different hands in the composition of the Pentateuch, and two authors for Isaiah.

He died in the full hopes and peace of the gospel, and said to the attendants at his deathbed that his sickness had taught him the meaning of the Psalms and Job as he had never known it before. He chose for the inscription on his monument the words, “There remaineth a rest to the people of God” (Heb. iv.9). Delitzsch pronounced him a “theologian after God’s heart.”

Oehler was not a prolific author. He was never sufficiently satisfied with his work to publish much. Most important were his articles, forty in number, written for the first edition of Herzog’s Encyclopædia. [The great value of these articles is attested by the fact, that, in the second edition, his name is one of the first included by Delitzsch and von Orelli, to whom has been intrusted the work of their revision. See Elohim, Jehovah, Messianic Prophecy, etc.] His Gesammelte Seminardreden (1872), and his Theology of the Old Testament, were edited by his son, Tübingen, 1873, 1874, 2 vols. 2d ed., 1882. Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1874, 1875, 2 vols., 2d ed. (Oehler’s Theology of the Old Testament is the best work
in its department, and is characterized by thoroughness of treatment, and reverence of tone; new edition of the English trans., N. Y., 1865.)
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BOETINGER, Friedrich Christoph, the great Swiss theosophist of the eighteenth century, as Harnann was the magus of the South, as Harnann was the magus of the South, as Harnann was the magus of the South, as Harnann was the magus of the South, as Harnann was the magus of the South, as Harnann was the magus of the South, as Harnann was the magus of the South, as Harnann was the magus of the South, as Harnann was the magus of the South, as Harnann was the magus of the North; b. at Goppingen, Wurtemberg, May 6, 1702; d. at Murrhard, Wurtemberg, Feb. 10, 1782. A contemporary (the poet Schubart) said, that "with Oetinger an academy of sciences had died." In a time of growing rationalism, he, as another, understood the magnitude of the task which Protestant scholarship had in opposing that antichristian mode of thought which bases itself upon philosophy, the natural sciences, etc. He was the prophet of this task, but did not himself solve the problems, though he undertook to do so. Thesosophy was born with his spontaneous flash, as it was with Boehme. He was a thinker, who, with proper forethought, took up the great philosophical and theological questions of his day, and sought to reach by investigation the original, living essence. He found it, first of all, in the two Bibles,— nature, and the word of God,— and then in those who draw directly from these. For the teachings of nature he depended chiefly upon alchemy; for those of the Old Testament he studied the Cabala; for the New Testament, the Fathers and Bengel, and, in general, the mystics and theosophists, especially Boehme, and, at a later time, Swedenborg.

Oetinger studied at Tubingen, and, in spite of his mother's urgency that he should follow the law, devoted himself to the study of theology. "From that time on," he says, "I was another man. I was no longer elegant in my dress, moved no more in society, talked little, read the Bible, and left Cicero and other worldly authors alone." However, he pursued with zeal the study of philosophy. Bengel, with whom he corresponded, became his ideal in theology; Boehme, in philosophy. He sought to construct a sacred philosophy, and to find out the essential features of the great biblical truths. In 1728 he travelled in Northern Germany, visited Zinzendorf and Herrnhut, giving lectures there on Hebrew, Greek, and the Song of Solomon, but without accomplishing much, and became docent at Halle. Here he found time to study medicine, which he practised for a while. Efforts to separate him from the Lutheran Church proved unavailing, and at a great age he said that his entire theology was concentrated in Luther's Catechism. Returning to Wurtemberg, he filled the place of repetant at Tubingen, became pastor at Hirsau, and, after occupying several other pastorate s, was promoted to the dignity of a prelate at Murrhard. In the mean time he had married. As a pastor he won universal respect.

Oetinger opposed the idealistic and rationalistic tendencies of his age, and by his "biblical philosophy," as he calls it, sought to accomplish a truly reformatory work, removing all the false ideas that are mingled in the essence of things, and coming to the thing itself, and apprehending the life in its fulness. He com-
The differences in the nature of the offerings were due to the difference of the intent with which they were made. The element which made the one well pleasing was not that it was a bloody sacrifice. The different reception of the sacrifices was due to the difference in the intent with which they were made. This is indicated in chap. iv. 3, where it is evident that Abel made choice of the best to express his gratitude, Cain exercised no discrimination, but offered what first came to his hand. At the very opening of the Bible, therefore, emphasis is laid upon the pious disposition of the one making the sacrifice, as the indispensable condition of its being acceptable to God. Delitzsch's idea, that Abel's sacrifice conveyed the notion of expiation, and that, when he killed the animal, Abel made a confession of criminal guilt, and his desire for the forgiveness of sins, is not implied in the text. Nevertheless both offerings were expressions of petition, as well as of gratitude. The second sacrifice in the Old Testament is that of Noah (Gen. viii. 20). In these two instances there is no hint that sacrifice rests upon a divine command. It was a voluntary act, which man performed as a creature made in the image of God, with whom he longs to be in the communion for which he was created. Sacrifices, therefore, as Neumann has well said (Zeitschr. f. christl. Wissenschaft, 1859, p. 238), are the "voluntary utterances of man's nature, which was made for God," and are no more inventions of his brain than prayer, but an instinct of his being.

The twenty-second chapter of Genesis is important in connection with the development of the notion of sacrifice in the Old Testament. There God proves Abraham's faith by calling upon him to offer up his son, in whose place he afterwards commanded him to substitute an animal. This transaction gave divine sanction to the practice of sacrifice in general as an act of devotion to God, and willingness to give up which is dearer to God, and, on the other hand, taught that human sacrifices were to have no place in the religion of Israel, but that animals were to be used as substitutes for men. There is no hint of the idea of atonement in the sacrifice of Isaac, nor are there any expiatory sacrifices in the Old Testament before Moses, on account of the presupposition of the revelation of God's holiness in the law and the entrance of the people into a covenant relation with a holy God. According to Exod. xx. 24 there are three elements which constitute the Mosaic idea of sacrifice. (1) God chooses a place to put his name there (Deut. xii. 6, 11, xiv. 29), that is, to reveal himself to his people. Henceforth there is one place of worship which he fills with his glory. (2) The people approach God in the spirit of devotion, and consecrate themselves, with all that they have, to him. In order to make possible the people's approach to the altar, and to perpetuate the covenant which man's sins constantly threaten to interrupt, God institutes the mediatorial order of the priesthood, and an expiatory ritual, in which the thought is embodied, that man can never approach God without making expiation, and that expiation is the condition of the acceptance of his gift. (3) The divine grace is imparted through the priestly blessing (Lev. ix. 22, etc.). The Mosaic ritual was therefore not merely a body of ceremonies designed to awaken and confirm piety, but a system in which a constant and living communion was carried on between God and man.

We shall now discuss, (1) the objects, (2) the ritual, (3) the classes, of sacrifice.

I. Objects of Sacrifice.— The Hebrew sacrifices were bloody or animal, and unbloody or vegetable. The latter are designated by the term min’ha (מִזְהַב). There is no general term for the bloody offerings, Zevah (צוּף), which is employed in the latter books as a general designation, being employed in the Pentateuch only for peace-offerings. The bloody offerings were the more important, on account of the significance of the blood. The vegetable or meat offerings might likewise be independent offerings (Lev. xi. 1; Num. x. 15 sqq., etc.), but were usually connected with the bloody offerings.

(1) The bloody sacrifices were, as has already been stated, exclusively animal sacrifices. The sacrifice of children, which was practised amongst the Canaanites and other peoples, was unconditionally forbidden as an abomination (Deut. xii. 31). It may be that such sacrifices were practised in the wilderness (Lev. xviii. 21, xx. 2 sqq.), or even afterwards, as is indicated by the ambiguous passages in Ezekiel (xx. 25 sqq.). The Mosaic law, however, gives to man authority over the life of his fellowman, only in cases of judicial sentence for transgressions of theocratic commandments. The animals used in the bloody sacrifices were both sexes of cattle, sheep, goats. Turtle-doves and young doves were also employed. These furnished the principal animal food of the poor classes, and this explains their use in sacrifice. They might be brought as a substitute in all cases, except a few, for the larger and more expensive animals (Lev. v. 7, xili. 8). Other birds were not used; and why birds frequenting marshy ground, especially geese, which had a high place in the sacrifices of the Egyptians, were omitted, we do not know. Venison and fishes were not objects of sacrifice in the Mosaic ritual, but were so used by some of the heathen religions of Western Asia. The animals offered in sacrifice had to be free from physical blemish (Lev. xx. 20-24, etc.), and at least eight days old, in order to make possible the offering of an unclean (Lev. xxii. 27; comp. Exod. xxii. 30). In a few cases the age was more definitely fixed (Lev. ix. 3, xiv. 10, etc.).

(2) The vegetable or meat offerings were ears roasted on the fire (Lev. ii. 14), white meal, probably the finest meal (Lev. ii. 1), and unleavened bread or cakes (Lev. ii. 4 sqq.). These offerings
were therefore taken from the things contributing to man's daily nourishment, and won by his toil. The fruit of trees, such as dates and pomegranates, which required little human labor, while perhaps none at all, were excluded. The strictest injunction bearing upon the meat-offerings was, that they should be unleavened (Lev. ii. 11); and this feature seems to correspond to the unblemished character of the animal offerings. An essential of all meat-offerings was salt (Lev. ii. 13). Whether this was likewise true in the case of the animal offerings cannot be determined from Lev. ii. 13. The custom was, however, always practised, at a later period, of salting them (Mark ix. 49). Salt was not enjoined because it made the offering palatable, but because it preserves from corruption. It was therefore a symbol of purification (Mark ix. 49) and of endurance (see Lev. ii. 13, where the expression "salt of the covenant of thy God" signifies that the covenant would be indestructible). Three principles were made prominent in the selection of the objects of sacrifice. The objects sacrificed had to belong to the possessions of Israel. A real sacrifice could only be spoken of when the individual relinquished something that was his own property. The offerings were vegetable, and are frequently called "the bread of God" (Lev. xxi. 6, 17; Num. xxviii. 2, 24). All objects used as food, however, were not sacrificed, but only those which the people toiled and labored for. Thus they laid down the confession in their sacrifices, that the earth's products and harvests were due to the divine blessing. Again: the sacrifices stood in a peculiarly intimate relation to the individual, as Kurz has brought out. The firstlings and first-fruits, to which the heart is inclined to cling most strongly, were chosen; and, as Philo (De. Vict., 1) long ago observed, the tamest and most innocent animals were selected, and those offering the least resistance to the knife.

II. RITUAL OF SACRIFICE. — The essential parts in the animal sacrifices were, (1) the presentation of the animal at the altar, (2) the imposition of hands, (3) the slaying, (4) the disposition of the blood, (5) the burning upon the altar. Other acts, which occurred only in the case of special kinds of sacrifices, will be spoken of at another place. The worshipper, after sanctifying himself (1 Sam. xvi. 5), brought the animal to the altar of burnt-offering, at the entrance of the tabernacle (Lev. i. 3, iv. 4). Then he placed his hands upon the head of the animal. The ceremony of the imposition of hands took place only in the case of the sin-offerings (Lev. iv. 15), when the offering was made for the congregation, and was done by the elders. In the case of sacrifices offered by individuals, it was invariably the individual, and not the priest, who performed the ceremony of imposition. The meaning of this rite is not clear. Individual imposition of hands — of heart over to the animal, and thus consecrated it as a sacrifice. The sacrifice became the channel of expiation, thanksgiving, or supplication, according to the exact object of the offering. There is nothing to warrant us in limiting the ceremony to the idea of imputation of sins, or an expiatory substitution. Ewald caught the highest meaning of the ancient sacrifices when he said that the rite of imposition indicates the sacred moment of the sacrifice, and that all the feelings of the sacrificer were regarded as being transferred to the victim whose blood was about to be spilled for himself. The slaying of the victim was performed by the person making the sacrifice, and it was by no means a specifically priestly act. An exception was only made in the case of the sacrifice of doves, in order that none of the blood might be spilled (Lev. iv. 21). In the case of burnt, sin, and trespass offerings, the victim was slain on the north side of the altar; not because the Lord was regarded as dwelling in the north (Ewald), but, rather, because it was looked upon as the dark and gloomy portion of the horizon (Tholuck: D. A. T. in Nesen). The slaying of the victim was only meant to secure the blood; and there is no indication that it signified that its death atoned for the sinner to the justice of God. The expiatory symbolism occurred in connection with the disposition of the blood, which was immediately received by the priest in a cup pointed at the bottom, so that he might have occasion to delay by setting it down; and was sprinkled around the altar, or, in cases of higher grade, sprinkled upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering (Lev. iv. 30, 34); carried into the holy place; sprinkled seven times upon the veil (Lev. iv. 6, 17); and in some cases taken into the Holy of holies. For the meaning of this use of the blood, reference must be had, in the first place, to the words, "the life of the flesh is in the blood. . . It is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul" (Lev. xvii. 11), or, as it should be translated, "the blood maketh atonement through the soul, or because the soul is in it." The translation of the Authorized Version is to be ruled out, not only on account of the tautology it introduces into the sentence, but because the object of ἁρμός is always preceded by ἡ γῆ, ἢ γάρ, never by ἔναν alone. The idea is, that, in the warm blood sprinkled upon the altar, the soul of the animal is offered up; and it serves to expiate for the human soul, or, more accurately, to cover it. The fundamental idea of ἁρμός ("atonement") is, that the sin for which the atonement is rendered is conceived from the face of the Divine Being; the offering covering or hiding his face, or more definitely the guilt of the sinner, so that it is, as it were, blotted out. The sinner, therefore, becomes protected against punishment, and may approach God without fear. The idea is that, in the warm blood smeared upon the altar, the soul of the animal is offered up; and it serves to expiate for the human soul, or, more accurately, to cover it. The fundamental idea of ἁρμός ("atonement") is, that the sin for which the atonement is rendered is concealed from the face of the Divine Being; the offering covering or hiding his face, or more definitely the guilt of the sinner, so that it is, as it were, blotted out. The sinner, therefore, becomes protected against punishment, and may approach God without fear. The idea is, that, in the warm blood smeared upon the altar, the soul of the animal is offered up; and it serves to expiate for the human soul, or, more accurately, to cover it. The fundamental idea of ἁρμός ("atonement") is, that the sin for which the atonement is rendered is concealed from the face of the Divine Being; the offering covering or hiding his face, or more definitely the guilt of the sinner, so that it is, as it were, blotted out. The sinner, therefore, becomes protected against punishment, and may approach God without fear.
people is the soul itself. Man can offer up a gift; but the gift itself is unclean, for he who offers it is unclean and sinful. Therefore God substituted for the unclean soul of the sinner the innocent soul of the victim. It mediates between him and the holy God in the blood offered on the altar; so that God sees a pure life on the altar, which he accepts covering the guilt of the sinner.

After the blood had been spilled, the offerer took the skin off from the animal, and divided it into pieces (Lev. i. 6, viii. 20). The inspection of the entrails, which formed such an important part in the sacrifices of several ancient peoples, especially the Phoenicians, has no place in the Mosaic ritual. The offering was then burnt upon the altar, either entire, as in the burnt-offerings, or only the fatty parts. The chief significance of the burning of the victim consisted in God's acceptance of it, as the smoke, containing the fragrance and flavor, ascended upward.

The ritual of the meat-offerings was much less elaborate. The offering being brought, the priest took a handful of meal and oil, and all the incense, and burnt them upon the altar. The rest of the offering fell to the lot of the priests, and was to be eaten in the forecourt. These rules probably only applied to the freewill offerings.

III. The Classes. — The law distinguished between four kinds of offerings, — burnt, redemption (or peace), sin, and guilt (or trespass) offerings. The regulations concerning the first two are represented as being derived from God (Lev. i. 1). The rules for the meat-offerings are inserted between them. There were two main classes of offerings: (1) Those in which the covenant relation was presupposed to be undisturbed; (2) Those which sought to restore that relation, it being disturbed.

1. The Burnt-Offerings. — The characteristics of these offerings were, that the victim had to be an unblemished male, — either a bull, ram, or goat (the gender of the doves, however, not being prescribed), — and that it was consumed entire, with the exception of the skin and the appendages. By burnt-offerings the people and individuals attested their reverence for God, and complete devotion to him. They have been aptly called sacrificia latreutica. They were adapted to secure the favor of God and to atone for sin (Lev. i. 4), but not for particular transgressions. A burnt-offering was brought every morning and evening for the people as a body (Exod. xxix. 38–42; Num. xxviii. 3–8), and consisted in each case of a lamb. A tenth of an ephah of meal and a quarter of a hin of wine were connected with each of these daily sacrifices as a meat and drink offering. Between the meat and drink offerings the high-priestly meat-offering was offered, which was prescribed in Lev. vi. 13 sqq. The morning and evening sacrifices were increased on sabbath days and festival occasions. Sometimes individuals, on special occasions, offered as many as a thousand victims to the altar (1 Kings iii. 4; 1 Chron. xxix. 21, etc.). Probably only applied to the freewill sacrifices (at least, according to the later regulation: see, however, Lev. xvii. 6, xxi. 18), could present burnt-offerings; but they might not be presented at the rite of sacrifice. The Gentile rulers of the Jews availed themselves of this privilege, and Augustus made a daily offering of two lambs and one bull (Philo: Leg. ad Cai., 40). In the Herodian temple Gentiles might sacrifice in the court of the Gentiles.

2. Redemption-Offerings, usually called peace-offerings. The technical Hebrew expression is shelamim (šālā'aj). If it is derived from the Kal of Shalem, then it expresses, that, in offering this sacrifice, the individual gives expression to his sense of friendly communion with God. Another derivation, from the Piel, which would give the meaning of thank-offering (Gen. vii. 26; De Wette, Bahr, Knobel), is to be discarded. The LXX. translate the Hebrew by εἰρήνη τοῦ (peace-offering) or σωτηρία (redemption-offering); and the Vulgate, sacrificium pacificum (peace-offering). In this respect the peace-offering differs from the other offerings, which presuppose the disturbance of the covenant relation and human guilt. The Pentateuch also calls this kind of offerings simply ναο, or “slaying.” The designation is to be explained from the fact that a sacrificial meal was connected with the redemption-offerings, for which the victim was slain. The first operation of Lev. vii. 11 sqq. distinguishes three kinds of peace-offerings: (1) The sacrifice of Thanksgiving; (2) A vow; (3) A voluntary offering (verse 16). The first differs from the other two, not by being accompanied by singing and instrumental music (Ewald), but by a full recognition of unmerited and unexpected blessings. Animals of both genders might be used in the peace-offerings (Lev. iii. 6). Doves are never mentioned in this connection. The ritual, as far as the sprinkling of the blood, they shared with the burnt-offerings. Only the fatty parts were burnt on the altar; not, however, the fat which was inlaid in the flesh. They were considered the richest and best portions of the animal, and for this reason they were burnt. The breast of the victim was “waved,” or swung, by the priest (Lev. vii. 30), and the shoulder “heaved” (vii. 34). The first operation of swinging, including a forward and backward motion, seems to have signified that the offering was given up to God, but that he, in return, gave it back to the priest. In the public peace-offerings, all except the fatty parts seem to have gone to the priests, although this is only expressly said of the two lambs of the Pentecost peace-offering. When individuals offered peace-offerings, only the breast and the heaved shoulder went to the priests. The rest was consumed at a joyful sacrificial meal, in which any number might participate. The chief significance of the meal was, that God himself became a guest, and imparted his blessing.

3. Sin and Guilt (or Trespass) Offerings. These belong to the genus of expiatory sacrifices, and were designed to restore the covenant relation which had been disturbed by human transgression. The class of transgressions which they were designed to meet were the תָּשְׁלֵם, sins of ignorance, or venial sins, in opposition to presumptuous sins, or those committed in "high hand" (margin, Num. xv. 30), for which the law knew of no atonement. A confession of sins accompanied both these kinds of offerings (Lev. v. 3, xvi. 21, etc.). The difference between them has been well brought out by Riehm (Studien u. Kriti-
OFEERINGS.

From (pp. 28 sqq.) and Rinck ibidem, 1855, pp. 386 sqq.). To begin with the trespass-offerings: their nature is best brought out in Lev. v. 14-16, iv. 20-26; Num. v. 5-10. The trespass-offering presupposes a transgression, an act of infidelity to one's neighbor, which, in the view of the Old Testament, was regarded as a sin against God. Restitution had to be made to the offended party, with an addition of one-fifth of the value of the thing misappropriated; and also a ram was to be offered to God. The latter was the trespass-offering. Another case which called for the trespass-offering is mentioned in Lev. xix. 20-22.

In the trespass-offering, satisfaction was made; and this satisfaction served to cover the guilt of the sinner, so that he might again approach God. But it was not primarily the design of the guilt-offering, but of the sin-offering, to accomplish this result of covering the guilt of the soul. It is true that every sinner involves guilt; but all guilt is not the result of infidelity in the narrower sense, a real derogation of the theocratic laws. However, it is impossible to carry through a clear distinction. Guilt-offerings, in every case, concern special transgressions. The victim (a ram) in the guilt-offering was slain on the north side of the altar: the fatty pieces were burnt.

In the case of the sin-offerings the victims were a young bull (Lev. xvi. 8, iv. 3; Exod. xxix. 10, 14, etc.), a goat (Lev. iv. 23, xvi. 5; Num. xxvii. 15, etc.), a she-goat or she-lamb (Lev. iv. 28, v. 9; Num. vi. 14, etc.), a turtle-dove and young doves (Lev. v. 7, xii. 6, xiv. 22, etc.), or, to meet the ability of the very poorest, one-tenth of an ephah of white meal (Lev. v. 11). There were two characteristic features in the ritual of the sin-offering,—the disposition of the blood, and the destruction of the other parts of the victim after the fatty portions had been burnt. That the immediate object of the sin-offering was expiation is proved by the fact that the blood was not sprinkled on the altar, but applied to holy places, as on the horns of the altar of burnt-offering (Lev. iv. 25, 30, 34), and on the inner veil of the tabernacle (Lev. xvi. 26) and the horns of the altar of holies (Lev. iv. 5 sqq.). On the day of atonement (Lev. xvi.) some of the blood was sprinkled in the Holy of holies. The meat of the victim in the sin-offering was either eaten in the court of the holy place (Lev. vi. 18), or burnt outside of the camp (Lev. iv. 11 sqq., vi. 23, etc.). In the sin-offering, an innocent life was substituted on the altar for a guilty one. Why a goat should have been prescribed for the most solemn sin-offerings is difficult to decide. The rabbins say that it was chosen because the Israelites had sinned most in the worship of goats, or that the patriarchs killed a goat at the sale of Joseph. Bahr's view is, that it was on account of the goat's long hair, which symbolized grief for sin. These views are to be discarded. A better one is this, that the goat was chosen on account of its unpalatable meat, which the priests had to eat. The meaning of the imposition of hands on the victim of the sin-offering, with which a confession was probably associated, was that the individual gave up the pure life of the animal as a substitute for his own sinful life, and as an expiation for it.

The injunctions which have been treated in the foregoing paragraphs as Mosaic have been recently assigned by some scholars to a much later date. Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, following Vatke, have put them down to the post-exile period, and affirm that the sacrifices were not regulated by law before that time, and did not differ essentially from the heathen sacrifices, except that they were offered to Jehovah, and not to Baal or Molech. Passages from the prophets (such as Amos iv. 4 sq., v. 21 sqq.; Hos. vi. 6, viii. 11 sqq.; Isa. i. 11; Jer. vi. 19 sq., vii. 21 sqq.) are adduced to show, that, at that period, nothing was known of a ritual such as the Mosaic law prescribes. The change to a respect for this ritual is evident in Ezek. xi.-xlviii. for the first time. In opposition to this class of views, it is to be remarked that Moses must have regulated the ritual of sacrifice, which formed the soul of the Mosaic worship, if he was the founder of the Jehovistic religion. In the old so-called Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx.-xxiii., xxxiv.) there are certain regulations for this worship (Exod. xx. 24-26, xxiii. 18 sqq., xxxiv. 25 sq.), which presuppose a fuller sacrificial ritual. The passages in the prophecies noticed above do not exclude the existence of the Mosaic ritual. The prophets were only attacking religious hypocrisy, and speaking in accordance with the spirit of 1 Sam. xxv. 22. Amos v. 25 means nothing more than that another God than Jehovah was worshipped in the wilderness by the mass of the people. Jer. vii. 21 sq. cannot mean that no sacrificial ritual had been prescribed; for the prophet speaks of one in his prophecy of the future salvation (xvii. 26, xxiii. 18); and what he meant was, that obedience to God's commandments, and not the sacrificial ordinances, was the fundamental thing in the Mosaic system. The contrast between sacrifices and obedience is brought out here, as also in Hos. vi. 6. The prophecies introduce, in their picture of future salvation, essential elements from the ancient Mosaic ritual; but their main object was to insist upon moral laws.

Recent critics have also attacked the received opinion concerning the Mosaic law on the ground of the departure from the Mosaic command that there should be one place of sacrifice. They say there is no evidence that such a rule was known in the times of the judges and the first kings, when men like Samuel sacrificed on different high places. The conclusion is drawn, that the command concerning a single altar of sacrifice dates from the time of Hezekiah or Josiah, after the erection of the temple. Wellhausen lays particular stress upon this point. It is to be remarked, in opposition to these critics, that, with reference to the Mosaic period, the only supposition offering probability is, that there was only one altar, namely, the tabernacle. Thus the command enjoining the slaying of the victim at the door of the tabernacle (Lev. xvii. 1 sqq.) can only be understood of the period of the wanderings,—a command, which, in Deut. xii., is altered so as to read that the victim of the sanctuary, whether he was slain in the sin-offerings, with which a confession was probably associated, was that the individual gave up the pure life of the animal as a substitute for his own sinful life, and as an expiation for it.
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of these ventures reached a third edition within a year or two. Boswell thought more highly of his verses than more eminent authorities have done. His paraphrase of the Hundred and Forty-eighth Psalm (1759) was formerly much used as a hymn.

OIL, OLIVE-TREE. The southern boundary-line of the zone in which the olive-tree can be cultivated is the Atlas chain; the northern, the fortieth degree north latitude. The tree requires an annual mean temperature of sixty degrees Fahrenheit; and, as it can stand no very violent atmospheric changes, it succeeds best in countries with cool climate. It requires a mesarag, sandy, and stony soil, and grows most vigorously on the sunny slope of rocks, where it may form whole forests (Job xxix. 6). It is an evergreen; and it is the enormous age it may reach, and its almost inexhaustible power of regeneration, new trunks rising from the roots when the old ones have perished, which makes it such a favorite in the similes of poetical diction. It is doubtful, however, whether the seven olive-trees still standing in Getsemane, really, as Chateaubriand and others have asserted, date back to the time of Christ, not to speak of the time of Gethsemane. Generally speaking, the tree succeeded exceedingly well in Palestine, especially in Perea, Galilee, along the Lake of Gennesaret, in the Decapolis, on Lebanon, etc. (Deut. xxxiii. 24; Josephus: Bell. Jud., iii. 3, 8; iii. 10, 8; Plin., 18, 9). Olive-oil is always mentioned as one of the principal products of Palestine, together with wine, wheat, honey, and figs (Deut. viii. 8, xi. 14, xxvii. 40, xxxiii. 13). Every landed proprietor among the Jews had his olive-garden or oil-yard (Exod. xxviii. 11; Deut. vii. 11; 1 Sam. viii. 14); and such gardens formed an important part of the royal domains (1 Chron. xxviii. 29).

The fruit which the tree produces looks like a small plum. It is first green, then pallid, then purple, and finally, when fully ripe, it becomes almost black. The Jews, like the Greeks and the Romans, ate the green fruit pickled sour; but the principal use made of the olive was for the manufacture of oil. The finest oil was made from the green, still unripe fruit, picked carefully from the tree, crushed in a mortar, and then pressed through a pannier. The common oil was manufactured in an oil-press. The Jews used oil for the preparation of food (1 Kings xvii. 12; 1 Chron. xii. 40) just as we use butter; for the preparation of offerings (Exod. xxix. 2, 40; Lev. ii. 4, 15), for illumination (Exod. xxv. 26; Matt. xxv. 3), for healing wounds (Isa. i. 6; Mark vi. 13; Jas. v. 14; Luke x. 34), and, mixed with other odoriferous vegetable fluids, forointing the body,—a custom which in the Eastern countries is almost indispensable to the preservation of health. So important a part did the oil play in the every-day life of the Hebrews, that the failure of the harvest was considered a great calamity (Amos iv. 9; Heb. iii. 17); and the tree itself acquired a symbolical significance. It became a part of the festal booths (Neh. viii. 15), and carried by suppliants before the victor (2 Macc. xiv. 4). The dove of Noah came in with an olive-leaf in her mouth (Gen. viii. 11). The wild olive-tree, whose fruit is larger and more meaty, but whose oil is less valuable, and used only for ointments, has...
OLAF, St., king of Norway 1015–30, descended from the old royal family, but was educated in exile. Though he was a Christian, he led a wild life as a viking, and fought, especially in England, against the English and Danes. Having returned home in 1015, and made good his claims to the Norwegian crown, he concentrated all his energy on the establishment of Christianity in his native country. The means, however, which he employed, were violent and even cruel: those who resisted or relapsed were punished with exile, confiscation of property, torture, etc. Nevertheless, he succeeded. Churches were built, and priests appointed; the sabbath was celebrated; and the fast-days were kept. But the discontent was so intense, that, when Canute the Great invaded the country, he was joined by a large portion of the people. Olaf fled to Russia; and, when he returned, he was beaten, and killed in the battle of Stiklestad, July 29, 1030. Then a re-action set in. The Norwegians were very dissatisfied with their Danish ruler, a son of Canute. In 1031 a great assembly of clergymen and laymen declared Olaf a saint. His remains were dug up, and deposited in the cathedral of Nidaros Trondheim; miracles took place at his grave, where crowds of pilgrims soon began to gather; and his history are the Heimskringla, and Olaf's Saga, by Snorre Sturleson. See Ludwig Dane: Norweg. Passau, Cologne, Bonn, Nuremberg, Heidelberg, etc., and it was necessary to make provision for their religious wants. The conference, however, was determined that there should be no breach between the new church and the Roman-Catholic Church before 1870; that, indeed, the Old-Catholic Church which was to be organized should be the true continuation of the truly Catholic Church. But at this point a formidable difficulty presented itself: ordination and confirmation could only be performed by a bishop; and the party numbered no bishop among its members. At this juncture the Church of Utrecht came to the aid. The Church of Utrecht contains the remnant of the Jansenists, or Old-Catholics in Holland, and numbers at present one archbishopric of Utrecht, two bishoprics of Deventer and Haarlem, twenty-five congregations, and about six thousand members. It is strongly opposed to the theology and casuistry of the Jesuits; but it recognizes the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. It regularly informs the Pope of the election of a new bishop, and the Pope as regularly declares the election null and void. But in this church the apostolical succession has undeniably been preserved, and from that it was transferred to the Old-Catholic Church. In the summer of 1872 Archbishop Loos of Utrecht made a tour of visitation among the Old-Catholic congregations in Germany, and confirmed about five hundred children; and in 1873 the bishop (Heykamp) of Deventer consecrated Professor Reikens, who had been elected Old-Catholic bishop, in the fashion of the primitive church, by an electoral body composed of the clergy and delegates of the people.

At the third conference, held at Constance in 1873, the organization was completed, and a synodal constitution adopted. The diocesan synod, presided over by the bishop, and consisting of the clergy of the diocese, and one lay-delegate for each two hundred church-members, assembles every year, and despatches such business as has been prepared for it by the synodal committee,— an administrative body composed of four priests and five laymen, and placed beside the bishop for his assistance. The organization was recognized everywhere in Germany by the secular government. The first synod met at Bonn in 1874. A number of refusals have been gradually adopted and introduced,— the offering of the cup also to the laity in the Lord's Supper, the use of the native tongue in the service, the abolition of compulsory celibacy, etc. A similar constitution has been adopted by the Old-Catholic Church in Switzerland, where the movement first started, the movement could not stop; and the direction in which it had to run on was irresistibly prescribed by the logic of events.

The first Old-Catholic conference was held in Munich, Sept. 29–30, 1871. Dollinger was much opposed to the idea of organizing the party into an independent church; but congregations had already been formed in Munich, Passau, Cologne, Bonn, Nuremberg, Heidelberg, etc., and it was necessary to make provision for their religious wants. The conference, however, was determined that there should be no breach between the new church and the Roman-Catholic Church before 1870; that, indeed, the Old-Catholic Church which was to be organized should be the true continuation of the truly Catholic Church. But at this point a formidable difficulty presented itself: ordination and confirmation could only be performed by a bishop; and the party numbered no bishop among its members. At this juncture the Church of Utrecht came to the aid. The Church of Utrecht contains the remnant of the Jansenists, or Old-Catholics in Holland, and numbers at present one archbishopric of Utrecht, two bishoprics of Deventer and Haarlem, twenty-five congregations, and about six thousand members. It is strongly opposed to the theology and casuistry of the Jesuits; but it recognizes the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. It regularly informs the Pope of the election of a new bishop, and the Pope as regularly declares the election null and void. But in this church the apostolical succession has undeniably been preserved, and from that it was transferred to the Old-Catholic Church. In the summer of 1872 Archbishop Loos of Utrecht made a tour of visitation among the Old-Catholic congregations in Germany, and confirmed about five hundred children; and in 1873 the bishop (Heykamp) of Deventer consecrated Professor Reinkens, who had been elected Old-Catholic bishop, in the fashion of the primitive church, by an electoral body composed of the clergy and delegates of the people.

At the third conference, held at Constance in 1873, the organization was completed, and a synodal constitution adopted. The diocesan synod, presided over by the bishop, and consisting of the clergy of the diocese, and one lay-delegate for each two hundred church-members, assembles every year, and despatches such business as has been prepared for it by the synodal committee,— an administrative body composed of four priests and five laymen, and placed beside the bishop for his assistance. The organization was recognized everywhere in Germany by the secular government. The first synod met at Bonn in 1874. A number of refusals have been gradually adopted and introduced,— the offering of the cup also to the laity in the Lord's Supper, the use of the native tongue in the service, the abolition of compulsory celibacy, etc. A similar constitution has been adopted by the Old-Catholic Church in Switzerland, where the movement first started, the movement could not stop; and the direction in which it had to run on was irresistibly prescribed by the logic of events.

The first Old-Catholic conference was held in Munich, Sept. 29–30, 1871. Dollinger was much opposed to the idea of organizing the party into an independent church; but congregations had already been formed in Munich, Passau, Cologne, Bonn, Nuremberg, Heidelberg, etc., and it was necessary to make provision for their religious wants. The conference, however, was determined that there should be no breach between the new church and the Roman-Catholic Church before 1870; that, indeed, the Old-Catholic Church which was to be organized should be the true continuation of the truly Catholic Church. But at this point a formidable difficulty presented itself: ordination and confirmation could only be performed by a bishop; and the party numbered no bishop among its members. At this juncture the Church of Utrecht came to the aid. The Church of Utrecht contains the remnant of the Jansenists, or Old-Catholics in Holland, and numbers at present one archbishopric of Utrecht, two bishoprics of Deventer and Haarlem, twenty-five congregations, and about six thousand members. It is strongly opposed to the theology and casuistry of the Jesuits; but it recognizes the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. It regularly informs the Pope of the election of a new bishop, and the Pope as regularly declares the election null and void. But in this church the apostolical succession has undeniably been preserved, and from that it was transferred to the Old-Catholic Church. In the summer of 1872 Archbishop Loos of Utrecht made a tour of visitation among the Old-Catholic congregations in Germany, and confirmed about five hundred children; and in 1873 the bishop (Heykamp) of Deventer consecrated Professor Reinkens, who had been elected Old-Catholic bishop, in the fashion of the primitive church, by an electoral body composed of the clergy and delegates of the people.

At the third conference, held at Constance in 1873, the organization was completed, and a synodal constitution adopted. The diocesan synod, presided over by the bishop, and consisting of the clergy of the diocese, and one lay-delegate for each two hundred church-members, assembles every year, and despatches such business as has been prepared for it by the synodal committee,— an administrative body composed of four priests and five laymen, and placed beside the bishop for his assistance. The organization was recognized everywhere in Germany by the secular government. The first synod met at Bonn in 1874. A number of refusals have been gradually adopted and introduced,— the offering of the cup also to the laity in the Lord's Supper, the use of the native tongue in the service, the abolition of compulsory celibacy, etc. A similar constitution has been adopted by the Old-Catholic Church in Switzerland, where the movement first started, the movement could not stop; and the direction in which it had to run on was irresistibly prescribed by the logic of events.

The first Old-Catholic conference was held in Munich, Sept. 29–30, 1871. Dollinger was much opposed to the idea of organizing the party into an independent church; but congregations had already been formed in Munich, Passau, Cologne, Bonn, Nuremberg, Heidelberg, etc., and it was necessary to make provision for their religious wants. The conference, however, was determined that there should be no breach between the new church and the Roman-Catholic Church before 1870; that, indeed, the Old-Catholic Church which was to be organized should be the true continuation of the truly Catholic Church. But at this point a formidable difficulty presented itself: ordination and confirmation could only be performed by a bishop; and the party numbered no bishop among its members. At this juncture the Church of Utrecht came to the aid. The Church of Utrecht contains the remnant of the Jansenists, or Old-Catholics in Holland, and numbers at present one archbishopric of Utrecht, two bishoprics of Deventer and Haarlem, twenty-five congregations, and about six thousand members. It is strongly opposed to the theology and casuistry of the Jesuits; but it recognizes the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. It regularly informs the Pope of the election of a new bishop, and the Pope as regularly declares the election null and void. But in this church the apostolical succession has undeniably been preserved, and from that it was transferred to the Old-Catholic Church. In the summer of 1872 Archbishop Loos of Utrecht made a tour of visitation among the Old-Catholic congregations in Germany, and confirmed about five hundred children; and in 1873 the bishop (Heykamp) of Deventer consecrated Professor Reinkens, who had been elected Old-Catholic bishop, in the fashion of the primitive church, by an electoral body composed of the clergy and delegates of the people.

At the third conference, held at Constance in 1873, the organization was completed, and a synodal constitution adopted. The diocesan synod, presided over by the bishop, and consisting of the clergy of the diocese, and one lay-delegate for each two hundred church-members, assembles every year, and despatches such business as has been prepared for it by the synodal committee,— an administrative body composed of four priests and five laymen, and placed beside the bishop for his assistance. The organization was recognized everywhere in Germany by the secular government. The first synod met at Bonn in 1874. A number of refusals have been gradually adopted and introduced,— the offering of the cup also to the laity in the Lord's Supper, the use of the native tongue in the service, the abolition of compulsory celibacy, etc. A similar constitution has been adopted by the Old-Catholic Church in Switzerland, where the movement first started, the movement could not stop; and the direction in which it had to run on was irresistibly prescribed by the logic of events.
consecrated by Reinkens. The Swiss Constitution, however, is somewhat more democratic, as the bishop does not preside over the synod, greater influence on the administration is allowed to the congregation, the bishop can be deposed by the synod, etc. In Austria the government made some difficulties before recognizing the organization. In Bohemia, however, and in Austria proper, especially in Vienna, several Old-Catholic congregations have been formed. In Paris the ex-pére Hyacinthe Loyson has formed an Old-Catholic congregation. In 1878 the statistics of the movement showed 122 congregations and 52,002 souls. Since that time the movement has made little or no progress.


OLDENBURG, the Grand Duchy of, consists of three parts, — the duchy of Oldenburg, the principality of Lübeck, and the principality of Birkenfeld, — whose church-establishments are entirely independent of each other, though the constitution is the same in all of them. According to the last census of 1875, the grand duchy contained 319,314 inhabitants, of whom 245,054 were Evangelical, 71,743 Roman Catholic, 1,578 Jews, 909 Christians of various denominations, and 80 of no acknowledged form of religion. The Reformation was established in the country July 13, 1573, in 1635 the Church became a State establishment, and Lutheranism, the only denomination tolerated. In 1848 this constitution was abolished, the Church was separated from the State, and universal toleration made a law. In 1858, however, it was found necessary to return to the old order of things by the constitution of April 11. The Lutheran Church again became a State establishment, but religious freedom was retained.

OLD-LIGHT ANTIBURCHERS. See SECEDEES.

OLD TESTAMENT. See BIBLE TEXT, CANON.

OLEARIUS was the name of a German family, which, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, produced a great number of learned theologians. — I.JOHANNES OLEARIUS, b. at Wesel, Sept. 17, 1546; d. at Halle, Jan. 26, 1623; studied at Marburg and Jena, and was appointed professor of Hebrew at Königsberg in 1577, professor of theology at Helmstedt in 1578, and superintendent of Halle in 1581. He was a son-in-law of Hesshusen, and, like him, an ardent champion of correct Lutheranism. — II. GOTTFRIED OLEARIUS, son of I.; b. at Halle, Jan. 1, 1604; d. there Feb. 20, 1685; studied at Jena and Wittenberg, and was in 1647 appointed superintendent of Halle, and held this eminent position until his death on Nov. 17, 1685. He was a very prolific writer: Aphorismi homiletici, 1658; Annotationes biblica, 1677; Idea dispositionum biblicarum, 1681; Halygraphia (an historical description of the city of Halle), etc.

III. JOHANNES OLEARIUS, son of I.; b. at Halle, Sept. 17, 1611; d. at Weinsfels, April 14, 1680; studied at Wittenberg, and was appointed superintendent of Querfurt in 1637, court-preacher to the Duke of Saxony-Weisenfels in 1643, and superintendent of the Weisenfels dominions in 1680. He published Methodus studii theologici, 1684; Oratorio sacra, 1686; a number of devotional books, a hymn-book containing two hundred and forty hymns by himself, etc. — IV. GOTTFRIED OLEARIUS, son of II.; b. at Halle, Sept. 28, 1635; d. at Arnstadt, where he was superintendent, May 21, 1711; became especially noted as a hymn-writer: Poetische Erstüng, 1694, and Geistliche Singe-Lust, 1877. His Abacus Patrologicus, Halle, 1678 (lives of ecclesiastical writers before the Reformation, alphabetically arranged), was republished in 1711, by his son, in an enlarged form, under the title of Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum. — V. JOHANN CHRISTOPH OLEARIUS, son of III.; b. at Halle, Sept. 17, 1660; d. at Arnstadt, where he was superintendent, March 81, 1747; was a man of vast learning and great literary activity. His works on hymnology (Entwurf einer Liederbibliothek, 1702; Evangel. Liederschatz, 1703, 4 vols.; Jubilirende Liederfreude, 1717) are still of interest. — VI. Johannes Oelarius, son of II.; b. at Halle, May 17, 1664; d. at Leipzig, Aug. 6, 1713; was appointed professor of classical languages at Leipzig in 1688, and professor of theology in 1677. In the Pietist controversy he sided with Spener and Francke, though without taking active part in the contest until Carpzov's attack in 1692, which he met with an open and decided protest. Among his writings are, Exercitationes philologico ad epistles dominicales, 1674; De Styllo N. T., 1678; Synopsis controversiarum cum Pontificibus, Calculinatis, Socinianis, etc., 1688. — VII. Gottfried Oelarius, son of VI.; b. at Leipzig, July 28, 1672; d. there Nov. 10, 1714; was appointed professor of classical languages in his native city in 1699, and professor of theology in 1708. He was still more independent of the reigning orthodoxy than his father. Of his writings, mostly dissertations on exegetical and dogmatical subjects, his Jesus, der wahre Messias, Leie Befehl, 1705, 4 vols., received much attention. — VIII. Johann Christian Oelarius, son of III.; b. at Halle, June 22, 1646; d. there Dec. 9, 1699; studied at Jena, Leipzig, and Kiel; visited also the Dutch universities and Strassburg, and succeeded in 1686 his uncle as superintendent of Halle. He was an open but moderate adversary of the Pietist movement. He published some dissertations and sermons. More detailed information on the whole family is to be found in LEUCKFELD: Historia Hessusiana and DREYHAUT: Beschreibung des Saalebrettes.

OLEVIANUS, Caspar, one of the fathers and founders of the Reformed Church in Germany; b. in Trèves, Aug. 10, 1530; d. at Herborn, March 16, 1587. He was made acquainted with the bearing of Christ's sacrifice on the forgiveness of sin through the teachings of a pious mother, and entered the religious life at Halle, and at Buxtehude, and Bouges. A solemn religious impression was made upon his mind at Bouges by the death of a friend by drowning; and his own narrow escape; and he consecrated his powers to the service of
the gospel. He took up the study of Calvin's works, and in 1558 went to Geneva, where he became an ardent follower of the Swiss Reformer. Returning to Trèves in 1560, he was appointed teacher of Greek in the University. In 1572 he resigned his office as pastor, in order to devote himself wholly to the seminary. His few writings are mostly of devotional character. His *Catechisme chrétien pour la vie intérieure*, Louvain, 1666, was often republished.

**OLIN, Stephen, D.D., L.L.D., Methodist divine;** b. at Leicester, Vt., March 3, 1797; d. at Middletown, Conn., Aug. 16, 1861. He was graduated from Middlebury College 1820; entered the ministry of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, and, after several appointments, was professor of English literature in the University of Georgia 1827-94, president of Randolph Macon College, Virginia, 1834-37, president of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., 1842 till his death. From 1837 to 1841 he travelled in Europe, Egypt, and Palestine, the fruits of which journey were, *Travels in Egypt, Arabia Petraea, and the Holy Land*, New York, 1848, 2 vols.; and *Castle Horn*, New York, 1854. President Olin was renowned as a pulpit orator. His *Works*, consisting of sermons, etc., appeared New York, 1852, 2 vols.; and his *Life and Letters*, edited by his wife, New York, 1855, 2 vols.

**OLIVA, Fernan Perez de**, b. at Cordova, 1494; d. at Salamanca, 1550; studied at Salamanca, Acaia, Paris, and Rome; lectured with much success on the morals of Aristotle in Paris, and received the most flattering invitations to Rome from Adrian VI., but preferred to settle on Spanish soil at Salamanca, and acquired a noted place in the history of Spanish literature by employing the Castilian tongue, instead of the Latin, in his essays: *On the Dignity of Man, On the Faculties of the Mind, etc.* See *Tichenor*: *History of Spanish Literature*, New York, 1849.

**OLIVE. See On.**

**OLIVER, Thomas**, b. at Tregonan, in Wales, 1725; d. in London, March, 1796. Illiterate and profligate as a youth, he was converted under Whitefield's preaching, became (1753) one of Wesley's most active preachers, and his corrector of the press (1775-88), doing much work in the Calvinistic-Arminian Controversy. He wrote an *Elegy* on Wesley's death (1781) and four hymns, whereof "The God of Abraham praise" (1772 or earlier) is generally allowed to be one of the noblest odes in the language.

**OLIVET and OLIVES, Mount of**, a mountain range east of Jerusalem, called by the Arabs Jebel et Tur ("mount of the rock"). 1. *Physical Features.*—It is, properly speaking, a ridge, sloping on the west abruptly toward the Kidron Valley, by which it is separated from Jerusalem, but towards the east more gradually, breaking up into valleys. It has four distinct elevations, although the intervening depressions are very slight. (1) *Viri Galilaei* ("ye men of Galileae"), so called because there, tradition says, the angels addressed those words to the gazing disciples (Acts i. 11). It is a half-mile north of the city, and is 2,882 feet above sea-level. (2) "Mount of Ascension," 2,065 feet directly opposite the city, and properly the Mount of Olives. (3) "The Mount of Olives is a catacomb, the "Prophets' Tombs," on its side.
This summit is south-west of the former about six hundred yards. (4) “Mount of Offence,” because there Solomon set up the idol-worship. Bleak as the mountain ridge is at present, only a few scattered olive-trees being left to justify its name, there is evidence that once it really was covered with olives, myrtles, pines, and palms; and a little care and cultivation would restore its beauty.

2. The View from the Mount of Ascension is the “saddest and yet the most impressive in the world.” It is the best view of Jerusalem, so full of reminiscences of former grandeur, so full of evidences of present decay. And more can be seen than the city directly in front. On the north rises Scopus; on the east are the Dead Sea, apparently at one’s feet, but really seven hours of hard riding away, and the mountains around it; on the south is the Frank Mountain. Our Lord rose Scopus; on the east are the Dead Sea, aene evidences of present decay. And more can be named, there is evidence that once it really was covered with olives, myrtles, pines, and palms; and a little care and cultivation would restore its beauty.

3. Scripture Allusions. — Olivet is first mentioned in connection with David’s flight from Absalom (2 Sam. xvi. 10). It was the scene of the worship of Chemosh and Molech, set up by Solomon (1 Kings xi. 7), destroyed by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 13, 14); thence, also, the people, by order of Ezra, got the branches for the feast of tabernacles ( Neh. viii. 16). But the allusions to it in the New Testament are not only more numerous, but much more interesting. “It is very prominent in the closing scenes of our Saviour’s ministry. In Bethany, on the eastern slope of Olivet, he had his most intimate friends, — Lazarus, Martha, and Mary; — and performed his last and greatest miracle (Luke x. 38-42; John xii.). From Mount Olivet he made his triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Luke xix. 29-38). Here he spent the nights intervening between the entry and his passion, and returned every morning to teach in the temple (Luke xx. 37). Descending from this mountain, he wept over the ungrateful city, and foretold her fearful doom (Luke xix. 41-44; cf. ver. 37). To it he repaired on the night of his betrayal (John xviii. 1); from it he ascended to heaven to take possession of his throne (Luke xxiv. 50; Acts i. 12).” — SCHAFF, Through Bible Lands, p. 406. He entered at Ein Karem, south-west of Olivet; and so upon the same mountain pressed the feet of Jesus when in the depths of his humiliation; and in the heights of his triumph.

4. Buildings on the Mount. — Tradition wrongly puts the ascension upon the so-called “Mount of Ascension.” Indeed, our Lord’s footstep is shown in the Mohammedan mosque which now covers the spot. There Helena, the mother of Constantine, built (325) a basilica; and other churches and convents were built there by crusaders. The patriarch Modestus, in the beginning of the seventh century, built there a rotunda, open in the middle, because that the place of the ascension must not be covered by a roof. This building was several times destroyed and rebuilt. The present Chapel of the Ascension is octagonal, and was rebuilt after the earthquake of 1694. On the spot traditionally pointed out, sacred, Mohammedans and Moslems, rows of whose court “are ranged the altars of various Christian churches.”

Besides the literature under Jerusalem, see the exhaustive monograph of TOBLER: Siloachquelle u. d. Olberga, St. Gallen, 1832.

OLIVETAN, Pierre Robert, b. at Noyon; a relative of Calvin; was tutor in a rich family at Geneva in 1533, but was expelled from the city for propagating the ideas of the Reformation; settled at Neuchâtel, and undertook, on the instance of the Piedmontese Waldenses, to translate the Bible into French. As he was not a great Greek or Hebrew scholar, he used the translation of Lefèvre d’Étalpo as foundation for his own work. It appeared at Neuchâtel, 1535, in folio. Afterwards revised by Calvin, it was generally adopted by the French Protestants. Olivetan died at Ferrara in 1538.

OLIVI, Pierre Jean, b. at Sérignan in Languedoc, towards the middle of the thirteenth century; d. at Narbonne, 1297; entered the order of the Franciscans; studied theology in Paris; became a man of great learning and severe morals, and contended for the complete fulfilment of the rules of his order, also that of absolute poverty. To these maxims he added certain apocalyptic ideas resembling those of the abbot Joachim, which he set forth in his Postilla super Apocalyp. Before his death the book does not seem to have been known outside of the narrow circle of his friends and pupils; but in 1520 Pope John XXII. condemned sixty-six copies of it, and the author’s bones were dug up and burnt. See Wadding: Annales Minorum. C. SCHMIDT.

OLLIVANT, Alfred, D.D., Bishop of Llandaff; b. at Manchester, Eng., 1798; d. at Llandaff, Dec. 16, 1832. He was fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1821; vice-principal of St. David’s College, Lampeter, 1827-43; regius professor of divinity, Cambridge, 1843-49; and bishop of Llandaff, 1849 till his death. He published An Analysis of the Text of the History of Joseph, London, 1825, 2d ed., 1833; Sermons preached in the Chapel of St. David’s, Lampeter, 1831. He was a member of the O.T. Company of Revisers.

OLSHAUSEN, Hermann, a pious theologian, who participated actively in the theological movements of his day, and did excellent work in the department of New-Testament exegesis; the son of a clergyman; was b. at Oldeslohe [in Holstein], Aug. 21, 1798; entered the university of Kiel, and two years later passed to the university of Berlin, where he came under the influence of Schleiermacher and Neander. At the festival of the Reformation in 1817, he gained the prize for the best essay upon Melanchthon as depicted in his letters (Melanchthon. Charakteristik aus seinen Briefen dargestellt, Berlin, 1818). In 1820 he became privadoctor at Berlin, in 1821 professor extraordinarius, and, in 1827, ordinary professor at Königsberg. In the circle of young friends at Berlin who gathered especially about Neander, he had manifested a living faith in Christ in its full power. From that time he “desired only to be a faithful servant of the church of his Lord and Saviour.” He married Agnes von Fritzwitz-Gaffron, but his happiness was much interrupted by the affliction of a feeble constitution. In the hope of benefiting his health, he followed a call to Erlangen in 1834.

Olshausen’s special department was New-Testament exegesis. He prepared the way for his Commentary in a work on the historical proofs of the genuineness of the Gospels in the first two centu-
ries (Die Aechtkeit d. vier kanon. Evangelen, etc., Königsberg, 1833, English translation in American edition of Commentary by Fosdick). He stated his exegetical principles in two works, — Ein Wort über tieferen Schriftsinn (Königsberg, 1824), and D. bibl. Schriftauslegung (Hamburg, 1825), and defended the allegorical and typical methods, but without opposing the grammatical and historical. He believed that "experience is the condition of an understanding of a religious work, and especially the Bible." His ideas were realized in his Commentary on the New Testament, completed and revised by Ebrard and Wiesinger, Königsberg, 1830 sqq., and later editions (trans. for Clarke's Foreign Theol. Library, Edinburgh, 1847-49, 4 vols., and revised by Professor A.C. Kendrick, New York, 1856-58, 6 vols.). He often shows a profound perception of the meaning and connection of the plan of revelation, without neglecting, however, the meaning of the words. Olshausen's memory will continue to be held in honor as that of a Christian scholar; and the seed he sowed will not be lost for the kingdom of God.

L. FELT.

OMISH, or AMISH, the followers of Jakob Ammon. See MENNONITES.

OMINIPOTENCE, OMNISCIENCE, of God. See GOD.

OON (the Egyptian, An, the Greek, Heliopolis), "City of the Sun," which was a translation and paraphrase of the Egyptian name, and must have been known to the Hebrews, since Jeremiah (xiii. 19) calls the city Beth-she'mesh, "House of the Sun." It was one of the oldest and most renowned cities of Lower Egypt, and the principal seat of the worship of the sun. The magnificent sun-temple of On is the only Egyptian temple of which we have a detailed description by a Greek (Herodotus). It was especially celebrated for its numberless obelisks. The obelisk was the peculiar symbol of the sun-god, and most of the obelisks which have been carried to Europe have been taken from On. With the sun-temple were connected a priest school and a medical school, and those institutions were visited by all the Greek philosophers who went to Egypt to study. At the time of Strabo it is said that a Hebraic language was still shown, in which Plato had stopped. The population in the neighborhood of On was not purely Egyptian, but much mixed up with Semitic elements. Asenath, the wife of Joseph, was the daughter of Poti-pherah, a priest of Heliopolis (Gen. xii. 43). Both these names, however, are genuine Egyptian.

OONDERDONK, Henry Ustic, D.D., L.L.D., was b. in New York, March, 1789; and d. in Philadelphia, Dec. 6, 1858. He graduated at Columbia College, 1805; studied medicine in London; M.D., Edinburgh, 1810; with Dr. V. Mott, edited New-York Medical Journal; was ordained, 1815; ministered at Canandaigua, N.Y., 1816-20; rector of St. Ann's, Brooklyn, 1820-27; assistant bishop of Pennsylvania, 1827; succeeded Bishop White, 1836; suspended, 1844; restored, 1856. He published Episcopacy Examined and Re-examined (1835), An American Edition of Commentary by Fosdick). He stated his exegetical principles in two works, — Ein Wort über tieferen Schriftsinn (Königsberg, 1824), and D. bibl. Schriftauslegung (Hamburg, 1825), and defended the allegorical and typical methods, but without opposing the grammatical and historical. He believed that "experience is the condition of an understanding of a religious work, and especially the Bible." His ideas were realized in his Commentary on the New Testament, completed and revised by Ebrard and Wiesinger, Königsberg, 1830 sqq., and later editions (trans. for Clarke's Foreign Theol. Library, Edinburgh, 1847-49, 4 vols., and revised by Professor A.C. Kendrick, New York, 1856-58, 6 vols.). He often shows a profound perception of the meaning and connection of the plan of revelation, without neglecting, however, the meaning of the words. Olshausen's memory will continue to be held in honor as that of a Christian scholar; and the seed he sowed will not be lost for the kingdom of God.
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OMINIPOTENCE, OMNISCIENCE, of God. See GOD.

OON (the Egyptian, An, the Greek, Heliopolis), "City of the Sun," which was a translation and paraphrase of the Egyptian name, and must have been known to the Hebrews, since Jeremiah (xiii. 19) calls the city Beth-she'mesh, "House of the Sun." It was one of the oldest and most renowned cities of Lower Egypt, and the principal seat of the worship of the sun. The magnificent sun-temple of On is the only Egyptian temple of which we have a detailed description by a Greek (Herodotus). It was especially celebrated for its numberless obelisks. The obelisk was the peculiar symbol of the sun-god, and most of the obelisks which have been carried to Europe have been taken from On. With the sun-temple were connected a priest school and a medical school, and those institutions were visited by all the Greek philosophers who went to Egypt to study. At the time of Strabo it is said that a Hebraic language was still shown, in which Plato had stopped. The population in the neighborhood of On was not purely Egyptian, but much mixed up with Semitic elements. Asenath, the wife of Joseph, was the daughter of Poti-pherah, a priest of Heliopolis (Gen. xii. 43). Both these names, however, are genuine Egyptian.
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Ophir (Ὡφίρ) in the Sept. Ὁφίρ; or Ὡφίρ, in the Sept. Ὁφίρ, Ὁφίρ, etc.) is mentioned in Gen. x. 29 as the eleventh son of Joktan, and in 1 Kings ix. 28, x. 11, 2 Chron. viii. 18, ix. 10, as a region from which the fleet of Solomon, navigated by Egyptians, brought back gold, and that not only in immense quantities, but also of a fineness unequalled by the product of any other region (comp. 1 Chron. xxix. 4; Job xxviii. 16; Ps. xlv. 9). The question where the abode of Ophir the Shemite was to be sought for, was pretty accurately answered at the time of Moses: all the thirteen sons of Joktan, and the tribes descending from them, were settled in Arabia. But where was the Ophir of Solomon? The latter question has puzzled a great number of the most learned Orientalists and historians. Its theological import is small; but, in the chain of ancient traditions concerning commercial connections and routes, Ophir forms a link of the greatest consequence. Four different views with respect to its location have been propounded and sustained by reasons of weight. Some have placed it in South Africa and in which respect it also far exceeds India; and, finally, the circumnavigation of Africa by the Phcenicians, who, according to Herodotus, planted a hundred stations on the western coast of the continent. But the etymology of Fura is a weak point; and Africa has no sandal-wood and no peacocks, both of which belong exclusively to India. In favor of India speaks the circumstance that the names of the products (gold excepted) which were brought from Ophir are all of Indian origin, such as Koph, "ape," Kapi in Sanscrit; Shen habibim, "tooth of the elephant," from the Indian ibis, the Egyptian ibis, the Latin ibis, "ivory;" Tuktim, "peacock," from Čiš in Sanscrit, and Togei in Malabar, etc. It is also evident that the Zöph of the Septuagint means India, as Sophir is the Coptic name of "India and its islands;" and Josephus says explicitly, that the fleet of Solomon went to India, which in olden times was called Sophira, but now is called Chryse (J. E., 6, 8, 4). But the difficulty is to designate a point in which the gold of Himalaya and the sandal-wood of Deccan (that is, the products of the northern and southern parts of India) could be conveniently gathered together for exportation. Abhira has been pointed out as an old Arian settlement situated in lat. 20° N., between the Delta of India and the Gulf of Cambay; also the Supara of Ptolemy, the present Goa; and others. But in all cases the etymology presents difficulties. The safest is still to seek for Ophir in some place on the south-eastern coast of Arabia, which forms a convenient point of connection between Eastern Africa and India, and which in olden times was certainly inhabited by the Ophirites (Gen. x. 29), though not neither the country, nor any single place in it, bears the name. [See A. Soetbeer: Das Goldland Ophir, Berlin, 1880;] PRESSEL.

Ophites. See Gnosticism, p. 880.

Optatus, Bishop of Mileve in Numidia. Of his life nothing is known; but a book by him, De schismate Donalitarum adversus Parmenianum, has come down to us. According to Jerome (De vir. ill., 110) it was written between 384 and 375; but this statement is contradicted by a notice in the work itself, Rosennad servit (ii. 3), as Siricius did not ascend the episcopal throne of Rome until 384. The passage, however, may be a later interpolation or addition, as, indeed, the whole seventh book seems to be an appendix added to the original text at a later date. The plan of the work presupposes only the six first books, and Jerome knew only them. The work is a refutation, from the Catholic side, of a work, now lost, by the Donatist Parmenianus, and is written in a conciliatory spirit, which, of course, does not exclude many severe attacks in the details. It is, consequently, a precious source for the history of Donatism. But, besides this its historical importance, it has considerable dogmatical interest. In his exposition of the idea of the Church, Optatus is the immediate predecessor of Augustine, and independent of Cyprian. He was the first to ascribe to the sacrament that character of object (ex uno solo, non per homines) which came to play a decisive part in the dogmatics of the Western Church. From his explanation of the "gifts" of the church, it appears that the idea of the Cathedra Petri, as the representative of the unity of the episcopate, was accepted in Africa, etc. The first edition of
OPTIMISM AND PESSIMISM. When these terms are employed to denote philosophical systems, the former signifies the theory that existence is essentially good and the universe perfect; and the latter, the theory that existence is essentially evil and the universe a vanity. Neither term is old. The former only became current in the first half of the eighteenth century, when it was employed to designate the Leibnitzian doctrine of the best possible world. The latter has only come into circulation in the present century, and chiefly in consequence of the influence and celebrity acquired by the doctrine of Schopenhauer. Optimism and pessimism both existed, however, long before the terms now used to designate them. Springing more from the heart than from the head,—from moods and dispositions, than from reasons and discoveries,—they may be traced as veins of feeling and belief through poetry and religion, in almost every age and land which have had a literature, although they have only appeared in modern times as distinct philosophical theories. It is only, however, in the theoretical or philosophical stage that they deserve their name, and show their nature. Popular optimism and pessimism do not look beyond the interests of individuals or species; and yet the optimism and pessimism which do not regard the world in its entirety are manifestly both incomplete and inconsistent.

Optimism may allow that there is much pain, and pessimism may allow that there is much pleasure, in life. So far as suffering may lead to the greatest good, optimism demands it. So far as enjoyment is necessary to render an essentially evil existence endurable, pessimism requires it. Optimism denies that there is anything really evil, if the universe be considered as a whole, but not that there are many particular evils in the universe. Pessimism denies that there is anything really good in relation to the universe as a whole, but not that there are many things good as regards the particular interests of particular beings.

The chief classical and Christian philosophies were optimist in spirit. But optimism appeared as a distinct theory, only near the close of the seventeenth century. As it was adopted about the same time by Lord Shaftesbury, Archbishop King, and Leibnitz, it is necessary to bear in mind that Shaftesbury first expounded it in his Inquiry concerning Virtue, written in 1692, and surreptitiously published in 1699; King, in his De Origine Mundi, published in 1702; and Leibnitz, in his Theodicee, published in 1710. It had occurred independently to Leibnitz; but, before he published on the subject, he had read what Shaftesbury and King had written. It is an error to represent, as Dugald Stewart and Mr. Hunt have done, Shaftesbury or King as having derived their optimism from Leibnitz. In Pope's Essay on Man, the doctrine was most skilfully advocated in verse. In Voltaire's romance of Candide, it was most humorously ridiculed.

What optimism teaches is, that every thing in the universe is in its place, is good relatively to the whole, is for the best; that the universe as a whole could not have been better contrived or ordered than it is; that there is nothing really evil, since, however painful and hurtful many things may be within certain limits of a part of it, be contemplated; and whatever he wishes must be realized, because he is omnipotent and omniscient. This argument can be made extremely plausible. It is doubtful, however, if it be conclusive. "The world is the best possible, because God is infinitely powerful, wise, and good." Is there not just as much reason for saying that the world cannot be so good but that God could have made it better, because he is thus infinite? As he is infinite, and the world is finite, the distance between his goodness and any degree of goodness which the world can have must be infinite; and to say that it is so as good as he could make it, however good it may be, would appear to imply that his power must be limited. In fact, it would almost seem as if here were a case, where, turn to which side we please, there meets us the horn of a dilemma. If the world is not the best possible, says the optimist, God cannot be all-good. But if the world be the best possible, the best that God can make, is the inference not just as good that God cannot be all-powerful? Or, rather, is the true inference not, that we are reasoning in a region too high for us, and where our conclusions are not much worth one way or another? Then, is it clear that there can be no real evil in the world, because God is absolutely good? May it not merely be that there should be even such evil than that God should prevent it by making men unable to do it, while yet the world might be a great deal better than it is if men did no evil. There is obviously a vast difference between the so-called evils of the physical world and the evils of the moral world. The former can be shown to be conducive to the good of the physical system as a whole, and therefore to be only seemingly evil. The latter are pronounced by conscience essentially evil, and investigation fails to prove that they have any rightful place in the world.

The dissatisfaction with life which ultimately leads to pessimism comes to light in all literatures. It found a very remarkable religious expression in Buddhism. In the present century it has appeared in a series of speculative systems. The two countries in which pessimism has chiefly flourished are India and Germany. Only in pantheistic soil can pessimism flourish. The belief that existence is essentially evil can never spring from a true theism. Arthur Schopenhauer (1778-1880) was the founder of modern or German pessimism. According to him, the world is the worst possible. A worse world could not exist at all. It is representation, an illusion produced by the intellect, behind which lies will, the universal substance, the ultimate principle of all things. The world is led by itself blind, unconscious striving, which only comes to consciousness in animated beings. Discontent is of its very essence; and, with every new stage
of development, it becomes increasingly wretched. The radical evil is the will to live. The great aim of life is to get rid of life through extinction of the will to live; and this must be accomplished by fasting, by voluntary poverty, by meek submission to a person of one's own choice, and, in the last word, by the various exercises of asceticism. The most distinguished living representative of pessimism is Edward von Hartmann. He attempted to overcome the dualism of will and knowledge in Schopenhauer's philosophy by reducing them to a unity, which he calls the Unconscious. To the working of the irrational will of the Unconscious, he ascribes alike the origin of existence and of evil. That will has broken away from the primitive harmony of the Unconscious, and nature and life are the deplorable consequences. Reason follows after, to undo, as far as possible, the evil which has wrought, and to convince it of the mischief which it has caused and is causing; but, before it succeeds, all history must be traversed, all delusions experienced, all follies committed. He will not say that the world is the worst possible; he will not deny even that it may be the best possible, if it were only as it is supposed to be now what it is possible: but he holds decidedly that it is worse than would have been no world at all. He believes himself able to prove, by an appeal to the evidence both of individuals and of society, that pain preponderates in a high degree over pleasure, evil over good. He does not deny that there is a kind of progress and plan in history; and yet he regards history as, on the whole, an irrational process, the successive epochs of which are so many stages of illusion. The progress of history is, in his view, not the growth of any positive good in history, but the growth of man's consciousness of his view, not the growth of any positive good in history, but the growth of man's consciousness of his view. The advance of the Unconscious is the only positive good. That will is broken away from the primitive harmony of the Unconscious, and this must be accomplished to his own will, not necessarily in the Bible itself, at least in the sacred tradition still living: otherwise the direct relation is lost. Only a very few composers of oratorios, such as Scarlatti in his St. Francesca, and Metastasio in his St. Helena, have ventured away from the fountain itself. The subject chosen, the absence of the stage, allows the introduction of much broader epic elements than the opera can assimilate, and the absence of acting necessitates a much more abstract expression of emotion. On account of the personal appeal which the subject makes to the audience, the oratorio has no room for representation of character in the full, artistic sense of the word. On the other hand, however, if the dramatic next in age can acquire it by option if he prefers it to his own. In the ecclesiastical law of England, option denoted a right, which the archbishop acquired by confirming a bishop, of filling the next vacant benefice belonging to the see according to his own choice, and, in the last word, by the various exercises of asceticism. The most distinguished living representative of pessimism is Edward von Hartmann. He attempted to overcome the dualism of will and knowledge in Schopenhauer's philosophy by reducing them to a unity, which he calls the Unconscious. To the working of the irrational will of the Unconscious, he ascribes alike the origin of existence and of evil. That will has broken away from the primitive harmony of the Unconscious, and nature and life are the deplorable consequences. Reason follows after, to undo, as far as possible, the evil which has wrought, and to convince it of the mischief which it has caused and is causing; but, before it succeeds, all history must be traversed, all delusions experienced, all follies committed. He will not say that the world is the worst possible; he will not deny even that it may be the best possible, if it were only as it is supposed to be now what it is possible: but he holds decidedly that it is worse than would have been no world at all. He believes himself able to prove, by an appeal to the evidence both of individuals and of society, that pain preponderates in a high degree over pleasure, evil over good. He does not deny that there is a kind of progress and plan in history; and yet he regards history as, on the whole, an irrational process, the successive epochs of which are so many stages of illusion. The progress of history is, in his view, not the growth of any positive good in history, but the growth of man's consciousness of his view, not the growth of any positive good in history, but the growth of man's consciousness of his view. The advance of the Unconscious is the only positive good. That will is broken away from the primitive harmony of the Unconscious, and this must be accomplished to his own will, not necessarily in the Bible itself, at least in the sacred tradition still living: otherwise the direct relation is lost. Only a very few composers of oratorios, such as Scarlatti in his St. Francesca, and Metastasio in his St. Helena, have ventured away from the fountain itself. The subject chosen, the absence of the stage, allows the introduction of much broader epic elements than the opera can assimilate, and the absence of acting necessitates a much more abstract expression of emotion. On account of the personal appeal which the subject makes to the audience, the oratorio has no room for representation of character in the full, artistic sense of the word. On the other hand, however, if the dramatic
element becomes entirely lost in epic descriptions and lyric declamations, the oratorio shrinks into a mere cantata, as in the case of The Seven Words of Haydn. Generally it may be said that there is no similarity between the recitative and choruses of the oratorio and the thirty or forty airs which were preserved at the Frankish court, took the place of oratorio, being applied first to court oratories, and then to the Pope's private (Sistine) chapel, and other private or smaller churches. The term "oratorio" was also used for the nave of the church where the people worshipped (Theodos. et Valentin., Codex Theodos., IX. 45). It now usually designates a room distinct from the main church. The Oration in Paris is a Protestant church where Adolphe Monod preached. See GATTICUS: De oratorios domestici, 2d ed., Rome, 1770; JOSEPHUS DE BONIS: De oratorios publicis, FORTUNATUS A BRUIA: De oratorios domestici, both published by Assemani, Rome, 1766; art. "Bethaus," in WETZER U. WELTE'S Kirchen-Lexikon.

**ORATORY. ORDEAL.**

Historically the oratorio owes its origin to St. Filippo de Neri (1515-95), the founder of the order of the Oratorians, and the confessor of Palestreina. The opera was just the rage of the day, and without hesitation Neri engaged it in the service of the church. In the oratory of his order a stage was erected, and fitted up with full decoration. On this stage an azione sacra—that is, a scene of the Bible, or of the sacred tradition of the church—was enacted by priests in costume. The style of the music was that of the opera seria with some small modifications. The bass was allowed to sing solos, the choirs were more prominent, the orchestral accompaniment was less developed. The style of this development was the Passion of Handel, composed by Bach, and performed for the first time in the Cathedral of Leipzig on Good Friday, 1729. The last chapter of the history of the oratorio is marked by the appearance of Handel (1685-1759) and Bach (1685-1750); and the difference between the old Italian and the new Anglo-Germanic form of the genre is like that between a polite abbot of the period of the Renaissance and one of the four great prophets. The difference between the two great masters themselves may be thus described,—while the oratorio of Handel became a free, independent creation, though still belonging to the church, the passion-music of Bach remained a part of the service itself, and was partially destined for the use of the congregation. From the Roman-Catholic Church the Protestant churches of Germany had retained the custom of celebrating Good Friday by a special recital, in the Gregorian style, of the Passion; different lines being recited or sung by different voices, and sometimes repeated by the whole congregation. Under the influence of the opera, this Passion-recital had been further developed by Heinrich Schütz, chapel-master of Dresden, and Sebastiani, chapel-master of Königsberg. The narrative was dissolved into a series of recitatives, solos, duos, and choruses. The final perfection of this development was the Passion according to Matthew, composed by Bach, and performed for the first time in the Cathedral of Leipzig on Good Friday, 1729. The last chapter of the history of the oratorio is occupied by Haydn (1732-1809) and Mendelssohn (1809-47), by whose treatment its technical form, more especially the instrumental portion, no doubt, was still further developed, but who hardly can be said to have been able to keep up its spiritual standard. Haydn's.exuberance of graceful melody was somewhat wanting in sublimity, and one of Mendelssohn's compositions shows a greater affinity to the salon than to the church. [O. WANGEMANN: Geschichte des Oratoriums, Demmin, 1883; ed. PALMER.

**ORATORY (eisivagn, oratorium), literally a place where prayer is made, designated in early church the smaller and often private chapel in distinction from the parochial churches. The Council of Braga (572) forbade the celebration of the mass in them. At a later time the word "chapel," probably derived from the cappella ("little cowl") of Martin of Tours, which was preserved at the Frankish court, took the place of oratory, being applied first to court oratories, and then to the Pope's private (Sistine) chapel, and other private or smaller churches. The term "oratory" was also used for the nave of the church where the people worshipped (Theodos. et Valentin., Codex Theodos., IX. 45). It now usually designates a room distinct from the main church. The Oration in Paris is a Protestant church where Adolphe Monod preached. See GATTICUS: De oratorios domestici, 2d ed., Rome, 1770; JOSEPHUS DE BONIS: De oratorios publicis, FORTUNATUS A BRUIA: De oratorios domestici, both published by Assemani, Rome, 1766; art. "Bethaus," in WETZER U. WELTE'S Kirchen-Lexikon.

**ORATORY, Priests of the.** See NERI.

**ORDEAL,** probably from the Anglo-Saxon Ordal ("great judgment"), and alluded to the German Urtheil ("judgment"). As a general term it pointed to the judgment of God; and its use from the sixth to the thirteenth century denotes, in the history of European civilization, a transition state from the times when every man took the law in his own hand to the times when justice came to be administered by regular courts. Among the Germanic nations, decision of certain cases of strife by wager of battle or duel was a general custom; but as, in that way, justice could be only accidentally obtained, while one duel generally led to another, until whole families were covered with bloodshed, or destroyed, the custom was of course an abomination to the eyes of the Christian clergy. Unable, however, to substitute for this barbarity a regular procedure with witnesses and testimonies, the clergy themselves encouraged the appeals to the direct judgment of God; that is, the legal establishment of the ordeal. There were several kinds of ordeal by fire or iron, which consisted in carrying red-hot iron in the hands, or walking upon it, and was much used in cases of adultery; ordeal by hot water, which consisted in thrusting the arm down into a vessel of boiling water, and fetching up some object from the bottom, and was much used in cases of theft; ordeal by cold water, which consisted in being thrown, with hands and feet tied together, into a stream of water, and was much used in cases of witchcraft; ordeal of the Eucharist, of the corsened, etc., mostly used for ecclesiastics. Gradually these ordeals were incorporated with the laws,—the Salic, Saxon, Lombardian, Visigothic, etc.,—and became regular institutions in the social order; but though they were introduced by the clergy, and always administered under their superintendence, which could not but add to the social importance of the church, the clergy never became unanimous on the point. In the beginning of the ninth century a solemn council of Lyons absolutely condemned the ordeal. In the eleventh century the opposition became, if not more pronounced, at least more wide-spread; and finally the Council of Trent altogether rejected it (Sess. 25, De Reformazione, cap. 18). In Protestant countries, however,—Prussia, Dated in, etc.—ordeals were still tried by ordeal in the seventeenth century.
ORDINATION.

1, 3). Four conclusions may be derived from the passages in the Acts: (1) A special efficacy was associated with the solemn rite of the laying-on of hands; (2) It was not confined to the apostles; (3) An inferior in public ecclesiastical office, or perhaps a layman (Ananias is called a "disciple"), might lay his hands upon a superior; (4) The rite of the laying-on of hands, with which a special efficacy or empowerment was associated, was not limited to one occasion.

Passing on to Paul's Epistles, it is discovered that the laying-on of hands was associated with the setting-apart of Christians to the special work of the ministry. Thus Timothy is enjoined to "lay hands suddenly on no man" (1 Tim. v. 22), and is reminded of his own solemn setting-apart "with the laying-on of the hands of the presbytery" (1 Tim. iv. 14). Two things seem to be clear from these statements in the New Testament: (1) The imposition of hands was practised, and had efficacy in other instances than the setting-apart for the ministry; (2) The usual way of induction into the ministry was by a solemn service, of which the imposition of hands formed a part. A third deduction would concern the persons competent to set apart for the ministry, or ordain. This has formed a subject of dispute, and wide divergence of opinion, and leads us to the second division.

II. THE MEANING OF ORDINATION, AND THE PERSONS COMPETENT TO ORDAIN. 1. In the early church the rite of ordination seems to have been regarded as a formal induction into the functions and responsibilities of ministerial service, and as having more significance than a mere conferment of the authority of the church. The clergy were at first elected by the people; and Clement of Rome speaks of them as having been appointed by other distinguished men, with the approbation of the whole church (1 Epistle ad Cor., c. 44). But the fact that the special ordination of the presbyters or the bishop was considered necessary seems to imply that a special efficacy was associated with the rite. Augustine, however, distinctly exclaims, "What else is the imposition of hands, then? This the apostle Paul mentions (quid aliud est manuum impositio quam oratio super hominem. — De bap. c. Donat., 3, 10). With the growing importance of the episcopal office, and the sanctity associated with it and the clergy in general, the rite of ordination assumed the character of a sacramental act, in which a special grace was conferred, and which could only be performed by the bishop. In the middle ages it secured the dignity and position of a sacrament, and is so treated by Peter Lombardus and others. In the early church, forced ordinations were not uncommon; and their efficacy was rated very high. Gregory Nazianzen and others were ordained without any premonition, or their consent.

2. The Greek and Roman-Catholic Churches hold ordination as one of the seven sacraments by which baptized persons are consecrated, and made competent for the duties of the several orders of the priesthood (Wetzer and Welte: Kirchen-Lexikon, vii. 810). Like baptism, it confers an indelible character, and for that reason may not be repeated. This character, or chrism, is conferred irrespective of the person and life.
of the ordinant and candidate. The Council of Trent (Sess. 23, Can. iv.-vi.) declares that the Holy Ghost is given in ordination; that the words of the ordinant, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," have effect; and that the priest shall not lose his priestly character and powers (become a layman). In one sense, as Martensen (Dogmatik) has said, ordination is the fundamental sacrament; for only those who have received it can pronounce absolution, and perform the eucharistic miracle (laymen being allowed, under certain circumstances, to administer the rite of baptism). Bishops alone are competent to administer the rite of ordination, and all bishops have the right to do so. This applies to the three higher orders of the clergy. Under certain circumstances, presbyters may ordain the lower orders. (See Orders, Holy.) On the principle once a bishop always a bishop, the ordination of a bishop is valid in all cases. Witness the ordination of the first Jesuit bishop by the bishop of Babylon. (See Episcopacy.) But the Roman-Catholic Church, in spite of this general principle, denies the validity of the ordination of the Church of England and holds that church to be a schismatical body. The Council of Trent (Sess. 23, Can. iv.-vi.) declares that the rite of ordination, and all bishops have the right to ordain and all bishops have the right to ordain to the ministry. The Augsburg Confession says (art. 14), "No one may teach publicly in the church, or administer the sacraments, except he be rightly called (rite vocatua)." Ordination is regarded as the church's solemn approval and public attestation of this inward call. In the churches of the Reformed communion (Presbyterian, etc.) the rite is administered by presbyters, who combine in laying their hands upon the head of the candidate, and offering prayer, and thus setting him apart for the ministry. The rite as such confers no grace.

5. The Moravians confine the right to ordain to their bishops, but recognize the ordination of other Protestant bodies as valid.

6. The Disciples of Christ, Quakers, and Plymouth Brethren. — These bodies do not recognize any human rite of ordination. They hold all Christians to be equal, and, while they fully accept the doctrine of a divine and inward call to preach, refuse to grant any efficacy to the human ordinance of setting apart for ministerial functions.

For further information, see Clergy, Bishop, Deacon, etc. The literature of the seventeenth century bearing on this question was extensive (e.g., see George Gillespie), and cannot be given in this place. Bellarmin: De Ordine; Martene: De Antiqu. Eccles. Ritibus. Bingham: Eccles. Ant.; Stubbs: Episcopal Succession; Jacob: Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament, London and New York, 1872; Wordsworth: The Christian Ministry, London, 1872; Dickinson: Defence of Presbyterian Ordination; Miller: On the Christian Ministry, 1807, etc.: The Primitive and Apostolic Order of Christ, 1840; Welles: Divine Right of Presbyterian Ordination; Archdeacon Richel: Ordination and Confession, in Quarterly Review, October, 1877; Charles Hodge: Discourses in Church Polity, New York, 1875. See also the article "Ordination" in Wetzer u. Welte and Smith and Cheetham, Dict. of Antiq., and Episcopacy, in vol. i.

ORDINES, as denoting the ecclesiastical officers in contradistinction to the laity (plebs), occurs for the first time in the works of Tertullian (De idol., 7; De exhort. cont., 7; De monog., 11), and is probably still older. In the beginning, however, no emphasis was laid either on the number, or on the distinction between ordinates majoræ [priest, deacon, and subdeacon] and minoræ [chantor, psalmist, ostiarii, lectores, exorcist, and acolyte]. In his letter to Fabius, Cornelius of Rome speaks of presbyters, diaconi, subdiaconi, acolythi, exorcizæ, anagnostæ, and psyllæ (Euseb.: Hist. Eccl., VI. 43), while the Apostolical Constitutions (Lib. VIII.) treat only of the ordination of bishops, presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, and anagnostæ. In accordance with the wants of actual life, the ecclesiastical ordines developed so rapidly and so differently in the different countries, and the subject was not brought into systematic form until the time of the schoolmen. Petrus Lombardus fixes the number of ordinates at seven, in harmony with the seven graces of the Holy Spirit,—ostiarii ("door-keepers"), lectores ("readers"), exorcizæ, anagnostæ, and acolythi ("acolytes"), subdiaconi ("sub-deacons"), diaconi ("deacons"), and sacerdotes ("priests"). Each
of these offices Christ himself has filled at some period of his life; that of eoecarius, when he drove the money-dealers out of the temple; that of lector, when he expounded Scripture in the synagogue. The praepositus, according to Paulus Lombardus, not a peculiar ordo, but only a dignity and office, developed into four stages,—the patriarch, the archbishop, the metropolitan, and the bishop. By the Council of Trent the scholastic exposition was made a part of the confession of the Church of Rome, though several of the old offices have disappeared altogether. The canonists, however, reckon generally eight or nine ordines.

**ORDO ROMANUS** was the original name of those rules according to which the service of the Church of Rome was regulated. The oldest ordo existing is that ascribed to Gelasius, who died in 496. (See Mabillon: *Antiqui Libri Rituales, in Museo Italicum*, ii.) It was very extensively used in the ninth century. In the thirteenth century the name *Ordo Romanus* was replaced by that of *Ceremoniale Romanum* (Gregory X., 1272), and this latter was in turn replaced by those of Pontificale Romanum and Ceremoniales Episcoporum (Clement VIII., 1596). Collections of Ordines Romani were published by Georg Cassander, Cologne, 1559; Melchior Hittorp, Cologne, 1568; and G. Ferrarius, Rome, 1591.

**ORGAN.** The Greek word ὀργανός was originally used for any kind of musical instrument, but was afterwards confined to wind-instruments composed of pipes. The number of pipes was generally ten; and, in order to spare the human lungs, the pipes were sounded either from a wind-magazine, in the form of a leathern pouch, compressed by the arm (tibia utricularea), or by bellows, whose supply of wind was regulated by means of water (organum hydraulicum). The latter kind of instruments, to which the name was gradually restricted, was much used by the Greeks, the Romans, and in the Christian Orient, both at court and at private entertainments. Hence grave people objected to organ-playing as a frivolity, such as the Pagan Ammianus Marcellinus (14, 18), and the Christian Sidonius Apollinaris (Epistola, liber i. ep. 2). Others, however, thought otherwise. A Frankish monk from the Moravian time reckons it one of the great joys of future life, that there shall be perpetual organ-playing (Migne: *Patr. Lat.*, 88, p. 958); from which passage it may also be learnt, that, at that time, the organ was already used to accompany the hymn-singing of the service. It can be unsually handled. The pedal claviature was not invented until the beginning of the fifteenth century. In the Greek Church the organ never came into use. But after the Emperor Ferdinand, it would probably have been abolished by the Council of Trent. The Reformed Church discarded it; and though the Church of Basel very early re-introduced it, it was in other places admitted only sparingly, and after long hesitation. The Lutheran Church continued its use, and produced its great, hitherto unsurpassed master, Johann Sebastian Bach. See O. WANGEMANN: Geschichte der Orgel, 2d ed., 1881; [HOPKINS and REINBAULT: *The Organ, its History and Construction*, 2d ed., 1870; also art. PSALMODY].

**ORIEL, or ORIOLE,** an architectural term, almost synonymous with bay or bow window, and denoting a smaller apartment, or a recess projecting from a larger room. It originated from the peculiar arrangement of the domestic oratory, which, rising through the whole height of the building, generally presented such a projection (oratorium) from the second story, in which the lord of the house and his family and guests were seated when participating in the service.

**ORIFLAMME** (auriflamma, "a flame of gold"), a flag of flame-colored silk embroidered with gold, and carried on the point of a lance. It was originally simply the standard of the Count of Vexin as the defender of the Church of St. Denis; but, when Louis VI. acquired the county of Vexin, the oriflamme became the standard of France. In times of peace it was preserved in the Cathedral of St. Denis, and it was solemnly consecrated whenever it was brought forth to lead in battle. After the battle of Bouvines (1214), the original oriflamme seems to have been lost.

**ORIGEN,** a distinguished Christian theologian and teacher, of the early part of the third century. His name was probably derived from the name of the Egyptian divinity, Or-Horus. Eusebius gives him the surname Adamantius, which Jerome (Ep. ad Paulum) explains of his untrrning industry; Photius (Bibl., c. 118), of the irresistibleness of his logic.

I. Personal History. — Origen was probably b. in Alexandria, 185 or 186, of Christian parents; d. at Cesarea or Tyre, about 254. He was probably baptized in youth, according to the custom in Egypt. At an early age he enjoyed the catechetical instructions of Pantanust and Clemens. In the persecution of 202, his father, Leonidas, was thrown into prison, and, after suffering the confiscation of his goods, was put to death. A rich Christian lady, Adamanthus, who Jerome (Ep. ad Paulum) explains of his untrrning industry; Photius (Bibl., c. 118), of the irresistibleness of his logic.
authors. About this time he subjected himself to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven’s sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla’s reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen’s reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia) to become his teacher, which he accepted. Some troubles in Alexandria probably caused Caracalla’s bloody executions in that city in 215 or 216, in which the learned were specially singled out (Eusebius, VI. 18, 16), forced him to leave Egypt secretly. He went to Palestine, was cordially received by Bishop Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Cesarea, and gave, at their suggestion, public discourses in the church. Bishop Demetrius of Alexandria complained of this course as contrary to ecclesiastical custom, Origen not having received presbyteral ordination, and summoned Origen back to Alexandria, whither he returned, resuming his catechetical instructions. Soon after (about 218), he was invited to Antioch by Manmea, the mother of Alexander Severus, later emperor, to give her instruction in the Christian religion. His friend and convert, Ambrosius, was his constant companion, spurred him up to literary labors, and furnished him with the necessary means. Seven ready writers, as many copyists, and several female calligraphists, were constantly at his disposal. The statement of Epiphanius (Haer., 64, 3), that he began his literary labors with the Hexapla, is doubtful. To the Alexandrian period belong the five first books of his Commentary on John, a large part of his Genesis, the Expositions on Ps. L.—XXV. Lamentations, a youthful work on the Song of Songs, the two books on the resurrection, the Stromata, and the work on the fundamental doctrines (De Principiis).

About 230 he went to Greece, by way of Palestine, where Theoctistus and Alexander ordained him presbyter. This conduct aroused Demetrius again; and a synod summoned by him forbade Origen to teach in Alexandria, and another synod of bishops divested him of his presbyterial dignity, and communicated its decision to the foreign churches. The majority of these, including Rome, assented. Palestine, Phocinia, Arabia, and Achaia were the only exceptions. Origen settled down at Cesarea, continued his exegetical labors, and founded a theological school. Our information of it is derived from Origen’s grateful pupil, Gregory Thaumaturgus. About 235 he found himself in Cappadocia, about 238, he spent some time at Athens, where he completed his Commentary on Ezekiel (Eusebius, vi. 82). Origen composed the Commentary on the Song of Songs, which Jerome praises so highly. The doctrinal controversy over Beryl of Bostra called him to a synod in Arabia, at which he succeeded in convincing Beryl. Origen wrote letters to Philip Arabs to Cappadocia, and to his wife Severa, and in this period finished his work against Celsus. In the persecution of Decius he suffered torture, either at Cesarea or Tyre. He died a natural death, and was buried at Tyre.

II. Writings. — The fertility of Origen’s pen is attested by the exaggerated tradition that he wrote six thousand works (Epiph.: Heres., 64, Rufinus).

1. Critical and Exegetical Works. — Origen’s principal critical work was the Hexapla [a polyglot of the Old Testament, giving the original text in Hebrew and Greek characters, and the four Greek versions, the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. It was deposited in the Library of Cesarea, and only a few fragments are preserved]. His exegetical works include commentaries, scholia, or short annotations on the Psalms and Galatians (lost), and homilies, of which nineteen (in Greek) are preserved on Jeremiah, one on the Witch of Endor and fragments, and thirty-nine on Luke, and two on the Song of Solomon in the Latin translation of Jerome, and nine on the Psalms, and nine on Judges in the translation of Rufinus. Besides these, we have the following: as they were taken down by copyists: nine on Isaiah, fourteen on Ezekiel (both in Jerome’s translations), seventeen on Genesis, thirteen on Exodus, sixteen on Leuiticus, twenty-eight on Numbers, twenty-six on Joshua, and two on Samuel (all in the translations of Rufinus). Origen often complains of the small attendance upon his homilies, the instability and whispering of the hearers, etc. He appreciated the dangers of rhetoric, and sought to instruct and edify; but the allegorical treatment often predominates. Of his numerous commentaries (verba) on the Old Testament, only fragments of those on Genesis, the Psalms, the two books of Chronicles, and the Song of Solomon, are preserved in the translation of Rufinus. Of the commentaries on the New Testament there are preserved important fragments in Greek and Latin, on Matthew, John, and the whole of Romans, in the translation of Rufinus. Only small portions of the other commentaries have come down to us. In the important Commentary on John, he takes constant notice of the Gnostic exegesis of the Valentinian, Hermacleon.

2. Philosophical and Theological Works. — Here belong, first of all, the ten books of the Stromata (epoqaraic), in which Origen compared the doctrines of Christianity with the teachings of the philosophers, confirming the former by the latter. Only small fragments are preserved. The so-called Philosophoumena of Origen belong to Hippolytus (see HIPPOLYTUS). The work on the fundamental doctrine is included in the last four books on the translation of Rufinus. The more literal translation of Jerome is lost, except a few sentences. Its four books treat, (1) of God, the Logos; (2) of the earth, the identity of the God
of the Old and New Testaments, the incarnation, etc.; (2) human freedom, temptation, universal restoration, etc.; (4) the Word of God, its divinity and exposition. Of his two books on the Resurrection, only fragments are preserved in the Apology of Pamphilus and in Photius.

3. Origen also wrote an ascetic work on martyrdom (εἰς μαρτυρίαν προτρεπτικός), a work on prayer, and a number of letters, a hundred of which Eusebius collected. Only two are preserved.

4. The great apologetic work of the Greek Church is the treatise against Celsus, in eight books, — a work of Origen's mature years, written in the reign of Philip Arabs. Exactly who this Celsus was Origen is not sure, — whether an Epicurean of the reign of Nero, or another of the reign of Hadrian. He inclines to the latter view. [Most historians (Mosheim, Gieseler, Baur, Friedlander) assign Celsus to 150 or later; others (Tillemont, Neander, Zeller), to about 160 or 170; Keim, to 178. As the place of composition, Keim suggests Rome; others, Alexandria.] The book which he refutes is the λόγος ἀφήνους. This Celsus stood in the line of thought of Platonism of his day, and brings satire to bear on Christianity, whose doctrines seem to him to be irrational. The Platonism of Celsus seems to preclude his identification with a person of the same name, at whose suggestion Lucian of Samosata wrote his Alexander*, but Keim has brought forward plausible considerations in its favor. The Celsus of Origen regards the Christian Church as a secret society. The Christians do not follow reason, but blind faith, and despise learning and culture. Origen replies, that the Christians were right in following the truth which had been attested by miracles and prophecy, and that faith is a universal principle of daily life. He then refutes Celsus’s objections that the Jews rejected Christ, believed him to have been the offspring of an adulterous connection, and to have learned magical arts in Egypt, and that Christ died in ignominy on the cross. Origen brings out the atoning significance of the crucifixion, uses the prophecies in proof of his positions, and urges the originality of the person of Christ. In Book II. Celsus brings forward the absurdity of the incarnation of God, and the incompatibility of the Logos with the perfections of God. Origen replies by showing that the incarnation differed very widely from the myths which Celsus had referred to, in having a definite and benevolent purpose, and quotes heathen teachers to confirm the propriety of the claim, which the gospel made, to convert and change the lives of the vicious and sinful, which had drawn from Celsus a sneer. In Book III. Celsus combats special Christian doctrines as being inferior to the teaching of philosophy, and Christianity inferior to Paganism. He adduces especially Plato and his spiritualism. Origen replied by magnifying the gospel, just because it was designed to reach down and help the masses, as well as to delight the cultured. In Book IV. Origen proves that it is the Christians who have a spiritual worship, a spiritual conception of God, and lead virtuous lives. The great apologist wrote his work to meet the doubts of weak Christians. It is full of profound and suggestive thoughts; but the general impression is somewhat impaired by the author's plan of replying to each special objection in detail.

III. Theological System. — Following the direction which Justin Martyr, and especially Clement of Alexandria, had conceived, Origen sought to create, with the aid of the philosophy of his day, a science of Christian doctrine whose systematic structure should be equal to the systems of the philosophers. In doing this, he held very positively to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as they had been handed down and defined in opposition to the heretics, especially the Gnostic heretics. But he found truths in the philosophical systems, and tried to show that they were borrowed from the Bible, predicating, however, a general revelation of the Logos. The study of philosophy has a propedeutic value; but the real source of Christian knowledge is the Bible, which is all inspired. Faith is sufficient for salvation and sanctification, without culture; but it is not mere assent, but a communion of the heart with God, which shows itself in corresponding acts of righteousness. It is the indispensable condition of salvation and true knowledge. In the interpretation of Scripture, Origen found three senses,— the somatic, psychic, and pneumatic, corresponding to the three parts of man’s nature, — body, soul, and spirit. The somatic or literal sense is adapted to the mass of Christians, and is to be accepted, except where it suggests thoughts unworthy of God, and contrary to reason. The psychic sense attaches not merely to distinctly ethical passages, but also to historical and other portions of the Word. The pneumatic, allegorical, or mystical sense includes the higher speculative ideas which may be drawn from Scripture. Origen revelled in its application.

Under the influence of Philo, and especially Justin, and Clement of Alexandria, who followed Philo, Origen started with the conception of God as an unchangeable and spiritual Being, who is the Creator of all things and the Author of all that is good. He was also benevolent, and has revealed himself from eternity through the Logos, the perfect image of himself, who bears as necessary a relation to his own existence as the light bears to the sun and the will to the mind. The Logos is Son, but of the same essence with God (ἐνώμεον, ἀμφιλογοονος, — Fragmenta, Ep. ad Hebr.), but attains another according to his nature and person (Ἐπιτροπ ἐκ ὐσίας καὶ ἐκπόρους), and occupies a subordinate relation. He is the mediator between the increate and created beings. His first product is the Holy Ghost. From eternity he created a limited number of finite spirits, whose freedom of will included the possibility of evil, or departure from God. The world was created out of nothing, and all dualism is distinctly denied. Matter is not essentially evil. Man is a fallen and sinful creature, bound in the chains of carnal affections. The world is the scene of a terrific struggle of spirits, but also a school of education, in which those who have fallen lowest, including Satan and the demons, are endowed with the power of free will, and may be restored. This cosmic process is essentially nothing more than an emancipation of the soul, and its return to God. The earth was made the scene of a divine revelation, which has culminated in the incarnation of the Logos, and the activity of the Holy Spirit. The Logos...
was in the world from the beginning, and entered the hearts of those who were willing to receive him, especially the prophets. The motive of the incarnation was man’s redemption. The death of Christ is referred to as a ransom paid to Satan, an offering made to God, etc.

Origen teaches the ultimate restoration (σωτηρία) of all, the Devil not being an exception. [Gregory of Nyssa, who held the same view, quotes Origen.]

Lit. — Origen’s works were edited, at first in Latin, by Merlin (Paris, 1512), Erasmus and Beat. Rheinan. (Basel, 1539), Genebrardus (Paris, 1574, 2 vols.), and in Greek by Spencer, with notes (Canterbury, 1658 and 1677). Heretius: Exegetica sive quae. ex Comm. Or. in Sacr. Script. graec. rep. potuit, gr. et lat., Rothomagi, 2 vols., also Paris, 1679; Col., 1685; complete edition of his works in Greek and Latin by De la Rue, 4 vols., Paris, 1868-78; Migne: Gr. Patrology, vols. 11-17; Redepenning: Orig. de Principiis, Leipzig, 1836; [W. Selwyn: Origines contra Celsum libri I.-IV., London, 1877]. — Biographical matter is found in Eusebius, Epiphanius, Hesychius, Origen (Hes. 94), and Jerome (Cat. 53), etc.; Heretius: Origini (life, teachings, and works), in his edition of the Exegetica, and also in De la Rue; Thomasius: Origenes, ein Beitrag zur alten Dogmengesch., Nürnberg, 1837; Redepenning: Origenes, eine Darstellung s. Lebens u. s. Lehre, 2 vols., Bonn, 1841, 1849; the church histories of Schröcker, [Neander, Schaff]; the histories of philosophy of Ritter and Ueberweg; Dörner: Person of Christ; Möller: Kosmologie in d. griech. Kirche, pp. 536 sqq. — Works on the Celsus Controversy.— Mosheim: Uebersetzung mit Anmerkungen, Hamburg, 1745; Fenger: De Celso, christian. advers., Epicurao, Havn., 1828; Philippi: De Celso philosophandi generae, BeroL, 1836; Jachmann: De Celso, etc., 1836; Ehrenfeuchter: De Celso, Götingen, 1848, 1849; Baur: Das Christenthum u. d.christl. Kirche d. drei ersten Jahrh., 2 ed., Tübingen, 1860; Keim: Celsus' wahres Wort ... wiederveröffentelt, übersetzt, etc., Zürich, 1862, 2 vols.; Affairs had taken a turn adverse to the memory of Origen in Alexandria. Bishop Theophilus (385-412) in 399 opposed the Anthropomorphites among the monks of Egypt, who, in opposition to Origen, ascribed a body and a human form to God. But the monks went to Alexandria, and terrified Theophilus to such an extent, that he assented to a condemnation of Origen’s writings. Acts condemning Origen were passed by a synod of Alexandria in 400, and by one assembled in the Nitrian Desert, where Origen was held in much reverence. Violent in his zeal, Theophilus secured the passage of a similar act at Jerusalem. Anastasius of Rome signed his assent; Jerome praised the heroism of Theophilus; and Epiphanius rejoiced at the defeat of Amalek. The friends of Origen, among whom Evagrius Ponticus was prominent, were not silenced by these harsh measures. But works began to appear reflecting Origen’s views. He was even accused of Pelagianism. The church historians Socrates and Sozomen declare with much heat against him.

In Justinian’s reign the convent of St. Sabas in Palestine became the rallying-point for the followers of Origen. Sabas himself is reported, however, before his death (about 331) to have reques-
ed the emperor to proceed against them. Bishop Ephraem of Antioch condemned Origen in a synod. Pelagius and mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, influenced Justinian to write the famous letter Ad Mennam (Mansi, IX. 487-584), which ad- duces ten heretical articles from Origen's writings. Mennas was called upon to secure a synodal con- demnation of the Alexandrian teacher. At the same time the controversy continued in Palestine. The Origenists were divided into two parties, — the Protoktists (so called in allusion to the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ's soul) or Tetra- dites, and the Isocrists (so called with reference to the doctrine of the restoration of all souls, and their attainment to an absolute equality with Christ). The latter were the more powerful, and secured the promotion of Macarius to the bishopric of Jerusalem (546). But the former, combin- ing with the orthodox party, deposed Macarius, and put Eustachius in his place (546). He op- posed the Origenists. In Bonon at Jerusalem. A letter of Justinian to the fifth oecumenical council (553) secured the condemna- tion of the Origenistic heresies.

The doctrines to which exception was more especially taken in Origen's system were the subordination of the Logos, the definition of the resurrection body as a spiritual body, the pre-exis- tence of the soul, especially Christ's soul, and the universal apokatastasis, including the Devil. See, besides the works mentioned under ORIGEN, WALCH: Histor. d. Ketzereien (vii. 802-810); HEPFELS: Conciliengesch. [and the Hist. of Doct. of HAGENBACH and SHEDD]. W. MÖLLE.

ORIGINAL ANTI-BURGHERS, BURGHERS, AND SECEDERS. See Seceders.

ORIGINAL SIN. See Sin.

ORLEANS, Maid of. See Joan of Arc.

ORME, William, a Scotch divine, b. at Falkirk, Scotland, 1787; d. 1850. Removing to Edinburgh, he was apprenticed to a wheelwright, but became a student of theology in 1805, Congregational minister of Perth, 1807, and, removing to London, was appointed pastor at Camberton, and foreign secretary to the London Missionary Society. He wrote an historical sketch of the translation and circulation of the Scriptures from the earliest period to the present time, Perth, 1815; Memoirs of John Owen, D.D., London, 1820, 2d ed., 1842; Life of William Kiffen, 1823; Life of Richard Baxter, prefixed to his Works, 1830; and especially Bibliotheca Britannica at great cost of Books on Sacred Literature, with Notices, Biographical, Critical, and Bibliographical, Edinburgh, 1824, 491 pp. The last work is often quoted by Allibone and others.

ORMUZD AND AHRIMAN. In the Zoroastrian writings, Ormuzd denotes the highest god, the absolute god, involving both the principle of good and of evil. But, in the later-developed dual- ism of the Parsee religion, Ormuzd sank down to be the representative of only one of these princi- ples,—that of the good; and Ahriman was placed in direct opposition to him as the representative of evil. See ZORASTHER.

OROSIS, Paulus, a Spaniard by birth, probably a native of Tarragona, and presbyter of Brac- cara in Lusitania; flourished in the fifth century. In 415 he visited Augustine, and presented to him his Commonitorium de errore Priscilianistaran et Origenistarum, to which Augustine answered with his Contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas ad Or- ostium. Furnished with a letter of recommendation from Augustine to Jerome, he went to Palestine, and was present at the synod of Jerusalem in 415, of which he has given a report. He was, how- ever, accused of Pelagianism by the Eastern bish- ops, and had to defend himself by his Apologeticus de arbitrii, and translated it by his return to his home. He wrote his principal work, Historiargy libri VII., adversus paganos, also called De cladibus et miseris mundi, or De toto mundi calamitatis, or Hormes- ta (Ormesta, a word of unknown derivation). It forms a kind of complement to the great apolo- logical work of Augustine, purporting to defend Christianity, by means of historical evidence, against the accusation of being the cause of all the miseries and calamities of the time. It is based on the chronicle of Eusebius-Jerome, and on the works of Livy, Eutropius, Justinus, Taciti- tus, Suetonius, etc.; but it uses its sources with great arbitrariness. In the middle ages, however, it was much read. Manuscripts of it are very frequent, and so are the earlier editions. The best ed. is that by C. ZANGEMEISTER, in Corpus Script. Eccles. Latin, Vienna, 1882. [King Alfred made an Anglo-Saxon translation of the L. Histo- riarum, of which there are editions with English versions, by DAINES BARRINGTON, London, 1778; BENJAMIN THORPE, 1854 (in Bohn's Antiq. Lib.), and JOSEPH BOSWORTH, 1856.]

ORTHODOXY AND HETERODOXY. These terms, which do not occur in the Bible, are derived from the Greek words ὄρθος ("right") and ἀρνητικόν ("opinion," or "doctrine"), and ἀποκαταστάσις ("other") and ὀπίσθα ("opinion"). The contrast which they express is based upon the supposition that the truth is known: all holding it are ortho- dox; all departing from it, heterodox. Applied to religion, and within the limits of the Christian Church, it is evident that those who hold to the Scriptures, and accept the dogmas therein set forth, are orthodox. The difficulty, however, of discovering and determining the exact teaching of the Scriptures, involves an uncertainty in the application of the terms. Infallibility ofjudg- ment in state actions is a matter of no concern to the unerring declaration of what heterodoxy is. That which seems to one portion of the Christian Church heterodox may be held by another portion to be scriptural. The Greek Church glories in the self-applied title of the "Holy Orthodox Apos- tolic" Church, and regards certain doctrines held by the remainder of Chris- tendom as heterodox. The Roman-Catholic com- munion regards the Protestant churches heterodox in many points; as, for example, their denial of transubstantiation, the immaculate conception, and the infallibility of the Pope. In the United States the term frequently applies to divergent views on the doctrine of the Trinity. Thus it has been common to speak of the orthodox and heterodox (Unitarian) Congregational churches, and of the orthodox and heterodox (Hicksite) Friends. The term "orthodox" as it is generally used among Protestants is a sum- mary of doctrine which has been and still is regarded as the generally accepted belief of the churches of the Reformation. Used in this wider sense, the term "orthodoxy" may become a shackle to the Church which fears the odium connected
with the accusation of heterodoxy, and has become a standard and concealed designation of intolerance and bigotry on the part of those hostile to Christianity, and others.

A close approach to the meaning of the term "orthodoxy" is given in Gal. ii. 14, where Paul speaks of those who "walked not uprightly (ὑποθεσαυσθακοδια) according to the truth of the gospel;" and 1 Tim. vi. 3: "if any man teach otherwise" (ὑτεροδοκαζειται), etc. There was a heterodoxy of life, as well as of teaching, in the times of the apostles. Ignatius was the first Christian writer to use the terms "heterodox teachers" (Ad Smyr., c. 6), and "heterodoxy" (Ad Magn., c. 8). It was not, however, till a definite rule of faith became current in the Church that the terms secured a strict ecclesiastical signification; and all were called heterodox who were excluded from the communion of the Church. In the image-controversy of the eighth and ninth centuries, the Oriental Church laid special stress upon its antiquity and orthodoxy, and in 842 established the Festival of Orthodoxy, which is now celebrated on Feb. 19.

John of Damascus called his system of theology ἐκκλησιαστική λογική; and all were called heterodox who were excluded from the communion of the Church. In the image-controversy of the eighth and ninth centuries, the Oriental Church laid special stress upon its antiquity and orthodoxy, and in 842 established the Festival of Orthodoxy, which is now celebrated on Feb. 19.

John of Damascus called his system of theology The Exposition of the Orthodox Faith (ταῦτα τῆς ἑραδουσίας πίστεως). Euthymius Zigabenus followed with Theological Armor of the Orthodox Faith (ἐναρμονία ὑποστηρίγμα τῆς ἑραδουσίας πίστεως); and Nicetas Acominatos, with the Treasury of Orthodoxy (θησαυρὸς ἑραδουσίας).

In the seventh century the term "orthodoxy" was again frequently used, and was appropriated among the Protestants by the strict school of Lutherans who deprecated all compromise in religion, in intellectuals, may be divorced from orthodoxy of life and conduct; in other words, may exist without a living faith. The tendency of the Christian Church to-day is to emphasize the essential doctrines of Christianity and personal devotion to Christ and the Savior of the world, and to be careful in the use of the term "heterodox" for fear of offending against the law of brotherly love.


ORTON, Job, a distinguished Independent clergyman; b. at Shrewsbury, Sept. 4, 1717; d. at Kidderminster, July 19, 1783. In 1734 he entered Dr. Doddridge’s academy at Northampton, and in 1739 became a teacher in the same institution. Two years later (1741) he became pastor in Shrewsbury of the Presbyterian and Independent congregations, which had united on him. He retired to Kidderminster in 1768, having resigned his pulpit on account of ill health. Mr. Orton was an indefatigable literary worker. His principal writings are, Religious Exercises recommended, 1769; Discourses to the Aged, 1771; XXXVI. Discourses on Practical Subjects, 2 vols., London, 1776; Letters to a Young Clergyman, 1791; and A Short and Plain Exposition of the Old Testament, with Devotional and Practical Reflections for the Use of Families subjoined to each Chapter, edited by Robert Gentleman, Worcester, 1788–91, 3d ed. 1822. Mr. Orton also edited the Works of Dr. Dodridge, to which he prefixed a Life, Leeds, 1802, 10 vols.

OSCULATORY, a representation, painted or carved, of Christ or the Virgin, which the priest kissed during the celebration of mass, and then passed to the people for the same purpose. The ceremony was probably a reminiscence of the kiss of peace with which, in ancient times, the Christians used to salute each other when meeting at the agape. See KISS OF PEACE.

OSGOOD, David, D.D., a distinguished and fearless Congregational preacher, the son of a farmer; b. at Andover, Mass., Oct. 14, 1747; d. at Medford, Dec. 12, 1822. Graduating at Harvard in 1771, he studied theology under Rev. Mr. Emerson of Hollis, and became pastor at Medford, where he continued for nearly fifty years, becoming one of the most distinguished preachers of the day. He was an unbending Federalist; and his political sermon in 1794, on Genet’s appeal to the people against the government, attracted much attention, and rapidly passed through several editions. His election sermon of 1809 was the most celebrated of his discourses. He was as thorough a Calvinist in theology as he was a Federalist in politics. A volume of his sermons appeared in Boston, 1824. See Sprague’s Annals.

OSGOOD, Samuel, D.D., L.L.D., clergyman and man of letters, belonging to an old Puritan family; born in Charlestown, Mass., Aug. 30, 1812; d. in New-York City, April 14, 1880. Graduating at Harvard College in 1832, he studied theology at the Harvard Divinity School. Channing and Ware were then exercising their extensive influence, and Mr. Osgood entered the Unitarian ministry in 1835. In 1838 he became pastor of the Unitarian Church, Nashua, N.H.; in 1841 became pastor in Proctor, Vt., and, in 1849, of the Church of the Messiah (34th Street and Park Avenue), New-York City. In 1869 he changed his theological views, and, after a year of travel in Europe, entered the ministry of the Episcopal Church (1870), and became rector of the Church of St. John Evangelist. In a conversation with a distinguished friend, he stated that the passage recording the baptismal formula had exerted more influence than any other in bringing about his change of views. He received the degree of doctor of divinity from Harvard, 1857, and that of doctor of laws from Hobart College, 1860. Dr. Osgood was regarded as one of the first men of letters in New-York City, and was especially known for the deep interest he took in the New-York Historical Society and other public literary institutions. Among his writings are, Studies of Christian Biography, New York, 1851; God with Men, New York, 1854; Milestones in our Life-Journey, New York, 1875; Student Life, New York, 1860; American Leaves, New York, 1870. He was also a frequent contributor to the North-American Review and other periodicals.

OSIANDER, Andreas, b. at Gunzenhausen in Brandenburg; Dec. 19, 1498; d. in Königsberg
OSTIANDER.
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Oct. 17, 1552; was educated in the schools of Leipzig and Altenburg; studied in the university of Ingoldstadt; was ordained a priest in 1520 at Nuremberg, and appointed teacher in Hebrew there, and preacher to the Church of St. Lawrence. He was a man of great courage and impetuosity; and, having embraced the Reformation, he contributed more than any one else to its establishment in Nuremberg. In 1524 he addressed to the town-council Ein gut Unterricht und getreuer Ratschlag, in 1525 he married; and in 1526 he drew up, together with Brenz, the constitution of the Lutheran churches of Nuremberg and Brandenburg. But his energy was very much mixed up with self-will and arrogance; and even in Nuremberg his relations to his colleagues were not pleasant. On the establishment of the Interim, he left the city, attended at Konigsberg and Chemnitz and Melchior Isinder were his opponents. Osianer held very peculiar views on this point. Fundamentally he agreed with Luther, and was as antagonistic to Calvinism as to Romanism. But he was a mystic, and interpreted the doctrine of justification by faith as not the imputation but the infusion of the essential righteousness or divine nature of Christ. His views may be best learned from his An fivus dei fuerit incarnatus, etc. (1550), and Von dem eignen Müller Jesu Christo, etc. (1551). Mörlin, who first tried to reconcile the opposing parties, soon became his most decided adversary; and Osianer used his influence with the duke to prevent the publication of his opponents' works. The controversy spread beyond Prussia. An address of Melanchthon received a rude answer from Osianer; and the latter prepared himself for warfare on a grand scale, when he suddenly died. The duke commanded peace; but Mörlin was banished, and the Osianerists kept the field. His life has been written by WILKIN (Stralsund, 1844) and W. MöLLER (Elberfeld, 1870).

OSTIANDER is the name of a family of celebrated theologians descending from the famous Konigstein controversialist.— I. Lukas Osianer, son of Andreas Osianer; b. at Nuremberg, Dec. 15, 1594; d. at Stuttgart, Sept. 17, 1694; studied at Königsberg and Tübingen, and was appointed court-preacher in Stuttgart in 1597, and prelate of Adlerberg in 1599. He published Biblia Latina, a paraphrase of the Bible, 1573–86, 7 vols., translated into German by D. Förster, 1600; Institutio christianae religionis, 1576; Epitomes historiae ecclesiasticae, 1602–04, often reprinted; sermons, etc. — II. Andreas Osianer, b. May 6, 1571, in Stuttgart; d. Aug. 10, 1638, at Tübingen, where he succeeded his brother as professor and chancellor. He was an ardent champion of correct Lutheran orthodoxy, and wrote Enchiridium controversiarum, 1590; Anabaptistus (1593), Schwenckfeldians (1607), Pontifex (1607). His Theologisches Bedenken (1623) against Arndt, whom he was utterly incapable of understanding, attracted most attention. WAGENMANN.

OSLER, Edward, a devout physician; b. at Falmouth, Eng., January, 1793; d. at Truro, March 7, 1868; was resident surgeon of the Swansea Infirmary, 1819–25; was then, at London and Bath, in the employ of the S. P. C. K.; and finally lived in Cornwall, where he edited the Royal Cornwall Gazette, 1841–63. He was an M.R.C.S., and Fellow of the Linnean Society. He published The Voyage, a Poem, 1830; Life of Lord Exmouth, 1837; Church and King, 1837, containing seventy hymns of his own. He also contributed largely to W. J. Hall's Psalms and Hymns, known as The Mist Hymn-Book, 1866. Some of his compositions have great merit, and have been largely used within and without the Church of England.

OSMOND, St., b. in Normandy; d. Dec. 3, 1099; came to England with William the Conqueror, and was by him made bishop of Salisbury in 1076. His Liber Ordinalis, or Liber Consuetudinarium Ecclesie, concerning the forms and ceremonies of divine worship, continued in use down to the time of Henry VIII. He was canonized by Calixtus III. in 1458.

OSSAT, Arnold d', b. in the diocese of AUCH, 1536; d. in Rome, 1604; studied at Bourges; practised as an advocate in Paris; was in 1574 appointed French ambassador in Rome; and was in 1599 made a cardinal by Clement VIII. His letters from Rome to the French court contain the most curious illustrations of the Papal policy during the sixteenth century. The best edition of them is that by AMELOT DE LA HOUSAYE, Paris, 1637; 2 vols. in 4.

OSTERWALD, Jean Frédéric, b. at Neuchâtel in 1663; d. there April 14, 1747. He studied at Orleans, Paris, and Geneva, and was in 1686 appointed dean of his native city, and pastor in 1699. He labored, with great success, for giving religious life a more practical character; and several of his treatises and discourses were translated into foreign languages,— A Treatise concerning the Causes of the Present Corruption of Christians, 1700, English trans. in Waton's Tracts (6); The Grounds and Principles of the Christian Religion, 1702, trans. by GEORGE STANHOPE, Lond., 1704; The Arguments of the Books and Chapters of the Old and New Testaments, 1722, trans. by JOHN CHAMBERLayne; Lectures on the Exercise of the Sacred Ministry, in an enlarged translation by THOMAS STEVENS, Lond., 1751. A. SCHWEIZER.

OSTIARY, OSTIARIUS, or JANITOR, was the lowest of the officers of the ancient church, and served as door-keeper during service, restraining strangers from entering, showing the members their seats, etc. The office probably originated in the Western Church in the course of the third century. It is not mentioned by Tertullian and Cyprian, but in Cornelius' letter to Fabius (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 4, 46), on the Eastern Church the office was originally performed by the deacons.
OSWALD.

 appointed his chaplain, Adalbert, bishop of Julin, and returned home. In 1127 he again visited the country, and in 1131 he was canonized by Clement III. The sources of his life are found in JAFFÉ: Bibliotheca Rerum Germ., Berlin, 1869, vgl. v.; Monumenta Bambergensia, containing his biography by Ebo and the Dialogue of Herhard. See GEORG HAAG: Quelle, etc., des O. v. B., Steitten, 1874; and the vivid description of him in KAHNIS: Gang der Kirche in Lebensbildern, Leipzig, 1881.

OTTO OF FREISING, b. after 1111; d. Sept. 21, 1168. He was a grandson of Henry IV., a half-brother of Conrad III., and the uncle of Friedrich I. After studying in Paris, he entered the Cistercian monastery of Morimund in 1135, and was in 1137 appointed bishop of Freising; which position he held till his death, taking an active part in all the political and religious movements of his time. It is, however, as a historian, and not as a theologian or politician, that he has gained fame. His De dicibus inscriptionum, or De mutatione rerum, was written between 1143 and 1148. In its first six books, down to 1106, it follows closely the Chronicon universale of Ekkehard: the seventh book (1106-46) is the only one which has any strictly historical interest. The work is, indeed, a philosophy of history, rather than a history. On the basis of Augustine and Orosius, the author will show and explain the contrast between the miseries of this world and the glory of the kingdom of heaven. The eighth book is a description of the latter. At the instance of his nephew he commenced his Gesta Friderici, a work of great historical interest; but he died before he had finished it. It was continued to 1190 by Ragewin. The best edition is that by Willman, in Monumenta Germaniae, also published separately in 2 vols., Hanover, 1867. See WATTECNACH: Deutsche Geschichtsquellen, Berlin, 1878 (4th ed.), ii. 206-217, and 412.
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Methodists. In 1784 he assisted Dr. Coke in ordaining Asbury bishop. On Sept. 25, 1800, in conjunction with Böhm, he convened a conference of thirteen ministers near Frederick City, which resulted in the organization of the Church of the United Brethren. Dr. Harbaugh brings forward evidence to show that Otterbein never left the German Reformed communion, and only desired to secure a re-organization of the methods in vogue within the church. Otterbein University, at Westerville, O., under the control of the United Brethren, preserves the name of this godly man. See Harbaugh: Fathers of the German Reformed Church. Drury: Life of Otterbein, Dayton, O., 1884; and art. United Brethren.

OUDIN, Casimir, b. at Mézières, in the Ardennes, 1638; d. at Leyden, 1717. He entered the order of the Premonstratensians in 1656, and attracted attention, in 1678, by the ingenious manner in which he, in the absence of the abbot and prior, received and complimented Louis XIV. on his visit to the monastery of Boncilly. Charged with the examination of the archives of the Premonstratensian monasteries, he visited the Netherlands, Burgundy, and Switzerland, and published in 1683 in Paris, where in 1686 he published his Supplementum de scripitoribus. The adverse criticism of Cave induced him to recast the whole work; and in 1722 his Commentarium de scripitoribus ecclesia antiquis, 9 vols. fol., which is considered a valuable work, appeared at Leipzig. Meanwhile he had left Paris in 1690, embraced the Reformation, and settled at Leyden, where he was appointed librarian at the university. C. Schmidt.

Owen, John, D.D., b. at Stadham, or Stadhampton, in the county of Oxford, 1745; d. at Ealing, Middlesex, Dec. 24, 1833. His father was a clergyman of Welsh extraction, tracing a descent from Gwegan ap Ithel, Prince of Glamorgan, who, according to Welsh genealogies, was a descendant of Caractus, the illustrious Briton. The father sent his son John to Oxford when only twelve years of age, such was the youthful precocity and early academic study of those days. From that era Owen's life may be divided into five periods.

I. From his entering the University to his Conversion. — He made great progress in learning, but, according to his own account, thought of nothing beyond personal distinction. In 1632 he took the degree of bachelor, in 1635 the degree of master of arts, and in 1637 left Oxford, at which time he seems to have been under religious convictions. Laud was then powerful in the university, and endeavored there to carry out his High-Church plans, and such a one means commended himself to Owen's judgment. At the risk of losing worldly prospects, he refused to submit to the Laudian discipline; and, being both in spiritual and temporal difficulties, he sunk into a state of deep melancholy. Before he left college he entered into holy orders, and became chaplain to Lord Lovelace, one of the Royalist party. From him Owen separated, on account of his own sympathy with the Patriots, as the Parliamentarians were called. Going up to London, he attended worship at Aldermary Church, hoping to hear the famous Edmund Calamy; but a stranger occupied the pulpit, and his sermon on the words, "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" led to Owen's spiritual decision of character.

II. From his Conversion to his Becoming an Independent. — Owen, soon after the incident at Aldermary, published a decidedly Calvinistic book, entitled Display of Arminianism, by which he publicly identified himself with the Anti-Church party, and presently was presented to the living of Fordham, Essex, by the Presbyterian committee for removing scandalous ministers. There he preached with much success, and shortly after his induction married a lady named Rooke. As a Presbyterian clergyman he preached before Parliament in 1646, and, rising in reputation, was promoted to the important incumbency of Coggeshall, near Fordham. He now adopted the principles of Independency; and while parish pastor, and preaching from the parish pulpit, he "gathered" an Independent Church, the members of which met together by themselves on terms of spiritual fellowship, as was the practice in many places at that period.

III. From his Becoming an Independent until he was Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. — During his residence at Coggeshall he further engaged in the Calvinistic controversy, and wrote his Salus Electorum, Sanguis Jesu. He also preached and published sermons to the Parliamentarians at Colchester and Rumford, entitled A Memorial of the Delight of Essex County and Committee. Thoroughly identified with the Parlia-

OUR LADY OF MERCY, SISTERS OF. See Mercy, Sisters of.

OUSELEY, Gideon, b. at Dunmore, Galway, Ireland, 1762; d. at Dublin, May 14, 1839. He was converted in 1786 by some Wesleyan soldiers, and at once began to preach with great vigor. His career was exceptionally successful. See Arthur: Life of Rev. Gideon Ouseley, London, 1876.

OVERBERG, Bernhard, b. at Höckel, in the principality of Osnabrück, May 1, 1754; d. at Münster, Nov. 9, 1826. He was educated in the Franciscan gymnasia at Rheine-on-the-Ems, and studied theology in Münster, where he was ordained a priest in 1780, and appointed teacher in the episcopal seminary in 1783. In 1789 he entered the house of the Princess Galitzin as her confessor, and in 1809 he was made director of the royal seminary. His influence on all educational affairs of the bishopric of Münster, especially on the normal school and the education of teachers, was very great and very beneficent. He published Christkatholischen Handbuch, 1804 (7th ed., 1854); Katechismus der christkathol. Lehre, 1806 (2d ed., 1831). He wrote his Conversion. — He made great progress in
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OVERBERG, Bernhard, b. at Höckel, in the principality of Osnabrück, May 1, 1754; d. at Münster, Nov. 9, 1826. He was educated in the Franciscan gymnasia at Rheine-on-the-Ems, and studied theology in Münster, where he was ordained a priest in 1780, and appointed teacher in the episcopal seminary in 1783. In 1789 he entered the house of the Princess Galitzin as her confessor, and in 1809 he was made director of the royal seminary. His influence on all educational affairs of the bishopric of Münster, especially on the normal school and the education of teachers, was very great and very beneficent. He published Christkatholischen Handbuch, 1804 (7th ed., 1854); Katechismus der christkathol. Lehre, 1806 (2d ed., 1831). He wrote his Life was written by Reimermann, Münster, 1829, and C. F. Krabbe, Münster, 1831 (2d ed., 1834). See also Jœsef Gallaud: Amalie ron Galitzin, Cologne, 1880.
mentarians, he was invited to preach before Parliament on the day after King Charles’s execution. When he acquitted himself with great prudence; and, without any reference to the preceding tragedy, he inculcated religious lessons suitable to all parties. Soon afterwards he met with Cromwell, who said, “Sir, you are a person I must be acquainted with;” to which Owen replied, “That will be your last wish without yours.” Cromwell requested he would accompany him in his expedition to Ireland, with which request Owen rather reluctantly complied. He preached before Parliament previous to his embarkation, and again on his return. Being attached to the great general in a clerical capacity, he accompanied him to Scotland, and occupied Presbyterian pulpits there, whilst the conflict was going on between Parliament and the Scotch Loyalists,—a conflict which was decided by the victory of Dunbar. Owen returned to Coggleshall in 1651; and then the House of Commons voted that he should be appointed dean of Christ Church, Oxford, in the room of Dr. Reynolds, the Presbyterian.

IV. FROM HIS BEING MADE DEAN TO HIS REMOVAL FROM THAT OFFICE. — Though Owen was an Independent, he had seen no inconsistency in holding a parish benefice, and now he felt no scruple in accepting a high university preferment. His career at Oxford was very remarkable. The university had fallen into great disorder during the civil wars, and the new dean acted as a vigorous and successful reformer. It has been the fashion to represent Oxford as full of ignorance, fanaticism, and confusion; but the history of that period in reference to universities needs to be rewritten. The heads of houses during Owen’s administration were men of eminent learning; they promoted education, as well as religion; and many distinguished persons in Church and State passed through a successful training at that era. Oxford has no reason to be ashamed of its annals under the Commonwealth. Certainly Owen was one of its most distinguished ornaments; and, so far from being a vulgar fanatic, he is acknowledged, even by Anthony Wood, to have been a Christian gentleman. It is curious to find, that at this time as at all others, the city preferred a sumptuous a style. Owen was made vice-chancellor in 1652, and preached before Parliament the next year, at the thanksgiving for a naval victory over the Dutch. In 1653 he attended a meeting of divines in London, to devise, if possible, a scheme over the Dutch. In 1653 he attended a meeting of Parliament, and presented an address to Charles II. on his December 1655, the vice-chancellor exerted himself to preserve the public peace, and raised a troop of sixty horse. More consistent with his character as a divine and a scholar, he the same year attended a conference at Whitehall, touching the treatment of Jews in this country. Next year he preached at Westminster Abbey a well-known sermon, entitled God’s Work in founding Zion, and his People’s Duty thereupon. Owen was unfriendly to Cromwell’s assumption of the character and took no part in the grand installation of the lord-protector. A meeting of Independents, by Cromwell’s permission, was held at the Savoy in 1658, when a declaration of faith was drawn up, to which Owen wrote a preface. Whilst the Savoy meetings were going on, Cromwell died, and his death made a great change in Owen’s fortunes. Richard succeeded Oliver. The dean preached before the first Parliament of the new protector. Political troubles ensued. Owen was mixed up with consultations at Wallingford House, which ended in the fall of Richard, and the recalling of the Long Parliament. Owen preached before the members for the last time in May, 1659; and in March, 1660, the House of Commons discharged him from his deanship, and replaced Reynolds.

V. FROM HIS LOSING THE DEANERY TO HIS DEATH. — He retired to Stadham; and, though he had been so conspicuous a person during the Commonwealth, he does not seem to have suffered much at the Restoration beyond the loss of his offices. Once, in going to London, his carriage was stopped by two informers, and a mob collected; but a magistrate interfered, and the men were reprimanded for acting illegally. He had an interview with Lord Clarendon, in which that influential minister of Charles II. treated him with respect, and expressed approbation of his services as a Protestant controversialist, saying that he had more merit than any Protestant of the period. Owen had nothing to do with the Savoy Conference, in which Richard Baxter took so active a part; nor did he engage in any of the endeavors to procure comprehension. In that respect he did not sympathize with his Presbyterian brethren. He corresponded with the Congregationalists of New England respecting their intolerant proceedings, and declined the offered presidency of Harvard College. We find him presenting an address to Charles II. on his Declaration of Indulgence; also he was engaged in interviews with his Majesty and the Duke of York, who treated him with much courtesy. Owen was on friendly terms with many distinguished people, and numbered some of them as members of a church in London over which he was pastor,—a church, which, after the death of Joseph Caryl, was united to the flock of which the latter had been pastor. The two congregations were formed, perhaps, the most numerous, certainly the most influential, Independent fellowship at that period. Mrs. Owen died in 1676, and the following year Owen married a second time, a wealthy lady, who possessed an estate at Ealing, near London, where her husband settled for the rest of his life. Just before the death of Dr. Pococke, Arabic professor, from harsh and unrighteous treatment. When a conspiracy against Cromwell’s government broke out in the West (1655), the vice-chancellor exerted himself to preserve the public peace, and raised a troop of sixty horse. More consistent with his character as a divine and a scholar, he the same year attended a conference at Whitehall, touching the treatment of Jews in this country. Next year he preached at Westminster Abbey a well-known sermon, entitled God’s Work in founding Zion, and his People’s Duty thereupon. Owen was unfriendly to Cromwell’s assumption of the character and took no part in the grand installation of the lord-protector. A meeting of Independents, by Cromwell’s permission, was held at the Savoy in 1658, when a declaration of faith was drawn up, to which Owen wrote a preface. Whilst the Savoy meetings were going on, Cromwell died, and his death made a great change in Owen’s fortunes. Richard succeeded Oliver. The dean preached before the first Parliament of the new protector. Political troubles ensued. Owen was mixed up with consultations at Wallingford House, which ended in the fall of Richard, and the recalling of the Long Parliament. Owen preached before the members for the last time in May, 1659; and in March, 1660, the House of Commons discharged him from his deanship, and replaced Reynolds.

V. FROM HIS LOSING THE DEANERY TO HIS DEATH. — He retired to Stadham; and, though he had been so conspicuous a person during the Commonwealth, he does not seem to have suffered much at the Restoration beyond the loss of his offices. Once, in going to London, his carriage was stopped by two informers, and a mob collected; but a magistrate interfered, and the men were reprimanded for acting illegally. He had an interview with Lord Clarendon, in which that influential minister of Charles II. treated him with respect, and expressed approbation of his services as a Protestant controversialist, saying that he had more merit than any Protestant of the period. Owen had nothing to do with the Savoy Conference, in which Richard Baxter took so active a part; nor did he engage in any of the endeavors to procure comprehension. In that respect he did not sympathize with his Presbyterian brethren. He corresponded with the Congregationalists of New England respecting their intolerant proceedings, and declined the offered presidency of Harvard College. We find him presenting an address to Charles II. on his Declaration of Indulgence; also he was engaged in interviews with his Majesty and the Duke of York, who treated him with much courtesy. Owen was on friendly terms with many distinguished people, and numbered some of them as members of a church in London over which he was pastor,—a church, which, after the death of Joseph Caryl, was united to the flock of which the latter had been pastor. The two congregations were formed, perhaps, the most numerous, certainly the most influential, Independent fellowship at that period. Mrs. Owen died in 1676, and the following year Owen married a second time, a wealthy lady, who possessed an estate at Ealing, near London, where her husband settled for the rest of his life. Just before the death of Dr. Pococke, Arabic professor, from harsh and unrighteous treatment. When a conspiracy against Cromwell’s government broke out in the West (1655), the vice-chancellor exerted himself to preserve the public peace, and raised a troop of sixty horse. More consistent with his character as a divine and a scholar, he the same year attended a conference at Whitehall, touching the treatment of Jews in this country. Next year he preached at Westminster Abbey a well-known sermon, entitled God’s Work in founding Zion, and his People’s Duty thereupon. Owen was unfriendly to Cromwell’s assumption of the character and took no part in the grand installation of the lord-protector. A meeting of Independents, by Cromwell’s permission, was held at the Savoy in 1658, when a declaration of faith was drawn up, to which Owen wrote a preface. Whilst the Savoy meetings were going on, Cromwell died, and his death made a great change in Owen’s fortunes. Richard succeeded Oliver. The dean preached before the first Parliament of the new protector. Political troubles ensued. Owen was mixed up with consultations at Wallingford House, which ended in the fall of Richard, and the recalling of the Long Parliament. Owen preached before the members for the last time in May, 1659; and in March, 1660, the House of Commons discharged him from his deanship, and replaced Reynolds.
the ship of the Church in a storm; but, while the pilot is in it, the loss of a poor under
rower will be inconsiderable.”

There are two editions of Dr. Owen’s works, the latest edited by Dr. Goold of Edinburgh [re
edited by Rev. Charles W. Quick, and published in Philadelphia, 1865-69, 17 vols., with Index]; but an earlier one (1826) by Thomas Russell, is
enough by valuable materials from the pen of William Orme,—the best life of Owen extant. As
Owen’s theological opinions on important sub
jects, they will be found in the following works.
The Divine Original of the Scriptures, published in
1659, takes up the subject of Christian evidence,
chiefly with respect to what is internal,—namely,
the life and efficacy of divine truth. His book
On the Holy Spirit (1674) takes up the subject of
inspiration. The doctrines of the Trinity, and of
the eternal generation of the Son of God, are
handled in the same work on the Holy Spirit, and in
the Vindiciæ Evangelicæ (1673). The person of
Christ is the subject of the Christologia (1679).
The atonement, in connection with divine de
crees, is the subject of Owen’s Salus Electorum, San
guis Jesu, published in 1648. In 1677 Owen
published a treatise on Justification by Faith. The
discussion of the Saints’ Perseverance appears in
a work under that title (1654). His notions of
government and religious liberty are expressed in his
Eshcol (1647), Christ’s Kingdom, or the Magistrate’s Power (1652), A Discovery of
the True Nature of Schism (1657), The Power of
the Magistrate about Religion (1658), Indulgence
and Toleration considered (1667), Inqaury into Evang
elical Churches (1861). His Antipapal writings
are, The Church of Rome no Safe Guide (1759),
Union among Protestants (1860), An Account of
the Protestant Religion (1868).

Owen’s works are generally valued more for
their matter than their method, more for their
substance than their style. Many of his discus
sions are wearisome, and the diction is generally
crabbed and uninviting. He was a high Cal
vinist, but his arguments in support of truths
believed by all evangelical Christians are very
powerful. His devotional works are more accepta
ble than the controversial, and it is very refresh
ing to read his Meditations on the Glory of Christ.
As he was dying, that book passed through the
press; and when told of this by Mr. Payne, a
nonconformist minister, he said, “I am glad to
hear it; but, O brother Payne! the long-wished
for day is come at last, in which I shall see that
glory in another manner than I have ever done,
and was capable of doing, in this world.” His piety
equalled his erudition.

OWEN, Robert, socialist and philanthropist;
March 14, 1771; d. at Newtown, Nov. 19, 1858.
The son of poor parents, he procured a situation
in London at the age of fourteen, and subsequent
ly had charge of the Chorlton Mills, near Man
chester, and the cotton-spinning manufactury at
New Lanark, Scotland, belonging to David Dale,
whose daughter Mr. Owen married in 1801. His
benevolent schemes so secured the good will of
the morals of the operatives of New Lanark, and
accomplished the education of their children.
The reputation of his success spread rapidly, and
attracted the attention of many philanthropists
and distinguished men. In 1813 Mr. Owen pub
lished New View of Society, or Essays on the For
mation of Human Character (London), in which
he developed a theory of modified communism.
In 1823 he visited the United States, where he
purchased a tract of land on the Wabash in Indian
s, and founded New Harmony. This com
munist enterprise was a complete failure. Re
turning to England in 1827, Mr. Owen founded
societies at Orbiston, Lanarkshire, and Tythorley,
Hampshire, in which the principle of co-operation
was put in practice. The founder’s ample means
enabled him to make these experiments on a lib
eral scale, but both these communities were like
wise utter failures. In 1828 he visited Mexico
at the invitation of the government, with the view
of establishing a communist society; but he
turned to Europe without accomplishing any thing.
He continued to advocate his peculiar views to
the day of his death. In 1829 he held a debate
with Dr. Alexander Campbell at Cincinnati on
the evidences of Christianity (he himself being an
unbeliever), which was famous. In the latter
years of his life (and probably under the influ
ence of his son, Robert Dale Owen) he was a believer
in Spiritualism, having become convinced of the
immutability of the soul. Mr. Owen was a man
of remarkable energy and decided ability, but
visionary. His attempts to realize his communis
tic theory of a society based upon the annihilation
of the social distinctions of birth, ability, and
capital, were abortive. He and his followers, called
“Owenists,” became in 1827 active in the estab
lishment of the labor leagues, in which the Chris
tian movement later turned to Europe without accomplishing any thing. Mr. Owen’s writings are,
Discourses on a New System of Society, with an Account of the Society at New
Lanark, Pittsburg, 1825; The Debate on the Evi
dences of Christianity . . . between Mr. Owen and
Dr. Campbell, Bethany, 1826, 2 vols.; The Revo
lution in the Mind and Practice of the Human
race, London, 1849, etc. See Packard: Life of
Booth: R. Owen, the Founder of Socialism in Eng
land, 1869; Sargent: R. Owen and his Social
Philosophy.

OWEN, Robert Dale, a prominent advocate of
Spiritualism; writer and politician; the son of
the preceding; was b. in Glasgow, Scotland, Nov.
7, 1801; d. June 24, 1877. He came to the United
States in 1823 with his father, assisting him in his
efforts to found a colony at New Harmony, Ind.,
and after a visit to Europe returned to the
United States, and became a citizen. In 1829
he began, with Miss Frances Wright, the publi
cation of The Free Enquirer, a weekly paper de
voted to the promulgation of socialist ideas and
the denial of the supernatural origin of Chris
tianity. It was discontinued after an existence of three years. He sat in the Indiana Legislature three terms (1855–58), and represented his district in Congress two terms (1843–47). In 1853 he was sent as chargé d'affaires to Naples, and represented the United States there till 1858. In 1860 he discussed the subject of divorce, in the columns of the New-York Tribune, with Horace Greeley, the pamphlet edition of the discussion having a circulation of sixty thousand copies. He was an ardent advocate of the emancipation of the slaves. Among his numerous publications are, Moral Physiology, New York, 1831; Footfalls on the Boundary of Another World (on Spiritualism), Philadelphia, 1860; The Wrong of Slavery, etc., Philadelphia, 1844; The Debatable Land between this World and the Next (on Spiritualistic phenomena), New York, 1872. See his autobiography, Threading my Way, New York, 1874.

OXFORD, the capital of Oxfordshire, Eng., population about 31,500, is situated on the Isis, among charming surroundings, and contains a great number of magnificent buildings, and collections of highest scientific and artistic merit.

The University. — Though not founded by Alfred the Great, it is a very old institution, and achieved very early a great fame. It probably originated from independent colleges founded in the place. The earliest we recognize it as a single organization dates from Henry III. (thirteenth century): the actual statutes date from 1239. At present the university comprises 21 colleges, some of which are very richly endowed, and 5 halls; and, according to the Oxford Calendar of 1882, there were 10,452 members on the books. The University Library is the Bodleian, containing about 400,000 volumes and about 30,000 manuscripts. The university of Oxford has been closely identified with the religious life of England; but, from the Restoration down to a recent period (1854), dissenters were debarred from the honors of the university. Now, however, all persons can receive its degrees, since subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles is no longer required. Wiclif was professor in Oxford. There Ridley and Latimer (1558) and Cranmer (1556)—all of whom were graduated at Cambridge—were burnt. In 1506 James I. prohibited Roman Catholics from "presenting to any ecclesiastical benefice, or nominating to any free school, hospital, or doative." In the civil war the university of Oxford sided with the Stuarts, and melted down its plate to help the king. Chief among these was Dr. Fell, dean of Christ Church, and vice-chancellor. To him succeeded Reynolds the Presbyterian, and then John Owen the Independent (1692), until 1700, when Reynolds was restored. In 1691 Owen was elected chancellor. During the Commonwealth, instruction was given as usual, although there was, of course, some confusion; and among the students were John Locke, Robert South, Philip Henry, Dr. Whitby, and Matthew Poole. Walton's Polyglot was carried through the press during this period (1654–56), and in it Oxford scholars took a principal part. With the Restoration (1660) a great change took place. The university became as pronouncedly loyal to the monarchy as it had been immediately before loyal to the Commonwealth, and those who had been ejected were restored. It was insultied by that tyrannical monarch James II., because it refused to countenance his Roman-Catholic and high-handed schemes. Yet, under Queen Anne, strong Jacobite sentiments prevailed in the university. Later on, in the eighteenth century, Oxford became the starting-point for the most remarkable religious movement in the annals of England.—Methodism; for John Wesley was student and fellow there, and "father" of the famous Holy Club, and there also Whitefield studied. In the nineteenth century Oxford has also been a religious centre. It will be necessary only to name Dr. Pusey, John Henry Newman, and John Keble, to call to mind the Tractarian movement which stirred England so profoundly forty years ago. A leader in quite a different school of religious thought is Jowett, master of Balliol, who heads in a scholarly way the Broad-church party. Oxford has been successively the nursery of the Reformation, of Puritanism, Anglo-Catholicism, Ritualism, and Broad-churchism. (See arts. on the persons and parties referred to.)

Councils. — Several councils or synods have been held in Oxford. Two have especial interest; one on Nov. 13, 1544, before which Wiclif was summoned to answer for his attack upon the doctrine of transubstantiation. The council passed no condemnatory sentence, yet by royal order he was debarred from lecturing in the university. The second synod to be mentioned was presided over by Thomas Arundel, and was held in 1408. It passed thirteen decrees against the Lollards, the followers of Wiclif; of which 3, 6, and 7 may be thus summarized: Every preacher must adapt his discourse to the class immediately addressed, so that he may to the clergy speak of the faults of the clergy, and to the laity of the faults of the clergy, but not vice versa. No book of Wiclif's may be read anywhere, unless it has been previously approved. The Bible must no longer appear in an English translation, and the Wiclifite translation must no longer be used.

Bishopric. — The see of Oxford was established by Henry VIII. in 1542; and the cathedral was first at the abbey of Oseney, but since 1546 has been Christ Church, Oxford. The episcopal stipend is £5,000. Among the eminent bishops of Oxford may be mentioned Henry Compton (1674), John Fell (1679), Thomas Seeker (1737), and Samuel Wilberforce (1840); about whom see arts. For a history of the see, consult E. Marshall: Oxford, London, 1882.

Oxford Tracts. See Tractarianism.

Oxlee, John, b. at Gisborough, Sept. 25, 1779; d. at Molesworth, Jan. 30, 1854. He was rector of Scrawton, Yorkshire, 1816–26, and of Molesworth, Hants, 1836, till his death. He is said to have mastered without a teacher a hundred and twenty languages and dialects. He wrote many works, of which the most important is The Christian Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation, London, 1815–50, 3 vols., a very learned work.

Ozanam, Antoine Frédéric, b. at Milan, April 23, 1813; d. at Marseilles, Sept. 8, 1853. Studied in Lyons and Paris, and was in 1841 appointed professor of foreign literature at the Sorbonne. He was a man of piety, learning, and great literary powers. His great aim was to write a counterpart of Gibbon’s Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, and to vindicate the Roman-Catholic Church in the form of a history of the Christian civilization; but he succeeded in realizing it only in a fragmentary manner: Dante et la philosophie catholique au 18e siècle, 1839; Histoire de la civilisation au 5e siècle, 1845 (translated by Ashley C. Glyn, London, 1868, 2 vols.); Études germaniques, 1847–49; Les Poètes Franciscains, and Mélanges. A collected edition of his works in 11 vols. appeared in Paris, 1862–75. His life was written by Karker (Paderborn, 1897), Kathleen O’Meara (Edinburgh, 1876), and Hardy (Mayence, 1878).
PACCA, Bartolommeo, b. at Benevento, Dec. 15, 1758; d. in Rome, April 19, 1844. The Roman curia answered the Congress of Ems by sending Pacca as nuncio to Cologne in 1786. Though he was not recognized, even not received, by the prince-bishops, he carried every thing before him with a high hand, until the advance of the French armies in 1794 compelled him to leave Germany. He filled another equally successful nunciature at Lisbon, 1795–1800; and on his return to Rome he was made a cardinal. His success led him to adopt the maxim,—never to give in, never to abandon a hair's breadth of his original claim, never to compromise; and he followed it till his death. He became one of the leaders of the Zelanti; and it was he who in 1809 drew up, and induced Pius VII. to sign, the bull of excommunication against Napoleon I. He was seized, and imprisoned in the Piedmontese fortress, Fenestrella, but was released in 1813, and took, after the restoration, an active part in the revocation of the Jesuits, the re-establishment of the Inquisition, etc. Though in the conclaves of 1823, 1826, and 1831 he failed to obtain a majority, he continued to exercise a great influence on the papal government. He wrote Mem. storiche d. Ministro e' due Viaggi in Francia, etc., 1828, 5th ed., 1831; Memorie storiche sul soggiorno del C. B. P. in Germania, 1832; Notizie sul Portogallo, 1832, 3d ed., 1845; Relazione del Viaggio di Pio VII. a Genova, 1815, 1833; of which writings there exist both French and German translations. [See Historical Memoirs of Cardinal Pacca, Prime-Minister of Pius VII. Translated from the Italian by Sir George Head, London, 1850, 2 vols.]

PACE, Richard, English ecclesiastic, diplomatist, and man of letters; b. at or near Winchester, Hampshire, about 1482; d. at Stepney, near London, 1532. His studies were principally conducted at Padua; and although, on his return, he entered Queen's College, Oxford, he very soon left it for the service of Cardinal Bainbridge, whom he accompanied to Rome end of 1509. In May, 1510, he became prebendary of Southwell; on May 20, 1514, archdeacon of Dorset; in October, 1519, dean of St. Paul's; and in the summer of 1522, dean of Exeter. Meanwhile he had attracted the service of Christiania in a healthy condition, it found its satisfaction within the life of the congregation. But by degrees, as the church became more and more familiarized with the surrounding world, the ascetic instinct, under the influence of the dualism of the Neo-Platonizing, Alexandrian theology, and seduced by the example of the monks of the Serapis worship, fell into extravagances; and the ascetics fled into the deserts, and became hermits. Pacchius was also swayed by this tendency; and in his twentieth year he settled in the desert to fight for the prize of asceticism under the training of Palemon, one of the most austere pupils of St. Anthony. But the movement had already reached such a speed and such a compass, that it could not go on any farther without some kind of organization; and to have effected this is the great merit of Pacchius. Something had already been done before his time. As the desert became peopled by anchorites, the laura arose; that is, a number of novices in asceticism built their cells around the cell of some hero in asceticism, in order to follow his example, and to receive his training; and thus the first trace of organization originated. Pachomius made the next step, transforming the laura into a monastery. In the island of Tabennese he founded the first cenobium (convent); that is, a house in which the anchorites, who had hitherto lived separately, each pursuing his own scheme of asceticism, came to live together, with common practices and exercises, according to certain fixed rules, and under the guidance or government of a director. The success of Pachomius' undertaking was enormous. Palladius states that in his time the monastery of Tabennese contained no less than fourteen hundred monks. Of the original rules of Pachomius, nothing certain is known. The Regula S. Pachomii, containing a hundred and ninety-four articles, and printed by Holstenius, in his Codex Regularum, i. pp. 29–30, and a shorter regulative, containing fourteen articles, and printed by Gazzaus as an appendix to his edition of Cassianus' De Canobiorum Institut., may contain fragments of the original rules; but their authenticity cannot be established. They present many curious features; thus, the monks are divided into twenty-four classes, named after the letters of the alphabet, the simple souls ranking in the first classes, the smart fellows in the last; but in this respect they agree very well with the writings generally ascribed by antiquity to Pacchius, — Monit ad Monachos, Verba Mystica, Letters, etc., printed by Holstenius, i.e., most of
which are entirely unintelligible. See, besides the above-mentioned writers, Acta Sanct., May 14; Gennadius: De viris illust., cap. 7. Mangold.

PACHYMERS, Georgius, b. at Nicea about 1292; d. in Constantinople, probably about 1310; held high offices at the Byzantine court during the reigns of MichaelPaleologus and Andronicus the Elder; took part with great energy in the negotiations for a union between the Greek and the Latin churches; and wrote a history, in thirteen books, of the two reigns during which he lived. He also wrote some treatises on Aristotle, on the procession of the Holy Spirit, etc.; but only his historical work has any interest.

PACIANUS, Bishop of Barcelona; d. about 390; is spoken of by Jerome in his De viris illust., 106 and 182, and in his Contra Rujin, 1, 24. Of his works, distinguished by the neatness of their style, but without any originality of ideas, are still extant, three letters, Contra Novatianos, and two minor treatises, Parousias ad pantiumiam and Sermo de baptismio, which are found in Bib. Max. Lug., iv., and Migne: Patr. Lat., xiii. See Act. Sanct., March 9.

PACIFICATION, Edicts of, is the name generally given to those edicts which from time to time the French kings issued in order to “pacify” the Hugenots. The first of the kind was that issued by Charles IX. in 1562, which guaranteed the Reformed religion toleration within certain limits: the last was the famous Edict of Nantes. See NANTES.

PADUA (Patavium), a city of Northern Italy; stands on the Brenta, twenty miles west of Venice, and has about sixty-six thousand inhabitants. At the beginning of the Christian era it was the largest and most important city of Northern Italy; and very early it became the seat of a bishop, according to legend, even in the times of the apostles. Afterwards the see belonged under the metropolita n of Venetia. But during the Lombard rule the city was more than once compelled to accept an Arian bishop, and the Catholic bishop then moved his residence to Chieti. When the city was built in the beginning of the fourth century by Paul, the fifteenth occupant of the episcopal chair. The present cathedral was begun in 1524, but not completed until 1754. The most magnificent church of the city is that of St. Anthony, begun in 1622, and finished in the fourteenth century. In 1797 the French carried away from that church treasures valued by some at 20,116,010 francs, by others at 38,305,446 francs; fourteenth century. In 1797 the French carried away from that church treasures valued by some at 20,116,010 francs, by others at 38,305,446 francs; fifty-two lamps belonging to the chapel of the saint,—one of pure gold, weighing 361 ounces; honorific signia of Pontifex Maximus. The decisivemeasurement against Paganism was inaugurated by the laws of Theodosius I. (378-395). One, of 381, punished relapse into Paganism with forfeiture of the right to make a will; another, of 385, forbade the inspection of entrails, or the exercise of magical rites, under penalty of death; a third, of 391, ordered all sacrifices to idols to cease, and all temples to be closed. In 422 an edict of Theodosius II. (402-450) forbade Pagans to practiseat the bar, to hold a military command, or to be government officials. Nevertheless, Optatus, prefect of Constantinople in 404, was a Pagan; and his was by no means the only instance of a Pagan holding a high position in the government. The schools remained in the hands of the Pagan philosophers for a century more: the last of them, that of Athens, was closed in 629 by Justinian I. (527-565). In the West, Gratian (387-388) removed the statue of Victory from the curia, and refused the title and insignia of Pontifex Maximus. The decisive measures, however, against Paganism were enacted by Honorius (395-425). He forbade the Pagan worship in 396, and ordered in 408 that the altar and the idols should be destroyed, and the temples appropriated to some secular use. Nevertheless, Theodoric the Great (493-526) found it necessary, at his visit to Rome in 500, to issue an edict threatening with death any one who should sacrifice to the idols. Gregory of Tours (593-693) tells us, that in Gaul the statue of Berecynthe was still carried around the vineyard in spring (De gloria confessorum, 2); and a capitulary of Charlemagne, dating from 789 (Baluz, Capitularia, I., 19), forbade the lighting tapers before trees and springs. In the very bosom of the Christian
PAINE, Robert, D.D., a bishop of the Methodist-Episcopal Church south; was b. in Person County, N.C., Nov. 12, 1799; and d. at Aberdeen, Miss., Oct. 19, 1852, being at the time of his death the senior bishop of the church. His father, James Paine, a highly respectable farmer, reared a large family. Young Robert made the chief one at Rangone.

PAINE, Thomas, political and deistic writer; b. at Thetford, Norfolk, Eng., Jan. 29, 1737; d. in Columbia Street, New-York City, June 8, 1800. His father was a Friend, who had been expelled from the society for marrying a Church-of-England woman. He received an indifferent education; left school at thirteen, and until sixteen worked at his father's trade of stay-making, then was for a while a sailor or marine. He settled at Sandwich in 1759 as a master stay-maker. From 1763 to 1774, with the expiration of one year, he was excise-man. In 1772 he wrote a small pamphlet, *The case of the officers of excise, with remarks on the qualifications of officers and on the numerous evils arising to the revenue from the insufficiency of the present salaries.* It was very able, and excited the ill will of the upper officials, so that in 1774 he was dismissed the service on charge of smuggling, occasioned by his keeping a tobacco-shop. By the advice of Benjamin Franklin, whom he met in London, he came to America (1774), where he immediately entered upon a journalistic and political career of great prominence and usefulness. He had, earlier in that year, separated from his second wife for an unknown cause. In America he was successively editor of the *Philadelphia Magazine* (January, 1775), secretary to the congressional Committee of Foreign Affairs (1777), but obliged to resign in 1779 (because, in the heat of a controversy in the *Philadelphia Packet* with Silas Deane, he divulged State secret), and in November, 1779, clerk to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania. In 1781 he negotiated a loan of ten million livres from France, and brought six million more as a present. In October, 1786, he himself received three thousand dollars from Congress to be paid to him during the Revolution, and, from the State of New York, a house and farm of three hundred acres in New Rochellle. From 1787 to 1802 he was in Europe, most of the time in France, where he was enthusiastically received as the author of *The Rights of Man*, naturalized, and elected to the National Assembly. He had the courage to vote against the execution of Louis XVI., and thus incurred the anger of Robespierre, who threw him into prison, January, 1794; and there he remained until Nov. 4, 1794, when, on the solicitation of James Monroe, he was released. He related that his door in the Luxembourg was once marked, in sign that he was to be executed; but his door opened outward, and so, when it was closed, the mark was of course hidden, and he escaped. On his return to the United States he was warmly welcomed, especially by Jefferson and his party. He was early director of the farm at New Rochelle. A monument to him was set up (1839) near the spot, although his remains had been taken to England in 1819 by William Cobbett. On Jan. 29, 1875, there was dedicated in Boston the Paine Memorial Building.
If Paine's writings had been only political, he would be entitled to honor as a bold and vigorous friend of human liberty. To him is to be traced the common saying, "These are the times which try man's souls," which is an opening sentence of the first number of *The Crisis* (December, 1776). His pamphlet, *Common Sense* (January, 1776), was one of the memorable writings of the day, and helped the cause of Independence. But it is as the author of *The Age of Reason*, an uncompromising, ignorant, and audacious attack on the Bible, that he is most widely known, indeed notorious. The first part of this work was handed by him while on his way to prison in the Luxembourg, to his friend Joel Barlow, and appeared, London and Paris, March, 1794; the second part, composed while in prison, December, 1795; the third was left in manuscript. 1 "His ignorance," says Leslie Stephen, "was vast, and his language brutal; but he had the gift of a true demagogue,—the power of wielding a fine vigorous English, a fit vehicle for fanatical passion." Paine was not an atheist, but a deist. In his will he speaks of his "reposing confidence in my Creator-God and in no other being; for I know no other, nor believe in any other." He voiced current doubt, and is still formidable; because, although he attacks a gross misconception of Christianity, he does it in such a manner as to turn his reader, in many cases, away from any serious consideration of the claim of Christianity. He was blind to the moral and spiritual truths of the Bible, and is therefore an incompetent critic, whose pretensions in this line are really ludicrous. *His Age of Reason* is still circulated and read. The Replies written at the time are not. Of these Replies the most famous is Bishop Watson's (1796).

The personal character of Paine has been very severely judged. Nothing too bad about him could be said by those who hated him for his opinions, and even his friends are compelled to admit that there was foundation for the damaging charges. Comparison of the contemporary biographies, both of friends and foes, seems to show that the charges of matrimonial infidelity and of seduction are probably unfounded; but that he was in his old age penurious, uncleanly, drunken, unscrupulous, may be accepted as true. He did a great service for the United States in her hour of peril. But alas! he has done irreparable injury ever since in turning many away from God and the religion of Jesus Christ.

His complete Works have been several times published, e.g., Boston, 1836, 3 vols.; New York, 1860, London, 1881; his *Age of Reason* repeatedly, e.g., New York, 1876; and his *Theological Works* (complete), New York, 1860, 1 vol.

His *Life* has been written by Francis Oldys (pseudonyme for George Chalmers), London, 1791, 5th ed., 1792, continued by William Cobbett, 1796 (abusive); James Cuzett, New York, 1809 (written by one who knew him in his last days; this is the source of all the damaging stories about Paine: Cheatham meant to be fair, yet was prejudiced); Thomas Clio Rickman, London, 1814 (apologetic, but honest, a good corrective of Cheatham's exaggerations). Rickman speaks with propriety and moderation, was friendly to Paine, but is compelled to give him, on the whole, a bad character; W. T. Shrwin, London, 1819 (apologetic); J. S. Harford, Bristol, 1820; G. Vale, New York, 1841 (apologetic); Charles Blanchard, New York, 1890 (a thoroughgoing defence of Paine, written in a careless style, and interlarded with irrelevant and questionable matter; it is prefixed to the edition of Paine's *Theological Works* mentioned above). See also G. J. Holyoak: *Essay on the Character and Services of Paine*, New York, 1876; cf. Leslie Stephen: *History of English Thought*, London and New York, 2d ed., 1881, 2 vols.; vol. i. pp. 458-464, vol. ii. 260-264; McMaster: *History of the People of the United States*, N.Y., vol. i. 1883, pp. 150-154.

**PAINTING, Christian.** The first law which governed the early Christian sculptors and painters was to present Christ as the source and centre of their life, and so to represent him as that all other figures in their compositions should appear like rays emanating from him. With respect to the contents and spirit of representation, it may be said, that, during the entire period of early Christian art, both sculpture and painting were, for the most part, limited to symbolic expression. In the beginning, symbolic representations were alone permitted. Soon, however, the art impulse partially broke away from these fetters; yet still art remained a sort of *biblia pauperum*, and sought Life a hand of the themes of sacred history. Even at a later period, when works of art were employed in multitudes for church decoration, it manifested a great partiality for scenes from the Apocalypse, representations of Christ enthroned as Judge and King of the world, the grouping of single figures in decidedly symbolic relationship.

As early as the fourth century we find a portrait-like representation of sacred personages accompanying these forms of artistic symbolism. It was even credited that veritable portraits of Christ, the Madonna, and the apostles, existed in paintings from the hand of St. Luke, and in sculpture from that of Nicodemus, in the napkin of St. Veronica, yea, even in the so-called *niphontes* (" likenesses of celestial origin").

In the first third of the early Christian period, from the third to the second half of the fifth century, from which numerous works of art in the so-called cemeteries ( Catacombs of Rome, Naples, Syracuse, etc.) have been preserved, painting maintained unchallenged the ancient plastic method of representation. Principal monuments, besides the paintings in the cemeteries, the mosaics of St. Costanza and St. Maria Maggiore in Rome,
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St. Giovanni in Fonte, and St. Nazario e Celso at Ravenna. In the second third till the eighth century, art sought more and more to adapt the antique forms to the idealistic, transcendental spirit of Christianity. Principal monuments, the mosaics of St. Pudentiana and SS. Coemae Damiani in Rome, of St. Apollinare Nuovo, St. Apollinare in Classe, and St. Vitale, at Ravenna, and some miniatures.

After the eighth century, painting, and, in fact, the entire art of early Christianity, leaped into a continually deepening decline, till the eleventh century. Examples are seen in the mosaics of St. Frassede, St. Marco, and others in Rome, miniatures of various manuscripts, and the Iconostase of Greek and Russian churches.

With the new life which awoke, after the beginning of the eleventh century, in Western Christendom, with the restoration of Church and State in the new mediæval forms, hierarchical and feudalistic, architecture reached not only the climax of its own development, but also asserted a decided preponderance over sculpture and painting. One spirit and one life prevailed in all three of the sister-arts. The newly awakened art impulse developed itself in Italy much later than in the North, especially in Germany. Not until the twelfth century did the earliest movement take place in Italy; and the following century had been ushered in before the first endeavors were made by single artists of lesser rank to blend the Byzantine style with the ancient Italian, and by this means to infuse new life into the old Christian types.

The Romanesque style of painting first reached completeness in Giovanni Cimabue of Florence (d. after 1300) and in Duccio di Buonisignora of Siena (flourished about 1282). On this wise there grew up in competition with each other two separate schools of painting,— that of Florence, and that of Siena; the Florentine, of a severer type, approaching nearer to the early Christian (Byzantine), the Siennese characterized more by tenderness and sentiment, more independent, and likewise more graceful in the rendering of form.

Closely in the footsteps of this pioneer followed the renowned Giotto di Bondone of Florence (1276–1339), known under the title of “the Father of Italian painting,” but in fact only the founder of the Gothic style of painting. He was a genius of first rank, an artist of creative productivity, a bold reformer who first broke through the traditions of art, and serve adherence to the early Christian types. The best pupils of Giotto were Taddeo Gaddi, and his son Angelo Gaddi, Giottoni, Orcagna, Spinello Aretino, Antonio Veneziano, and others.

In Germany the beginnings of the Romanesque style are represented in the miniatures of the eleventh century. The manuscripts from the treasures of the cathedral of Bamberg (now in Munich) evidence the desire which was already felt to breathe more life into the old Christiantypes, and to develop the ancient Christian symbolism through the imaginative element. An improved rendering of the human form is manifest in the twelfth century in the chief monuments of the Romanesque period, especially in the famous altar of Verdun (of the year 1180, now in the monastery of Neuburg, near Vienna), in the mural paintings of the grand hall of the monastery of Branweiler, near Cologne, and the ceiling of the central aisle of St. Michael at Hildesheim.

Far more numerous and important are the works still preserved from the period of the Gothic style, in which the peculiar spirit of medievalism first attained to complete artistic expression.

The development of glass-painting must especially be noted,— probably a German invention, dating at the end of the tenth century,— examples of which are seen in the windows of St. Cunibert at Cologne, in the choir of Cologne Cathedral, in the Church of St. Catharine at Oppenheim, and in Strassburg Cathedral.

In easel pictures, which previously appear to have been very little painted, there is manifest no higher artistic endeavor until the middle of the fourteenth century. After this, however, three separate schools started forth, each on its own path: (1) The Bohemian, or school of Prague, founded by Charles IV; (2) The Nuremberg school, the chief representative monuments of which are several altar-shrines in the Frauenkirche in St. Lawrence and St. Sebald in Nuremberg; (3) The school of Cologne, by far the most important, whose chief representatives were Master Wilhelm (about 1380) and Master Stephan (about 1480), the latter the founder of the famous cathedral at Cologne.

In the beginning of the fifteenth century broke forth, in opposition to the spirit of medievalism, a decided endeavor after greater truth of expression in art,— an endeavor in light, color, drawing, and composition, to bring the spiritual import of representation into harmony with the laws and principles of nature. This naturalistic development first manifested itself in Italy in the Florentine school. Fra Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole (1387–1455), although in other respects wholly dominated by the spirit of medievalism, was, nevertheless, the first who sought to penetrate into the psychological meaning of the human countenance. Over against him, already decidedly emancipated from medievalism, stands Tommaso di St. Giovanni da Castel, called Massaccio (1401–28), one of the greatest masters of the fifteenth century. With Fra Angelico are associated the names of Benozzo Gozzoli and Gentile da Fabriano; with Massaccio, those of Fra Filippo Lippi, his son Filippino, Domenico Ghirlandajo, and Bastiano Mainardi. Other Florentine artists, for example, Antonio Pallajolu and Andrea del Verocchio, who were also sculptors, strove by anatomical studies to transfer plastic forms to painting, in a more vigorous modeling of the human figure; while Luca Signorelli of Cortona (1440–1521), by the nobleness and artistic truth of his compositions, presents a strong contrast with the deeper sentiment of the Umbrian school. The Umbrian school, which had its chief theatre in the vicinity of Assisi Chiusi, and especially of the Florentine; and its chief master was Pietro Perugino (1446–1526), the teacher of Raphael. Closely allied to its spirit was Raphael’s father, Giovanni Santi (d. 1494), and Francesco Francia (d. 1617), the friend of Raphael, and one of the first masters of the fifteenth century.

The remaining schools of Italy follow the Flo-
entine. The principal one of these was the Venetian, whose chief master in the fifteenth century was Giovanni Bellini (about 1450–1516), the teacher of the genial Giorgione and the great Titian. The schools of Upper Italy devoted themselves to the study of the antique. Chief among them was the school of Padua and Mantua, whose founder was Francesco Squarcione, and whose head was the renowned Andrea Mantegna (1431–1506).

Italian painting in the sixteenth century, as represented in its various schools, reached its highest point of development, and its completest capacity for the expression of Christian thought. This most fruitful period of Christian painting is represented by five great masters. At their head stands Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519). A master in all five of the fine arts (he was a poet of repute and an excellent musician), he united in himself all the technical and spiritual achievements of the fifteenth century. He is the founder of the modern Milanese school; and prominent among his pupils are Cesare da Sesto, Andrea Salaino, Francesco Mei, and, especially, Luini. He exercised likewise an important influence upon Gaudenzio Ferrari, Gianantonio Razzi (called Il Todoma), and upon Fra Bartolomeo (1499–1517), a friend and enthusiastic follower of Savonarola.

The Venetian school of the sixteenth century sought to realize by means of color the noble results to which Leonardo had attained. In the quality of color this school achieved a supremacy over all others. It chief master was Titian of Cadore, near Venice (1477-1576); and he concentrates all its excellences in himself as in a focal point. With him labored the distinguished pupils of Giorgione,— Fra Sebastiano del Piombo (who afterward went over to Michel Angelo), Jacopo Palma (called Palma Vecchio), and Pordenone. Among Titian's own pupils the most distinguished was Jacopo Robusti, called Tintoretto (1512–94), almost the equal of his master in color, but his inferior in depth and spirituality.

In the renowned Paul Veronese (1538–88) we have the化身 of color of this school, albeit his paintings betray a lack of spiritual power, notwithstanding all their technical excellences.

The principal seat of the Lombard school in the sixteenth century was Parma, and the greatest achievements in chiariore were witnessed here. Its chief master was Correggio (1489–1534), the painter of celestial blessedness, whose Madonnas and angels, although of surpassing loveliness, are nevertheless chargeable with those faults which grew out of his partiality for chiariore, and his one-sided intellectual development.

The Florentine school, and, later, almost the entire painting of Italy after the beginning of the sixteenth century, were ruled by Michel Angelo Buonarotti of Florence (1475–1564). He was a pupil of Domenico Ghirlandajo, and one of the greatest artists of all time, the worthy rival of Raphael, a spirit of Titian power, almost as great in the three epochs of his greatness, or less success, entered upon the new path, and become followers of the Italian. The chief masters of the sixteenth century are, in the school of Cologne, the painter (unknown by name) of the Death of the Virgin,— his principal work,— and Johann von Meheim, who flourished somewhat later (about 1520) in the school of Westphalia, the master of Liesborn monastery; in the school of Ulm and Augsburg, the excellent Martin Schöon (about 1480), the somewhat younger Bartholomäus Zeitblom and his successor, Martin Schoffner of Ulm, and Hans Holbein, father of the renowned Hollein the younger of Augsburg; in the school of Nuremberg, Michael Wohlgemuth (1434–1519). The Nuremberg school produced the greatest master of German art, the only one who in spiritual depth and artistic genius approached the five great masters of Italy,— Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528), in painting, the famous Four Apostles, in Munich, is the first one animated by the spirit of the evangelical church, having its origin in a real enthusiasm for evangelical truth.

Mention must also be made of the Saxon school, whose head was the well-known Lucas Cranach...
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(1472–1558), the friend of Luther, whose best pupils were his sons John, and Lucas Cranach the younger.

The only artist who can be compared with the great master of Nuremberg is Hans Holbein the younger (1497–1554). In his larger compositions, for example, in the mural paintings of the Assembly Hall of German merchants in London, he shows the capabilities of the German Raphael. The Darmstadt Madonna, of which the one at Dresden is an excellent copy, and his well-known Dance of Death, a series of woodcuts, are his most characteristic works.

In the second half of the sixteenth century the painting of Germany and the Netherlands lost its independence by servile imitation of Italian masters. In Italy, likewise, we find a sudden decline, which clearly evidences that art had passed its zenith. A second race of pupils became mere imitators, even exaggerating the one-sidedness of Titian, Correggio, and Michel Angelo. The best examples of these so-called “mannerists” were Fr. Salviati and Giorgio Vasari, the renowned historian of painting.

In opposition to this confusion, at the end of the century arose the Bolognese school of the Caracci, whose advent marks for Italy the commencement of the fourth period of modern painting. Ludovico Caracci (1555–1619) and his two nephews and pupils, Agostino and Annibale Caracci (1560–1609), the latter the most gifted, established a sort of eclectic system, whose purpose it was to imitate the chief distinguishing qualities of the five great masters of painting. Their best pupils were Domenichino (1581–1641), Guercino (1590–1666), Franc. Albani (1578–1660), and especially Guido Reni (1575–1642), the most distinguished of all.

A second school of Italian painting in the beginning of the seventeenth century arrayed itself in opposition to the idealism of the great masters, and developed a one-sided realism and naturalism. The principal representative of this was Mic. Angelo Amerighi da Caravaggio (1556–1606), whose pupils—the two Frenchmen, Mousè Valentin and Simon Yonet, and the eminent Spanish painter of the highestrank in color and chiaroscuro, in which latter quality even Correggio is his inferior. His most distinguished pupils and successors were Gerbrandt van den Eeckhout, Solomon Koning, and Ferdinand Bol.

In France and Germany can claim no position of importance during this period in a brief review of Christian painting. In Germany the Thirty Years' War had nearly uprooted all elements of culture; and when, in the eighteenth century, the country began to recover from these devastations, masters of only subordinate rank—for example, Balh. Denner, Dietrich, and Raphael Mengs (1728–78)—appeared upon the stage.

In France the older and better masters, like Nic. Poussin, Estuché Lesueur, and others, strove in vain to make head against the theatrical style represented by Charles Lebrun, the favorite of Louis XIV.

Since the diffusion over Europe of that immoral and irreligious spirit which preceded and followed the French Revolution, Christian painting has naturally experienced a marked decline. But in Germany, France, and Belgium, individual schools have again grown up, the excellences of which, in the appreciation of the grand and the beautiful, cannot be denied. In the appreciation of the grand and the beautiful, cannot be denied. In the appreciation of the grand and the beautiful, cannot be denied. In the appreciation of the grand and the beautiful, cannot be denied. In the appreciation of the grand and the beautiful, cannot be denied.
ing, as might be expected from the religious conditions of the present time, seems partly a mere endeavor to revive a greatness and power which has perished, and partly a blind effort to reach a new goal, which is still enthroned in darkness.


PAJON, Claude, b. at Romorantin in Lower Blésois, 1620; d. at Carre, near Orleans, Sept. 27, 1665. He studied theology at Saumur, under Anthoine and Blesois, and was in 1650 appointed minister of Machenior, and in 1660 professor of theology at Saumur. But the sensation which his peculiar views produced led him to resign his professorships, and settle as minister in Orleans, where he spent the rest of his life. He is the father of the so-called Pajonism, a peculiar development of the doctrinal system of the French-Reformed Church. Camero introduced at Saumur the views that the will is completely governed by the intellect, and that the origin of sin is due to an obscuration of the intellect; and from these premises he inferred that the grace which works conversion is not a mutus brutus, not a blind force of nature, but a moral agency. Amyraut developed these views further by distinguishing between an objective and a subjective grace, between the external means of grace, which are free to all, and the internal working of the Holy Spirit, which explains why some are converted, and others not. But this subjective grace Pajon rejected, declaring that the sum total of external circumstances is in any given case sufficient to explain the conversion or non-conversion of an individual; since God governs the world through the objective connection between cause and effect, without any concurrence, direct interference of Providence. A literary exposition of his ideas he never gave. *Il sExamen du livre qui porte pour titre Proueues légitimes contre les Calvinistes (1673) is simply a refutation of Nicoli's attack on the Reformed Church; and his *Remonstrances sur l'Erreure de l'Anima, 1653) a refutation of the attack of the Roman-Catholic clergy in France on the Huguenots. He simply propounded them from the cathedral and in the pulpit; but he found many and enthusiastic disciples, — Papin, Leufant, Allix, Du Vidal, and others.— He caused great commotion. As after 1660 the king increased the numbers of the National Synod to assemble, and the National Synod was the only competent court in cases of heresy, the provincial synods took the matter in their hands, and the pupils of Pajon were everywhere excluded from the offices of the church. See Jurieu: Traité de la nature et de la grâce, etc. (Utrecht, 1687), which was very ably answered by Papin, in his Essais de théol. sur la providence et la grâce, etc., Francfort, 1687; Melchior Leydecker: Veritas evangelica triumphans; Friedrich Spanheim: Controversiarum elenchus; Valentin Fock: Ein Exzerpt von der Lehre und Pajan., Leipzig, 1892. A. SCHWEIZER.

PALAFOX DE MENDOZA, Juan de, b. in 1600; d. in 1659; was made bishop of Puebla de los Angeles in Mexico in 1638, and bishop of Osma in Spain in 1655. He wrote a book, Virtute del Indio, to effect another policy with respect to the natives of Spanish America; but the Jesuits compelled him to give up the cause, and return to Europe. He also wrote a history of the conquest of China by the Tartars, a history of the siege of Fontarabia, and a number of mystical and devotional books. A collected edition of his works appeared in Madrid, 1792, 15 vols. fol. His life was written by Gonzalos de Resende, Madrid, 1686, French translation, Paris, 1800.

PALAMAS, Gregorius, the leader of the Hesychasts; was a native of Asia, and a favorite of Charles V. He began his career at the court, and became a monk of Mount Athos. As he was the principal defender of the ideas of the uncreated light, the mystical absorption by contemplation, etc., the attacks of Barlaam, Acindynus, and Nicephorus Gregoros, are principally directed against him. In 1549 he was made archbishop of Thessalonica by the emperor, and consecrated by the patriarch Isidorus; but the city refused to admit him within its walls, and he retired to the Island of Lemnos. He was present at the synod of Constantinople in 1551; but of his later life nothing is known. He was a very prolific writer, and left more than sixty works, most of which, however, still remain in manuscript. Printed are Prosopopaia, and two orations in Bib. Patr. Lugd., xxvi.; two Greek treatises against the Latin Church, London, 1624; Refutations inscriptionum Johannes Becc, Rome, 1630; Encomium S. Petri Athonite, in Acta Sancatoria, Jan. ii.; Sambri, in Athanasius: Gratia orthod., i. See Jurieu: Traité de la nature et de la grâce, etc., Francfort, 1687; Melchior Leydecker: Veritas evangelica triumphans; Friedrich Spanheim: Controversiarum elenchus; Valentin Fock: Ein Exzerpt von der Lehre und Pajan., Leipzig, 1892. A. SCHWEIZER.

PALEARIO, Aonio (Delia Paglia,Antonio Degli Pallagricci), b. at Veroli in 1500; burnt in Rome July 3, 1570; one of the most prominent humanists of his age. He studied in Rome, 1520-27, and settled in 1530 as a teacher at Siena, where in 1536 he published his great didactic poem, — De immortalitate animarum. In 1542 he was summoned before the Inquisition, the materials for the accusation having been derived from his newly published Della pienezza, sufficiente e satisfazione della passione di Cristo; but he defended himself so brilliantly, that he was acquitted. In Siena he also wrote his Actio in Pontifices Romanos et eorum assecas, of which in 1568 he sent two copies to Germany, but which was not published until 1606, at Leipzig. In 1549 he was appointed professor at Lucca; but not feeling safe there, he went to the Portuguese settlements of the Roman curia, he removed in 1555 to Milan. But he did not escape his fate. In 1567 the inquisitor of Milan, Fra Angelo, accused him of heresy, and sent him to Rome, where, after two years' imprisonment, he was convicted, and condemned to death Oct. 15, 1568. For some
unknown reason, however, the verdict was not executed until July the following year. Collected editions of his works were published at Lyons, 1552, Bremen, 1619, Amsterdam, 1698, and Jena, 1728. See GURLETT: Leben des A. P. Hamburg, 1805; Mrs. YOUNG: The Life and Times of A. P., London, 1837. JULES BONNE: Palæstina, Paris, 1862; to him was formerly attributed The Benefit of Christ's Death, Eng. trans., Boston, 1860.

PALESTINE. Pelesketh ( HEAP, "land of wanderers"), meaning Philistia, occurs eight times in the Old Testament, and in King James's Version is rendered three times Palestina, once Palestine, three times Philistia, and once the Philistines. The Greek Παλαιστίνη, originating probably in Egypt, occurs for the first time in Herodotus [i. 105, ii. 104, iii. 5, vii. 80], who means by it only Philistia, though in one passage he appears to have carried its northern boundary as far up as Beirut. In the later Greek and Roman period the name was applied as well to it, to the whole country occupied by the Israelites on both sides of the Jordan. Josephus uses the word in both of these senses. In Ant. I. 6, 2, Philistia only is meant; in Ant. VIII. 10, 3, it is the whole country on both sides of the river. The oldest name of the country was the Land of Canaan (Gen. xi. 31), or simply Canaan, "Lowland," meaning only the country west of the Jordan, in contrast with the higher lands east of the river, the western territory being all that was originally promised to Abraham. Other scriptural names are Judaea, the Land of Israel, the Land of Promise, and the Holy Land (Zech. ii. 12), which last has been for centuries the most popular name. The country was preconfigured to its history. Its situation and its boundaries indicated at once opportunity and isolation. It lay between great situations and its boundaries indicated at once contrast with the higherlands east of the river, the north a gigantic gateway opens out between the ranges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. The Jordan is mostly high table-land, some of it 3,000 feet to the mile. The fourth stripe asof the Jordan, has, indeed, neither inlet nor outlet, and abounds in frogs and leeches. Lake Huleh ("Waters of Merom," Josh. xi. 7), the Semoenitis of Josephus (Ant. V. 5, 1), some twelve miles south of Banias, in the midst of an extensive papyrus marsh, seven feet above the sea-level, is triangular in shape, with its apex pointing southward, four miles long, nearly four miles across its northern end, and fifteen feet deep. Some ten miles and a half farther down enters the Sea of Galilee, 682.5 feet below the Mediterranean, and sixty-five miles farther down empties into the Dead Sea, 1,292 feet below the Mediterranean. Thus, between Hermon and the Sea of Galilee the descent is more than sixty feet to the mile, and between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea, more than one hundred feet to the mile. The fourth strip east of the Jordan is mostly high table-land, some of it 3,000 feet high, sinking away eastward into the Arabian Desert.

Of the four lakes of Palestine, the northernmost is Phihia, five miles east of Banias, nearly round, about a mile in diameter, and of unknown depth, occupying apparently the crater of an extinct volcano. It is about 3,300 feet above the Mediterranean, is not, as was anciently supposed, one of the sources of the Jordan, has, indeed, neither inlet nor outlet, and abounds in frogs and leeches. Lake Huleh ("Waters of Merom," Josh. xi. 7), the Semoenitis of Josephus (Ant. V. 5, 1), some twelve miles south of Banias, in the midst of an extensive papyrus marsh, seven feet above the sea-level, is triangular in shape, with its apex pointing southward, four miles long, nearly four miles across its northern end, and fifteen feet deep. Some ten miles and a half farther down enters the Sea of Galilee, 682.5 feet below the Mediterranean, and sixty-five miles farther down empties into the Dead Sea, 1,292 feet below the Mediterranean. Thus, between Hermon and the Sea of Galilee the descent is more than sixty feet to the mile, and between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea, more than one hundred feet to the mile. The fourth strip east of the Jordan is mostly high table-land, some of it 3,000 feet high, sinking away eastward into the Arabian Desert.
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dance of its fish, the suddenness and violence of its storms, and the hot-spring streams. The Dead Sea, sixty-five miles farther south, is about forty-six miles long, with an average breadth of ten miles, 1,292 feet below the Mediterranean when the sea is at the fullest after the winter rains, and over 1,300 feet deep at the deepest point; the southern part, covering what used to be the Valley of Sodom, being very shallow. The extraordinary depression of the Dead Sea was never suspected till in March, 1837, it was detected and measured by Moore and Beke, experimenting by means of boiling water. They made the depression, however, only about 600 feet. Scott and Symonds, in 1840-41, made it 1,251 feet; Lynch, in 1848, made it 1,310; and Conder, in 1874, made it 1,592 feet. No fish live in the Dead Sea, the water being extremely salt and bitter, containing twenty-six per cent of solid matter. The impression generally received of the scenery is that of grandeur and desolation. But some travellers have been much impressed also, by the singular beauty of this silent sea.

Many of the so-called rivers of Palestine are merely winter torrents, which run dry in summer. Of perennial streams, some sixteen in all, the most important is the Jordan. Its three sources are at Hasbeiyah, at Banias, and at Tell el-Kady (the ancient Dan): the first of which contributes about one-seventh; the second, two-sevenths; and the third, four-sevenths of the water. Between Banias (about ten miles south of Hasbeiyah) and the Dead Sea, the distance is a hundred and four miles. The Jordan has four tributaries, —two from the east, and two from the west. The eastern tributaries are the Yarmuk (ancient Hieronax), which drains the Haouran, and the Zerka (ancient Jabbock), which is fed by the mountains of Gilead. The western tributaries are the Jalud, near Bethshean, and the Fârah, where Enoch (John iii.28) has been looked for. Three permanent streams empty into the Dead Sea from the east: the northernmost of these, about ten miles down, is the Zerka Mâ'n, in whose valley are the hot sulphur-springs of Callirhoe, a little way north of Macherus, where John the Baptist was imprisoned and murdered. Halfway down is the Zerka M'aln, in whose valley are the hot-springs and fountains, which are the largest of all the fountains. The deep chasm of the Jordan Valley must have once been covered by some great convulsion of nature, antedating the historic period. The Dead Sea is no doubt much older than the time of Abra- ham, and the Cities of the Plain are not at all likely to have stood on ground now covered by the water. Hot-springs are numerous. Earthquakes are frequent and severe. In 1837 Safed and Tiberias were destroyed by a shock.

The present climate of Palestine is said by Conder to be "trying and unhealthy," but by reason of human neglect, rather than by reason of any great climatic change. The Jordan Valley is especially tropical and dangerous. The hottest month of the year is August. The best months for tourists is May, when the days are hot, but the nights are cool and fresh. There are only two seasons, summer and winter; the former, from April to November, rainyless, or nearly so; the latter, the rainy season, from November to April. But between the middle of December and the middle of February there is usually an intermission, separating "the former and the latter rain." The average annual rainfall at Jerusalem is sixty inches; while on our Atlantic seaboard it is forty-five, and in California, whose climate somewhat resembles that of Palestine, it is only twenty. At Jerusalem, from June, 1861, to January, 1865, according to Dr. Barclay's register, the mean temperature was 66.5°, the highest 92°, and the lowest 28°. In some years the mean has been 62°, and the highest 86°. At Khan Minieh, in 1876, Dr. Merrill encountered a sirocco heat of 130° in the sun. Hermon, 9,200 feet high, looking down upon the whole of Palestine, especially in clear air, gives an idea of snow, though late in autumn only slender threads of it are left, as the Arabs say, "like the struggling locks on an old man's head." In the winter, on the plains, ice seldom makes, and the
ground is seldom frozen. With abundant rains, which may generally be counted upon, Palestine might again be fertile as it was of old. But trees and shrubs, the small portion of these are noticed in the Bible. No tourist ever forgets the impression made upon him by the flowers of Palestine. For mile on mile, in the proper season, the ground is radiant with all the colors of the rainbow. Everywhere one sees the scarlet anemone, thought by some to be our Lord's "lily of the field." The rampion, the belladonna, and the pheasant's-eye (Adonis palestina) are also very brilliant. The narcissus, the crocus, and the mallow are all candidates for the honor of being considered "the rose of Sharon." Of sheba to Lebanon, there are very few trees except oaks, but terebinths, the most famous specimen of which is the so-called "Abraham's Oak," near Hebron, twenty-three feet in circumference. The immediate predecessorsof the Hebrews were the Canaanites, of Hamitic Semitic. This prehistoric population had probably been introduced by the Persians, has in some sections taken the place of the ox; and the neat-cattle of the country in general are neither so numerous nor so well cared for as in ancient times. Sheep and goats are abundant, but swine are seldom seen. Of birds, the most common are eagles, vultures, falcons, hawks, owls, storks, pelicans, ravens, doves, pigeons, partridges, quails, sparrows, and nightingales. Large birds of prey are particularly numerous. Brilliance of plumage is another striking feature. But singing-birds are few, the bulbul and nightingale being the most common. Dr. Tristram collected three hundred and twenty-two species of birds, and thinks that at least thirty other species might be added to the list. A small but fine collection, made in the Jordan Valley, and on the east side of the river, for the American Palestine Exploration Society, belongs now to the museum of the Union Theological Seminary in New-York City.

Fish are often referred to in Scripture, but no species are named. Gennesaret is still remarkable for its dense shoals of fish, frequently covering an acre or more of the surface. Dr. Tristram obtained fourteen species, and thinks there may be three times that number of species in the lake. The bream and sheat-fish, among the most abundant of all, are identical with the common species of the Nile. The crocodile of Josephus (J. W. iii. 10, 8) has at last been found. The "great fish" of Jon. i. 17, was not a "whale," as the aya of Matt. xii. 40 is unwarrantably rendered in our version, but may have been a specimen of the great white shark (Carcharias carotarius), still found in the Mediterranean, and sometimes twenty-five or thirty feet long. Reptiles abound in Palestine. Serpents are very numerous, most of them harmless, and many of them brilliantly colored. Some are venomous. Of lizards there is an immense variety. Frogs are numerous, but are all of one species; and only one species of the toad is known. The crocodile (the "leviathan" of Job xii.) may still be found in the marshes of the Zerka.

Insects are abundant, especially locusts, grass-hoppers, crickets, and cockroaches, also fleas, lice, and mosquitoes, the bee, the wasp, and the hornet.

The immediate predecessors of the Hebrews in Palestine were the Canaanites, of Hamitic blood. But these were preceded by an aboriginal, prehistoric population, supposed to have been Semitic. This prehistoric population probably occupied the country on both sides of the Jordan, but in the time of Abraham we find...
them mostly on the east side of the river. Ched-
oraam, King of Elam, the contemporary of
Abraham, is described in Gen. xiv. as smiting
these four tribes,— the Rephaimit in Bashan,
south of them the Zuzaim, still farther south the
Elam, and, farthest south of all, the Hermon.
On the west side of the Jordan, in the
neighborhood of Hebron (Num. xiii. 28), were
the Anakim, who were driven out by Joshua
(Josh. xi. 21, 22), only a remnant remaining in
Philistia. The Acin of Deut. ii. 23, assumed to
be identical with the Acites of Josh. xiii. 3, also
probably belonged to this same aboriginal Semitic
population. The earliest historic occupants of
Palestine, as we have said, were Hamites, de-
cended from Canaan, the fourth and youngest
son of Ham. The date of their immigration
cannot be determined. Their conquest of the
aboriginal Semitic tribes was evidently not yet
completed when Abraham crossed the Jordan.
In the original grant of territory to Abraham
(Gen. xv. 19-21), ten tribes are named, the first
two of which, the Kenites and Kenizzites, were
on the south, towards Egypt; and the third, the
Kushites, were on the south of the river. The
usually six tribes are named, as in Exod. iii. 8
and in Josh. ix. 1; but seven is the number in
Josh. xiv. 11, where the Gergashites, usually
omitted, are named as if on the west side of the
Jordan. These seven were the Hittites, Gerga-
sites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites,
and Jebusites. In the time of Moses and Joshua,
the Ammon-Moab people were on the east side of
the river, but had been crowd down by the
Amorites, who held the whole territory from
Mount Hermon to the Arnon. Reuben, Gad, and
Half-Manasseh took this East-Jordan territory:
the other nine tribes and a half took the West-
Jordan territory. The Hebrew commonwealth
reached the zenith of its prosperity and power
under David and Solomon. Visible decay began
about 975 B.C., with the succession of the ten
tribes. Assyria crushed the northern kingdom
of Israel about 720 B.C., and Babylon crushed
the southern kingdom of Judah about 587 B.C.
Since then the country has been almost con-
stantly under foreign domination, with hardly
more than the shadow of independence at any
time. Persians, Greeks, and Romans succeeded
one another in the mastery, the heroic Macca-
bbean period lasting only about a hundred years.
Under the Romans, in the time of Christ, there
were four provinces,— Galilee, Samarina, and
Judea on the west side of the river, and Perea
on the east side. Since 637 A.D., when Pales-
tine was conquered by the Saracens, it has, with
little interruption by the Crusades, the ancient
name of Elam. The Seljuk Turks seized the country in 1073,
and by their barbarous treatment of Christian
pilgrims provoked the Crusades. The Latin king-
dom, with its nine successive sovereigns, estab-
lished in 1099, held Jerusalem till 1187, and
staid in Acre till 1291. In 1517 the Ottomans
came in, and made the country a part of the
Turkish Empire. It was snatched from the Sult-
AN by Mohammed Ali in 1832; but Europe
intervened, and in 1841 it was given back again
to Turkey. It now belongs to the pashalic of
Damascus, which includes the three sub-pashalics
of Beirut, Akka, and Jerusalem. As no proper
census is ever taken, the population can only
be guessed at. For the whole area of ancient
Palestine, Dr. Socin, in Badeker's Handbook,
allows an aggregate of six hundred and fifty
thousand souls,— only about a tenth part of
what the country was ever inhabited. The Jews,
who number about twenty thousand, are comparatively recent comers, found only in
the sacred places of Jerusalem, Hebron, Tiberias,
and Safed. Jerusalem has a population of twenty-
five thousand, of whom ten thousand are Jews.
The Samaritans at Nablous number only about
a hundred and fifty. The bulk of the people are
a mixed race, descendants of the ancient
Syrians and their Arab-conquerors. East of the
Jordan are three important tribes dwelling per-
manently within recognized limits. These are,
north of the Arnon, the Adwān; south of the
Arnon, the Beni Sakhr; and in the Jordan Valley,
the Ghawarineh. Besides these are four tribes
of Bedaveen Aneasheh (the Wul' Ali, the Iesse-
neh, the Ruwalə, and the Bisher), who left
Arabia about 120 A.D., and are always in motion,
coming northward every summer, and going
southward every winter. The Turkish Govern-
ment has but little control of them. Dr. Mer-
ril's East of the Jordan gives us admirable
pictures of Arab life in Eastern Palestine.

Pilgrimages to the Holy Land began with
Helena, the mother of Constantine, in 326 A.D.,
and have continued ever since. What was then
known of the country may be found in the Ono-
masticon of Eusebius and Jerome. During the
middle ages the principal topographers of Pales-
tine were superstitious, ignorant, and careless
monks, whose identifications of sacred places
were largely of the legendary and childish sort.
The eighteenth century contributed something
towards a better knowledge of the Holy Land.
Reland's learned work (1741) is still a classic.
Richard Pococke was in Palestine in 1738. Korte,
the German bookseller, was the first (in 1741)

To question the genuineness of the traditional site
of the holy sepulchre. The natural history of
the country was ably treated in a posthumous
work of Hasselquist, edited (1757) by Linnaeus.
The nineteenth century opened a new epoch in
the history of biblical geography. Seetzen was
in the field from 1805 to 1807, Burckhardt in
1810, Irby and Mangles in 1817-1818. But no one
man has ever done so much for the geography of
the Holy Land as Dr. Edward Robinson. Not
only was he thoroughly prepared for his task by
fifteen years of special study, but he had a pas-
sion and a genius for exact and certain knowl-
edge. During two brief journeys, in 1838 and in
1839, accompanied and aided by Dr. Eil Smith,
one of the best Arabic scholars then living, he
fairly swept the whole field clean of ecclesiastical
traditions. He was the first to adopt and adhere
persistently to the rule of looking for ancient
Hebrew names under the disguise of modern
Arabic names. The number of ancient places
first visited or identified by him in 1838 was a
hundred and sixteen. The number of identifica-
tions added in 1839 was forty-nine. And very
few of these identifications have been set aside.
Next in rank, with respect to the amount and
quality of service rendered, is Dr. William M.
Thomson, for more than forty years an American
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missionary in Syria and Palestine, whose book, in two volumes, appeared in 1858, and in a new edition, in three volumes, in 1890–93. In 1848 the Lower Jordan and the Dead Sea were for the first time thoroughly explored and surveyed by Lieut. Lynch and Dale of the United-States Navy. In 1859 Johann Gottfried Wetzstein, Prussian consul at Damascus, explored the northern section of the country east of the Jordan. In 1866 Huleh and the Upper Jordan were explored by John Macgregor of Scotland, and in the same year the Lake of Galilee was surveyed by Capt. Wilson of the English Royal Engineers. This last piece of work was done under the direction of the Palestine Exploration Fund, a society organized in 1865 for the purpose of making an exhaustive exploration and accurate survey of the Holy Land. From 1867 to 1870 Capt. Warren, under the direction of the same society, was making excavations in and around Jerusalem. In 1870 the American Palestine Exploration Society was organized to work on the east side of the Jordan. The triangulation of Western Palestine was begun in the autumn of 1871 by Capt. Stewart and Lieuts. Conder and Kitchener. They have done a great work. Of 622 biblical sites in Western Palestine, they claim to have identified 172 out of the 434 in all, which they regard as now identified with reasonable certainty. Their large map, in twenty-six sheets, is on the scale of three-eighths of an inch to the mile. It was published in 1880. Seven quarto volumes go with it,—three volumes of Memoirs, one volume of Name Lists, one of Special Papers, one on the Jerusalem Work, and one on the Flora and Fauna of Western Palestine. The reduced map (on the scale of three-eighths of an inch to the mile) is in four forms,—the Modern, the Old-Testament Ancient, the New-Testament Ancient, and the Water-Basins. In 1873 the American Society sent out its first expedition under command of Lieut. Steever of the United-States army, who triangulated some five hundred square miles of the territory over against Jericho. The archaeologist of the expedition was Professor John A. Paine, who took squeezes and casts of important inscriptions (including those of Hamath), identified Mount Pisgah, and made a collection of East-Jordan plants. The second expedition, in 1876, was under command of Col. James C. Lane, and had Dr. Selah Merrill for its archaeologist. A rapid reconnaissance survey of the whole trans-Jordanic territory was made, about a hundred photographs of ruins and scenery were taken, several places of interest and importance (such as Succoth, Magdala, Magdala, and Tiberias) were identified, and in all about 300 names appeared for the first time on Meyer's map (not published). Dr. Merrill reckons about 240 biblical names east of the Jordan, besides fourteen mentioned in the Maccabees. Nearly 100 of these he thinks have been identified. At this point the work of triangulation was surrendered to the English Society, which entered the field in 1881, surveyed about five hundred square miles, and was then compelled by the unsettled condition of the country to withdraw, it is hoped only for a time. The American Society published four Statements (1871, 1875, 1875, 1877), and holds in reserve Dr. Merrill's Notes upon the Meyer map. Dr. Merrill's East of the Jordan (1881) is a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject. He is now (1883) American consul in Jerusalem.

In 1877 a German society was organized, and is doing good work. It publishes a monthly periodical.

LIT.—The literature of the subject is vast. Tobler, in his Bibliotheca Geographicae Palestinae (1867, with supplements in 1869 and 1875), enumerates more than a thousand writers. To mention only a few of the most important and useful: the Onomasticon of Eusebius (cir. 390), translated into Latin, with additions by Jerome (388), edited by Lassow and Parthey (Berlin, 1862); Descriptiones Terrae Sanctae, by writers of the eighth, ninth, twelfth, and fifteenth centuries, edited by Tobler (Leipzig, 1874); Early Travels in Palestine, edited by Wright (London, 1848); the Historia Theologica, et Moralis Terrae Sanctae Elucidation, of Quaresimus (Antwerp, 1630), valuable for the traditions; MAUNDRELL: Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem at Easter, 1697 (Oxford, 1703); KILANDS Palaestina Illustrata (Utrecht, 1714); HASSELQUIST: Voyages and Travels in the Holy Land in the Years 1749–58, edited by Linnaeus, 1757 (London, 1766); BURCKHARDT: Travels in Syria and the Holy Land (London, 1822); Travels in Egypt and Nubia, Syria and Asia Minor, during the Years 1817, 1818, by Irby and Mangles, printed, but not published (London, 1822); ROBINSON: Biblical Researches (Boston, London, and Berlin, 1841, 3 vols.), Later Researches (1856), and Physical Geography of the Holy Land (published posthumously, 1865); WILLIAMS: Holy City (1845, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1849), defending the traditional sites; WILSON: The Lands of the Bible (Edinb., 1847, 2 vols.); LYNCH: Expedition to the Dead Sea and the Jordan (1849); STANLEY: Sinai and Palestine (1857, 2d ed., posthumous, 1883), highly picturesque and graphic; BARCLAY: The City of the Great King (1858), valuable for the meteorology; THOMSON: The Land and the Book (1858–59, 2 vols., ed. 1850, 1858–59, 2 vols.); TOLBEE: Bethlen (1849), Jerusalem (1854), Nazareth (1868); PORTER: Damascus (1865), Giant Cities of Bashan (1865), Handbook of Syria and Palestine (revised edition, 1875); RITTER: Geography of Palestine, translated by Gage (1866, 4 vols.); TRISTRAM: The Land of Israel (1859), Natural History of the Bible (1867), Land of Moab (1873); MACCUGGOR: Rob Roy on the Jordan (1870); NUTT: Samaritan Targum and History (1874); CONDER: Tent-Work in Palestine (1878, 2 vols. 2d ed. 1885); BARTLETT: From Egypt to Palestine (1879); SCHAFF: Through Bible Lands (1880); MERRILL: East of the Jordan (1881), Galilee in the Time of Christ (1881). The best maps yet published are those of Van de Velde (1866), of Kiepert (1875), and of the English Exploration Fund (1880–83). The best atlases are those of Menke (1868) and of Clark (1868). ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK. PALESTRINA, Giovanni Pierluigi, the founder of the modern style of church-music; b. at Palestr. in the Roman Campagna, 1624; d. in Rome, Feb. 2, 1592. He studied under Claude Goudimel and made by his first compositions—three masses dedicated to Julius III.—so favorable an impression, that he was made musical director of the Julian chapel. He held similar positions at
various chapels and churches in Rome until his death; and by his compositions, which are very numerous,—masses, motets, hymns, etc., but of which only one-half has been published,—he produced a complete revolution in the history of church-music. As his masterpiece, is generally mentioned Missa Papce Marcelli. His life was short; he died May 25, 1845, in Bishop-Wearmouth. As a boy he exhibited the power of close and clear reasoning which afterwards made him distinguished. Entering Christ College, Cambridge, in 1759, he left it after taking his degree, in 1763, to become teacher, and subsequently assistant preacher, in Greenwich. In 1765 he received the prize from Cambridge for the best Latin dissertation, his theme being a comparison of the Stoic and Epicurean philosophies; and in 1769 he was elected fellow of Christ College. He lectured at Cambridge with success till 1775, when he accepted the living of Musgrove, Westmoreland, with which he combined several others. In 1780 he was appointed prebendary of Carlisle, 1782 archdeacon, and in 1783 coadjutor of the diocese. During this period he spent much time in the elaboration of his lectures. In 1794 he published his Evidences of Christianity, which had a cordial reception, and secured for him immediate promotion in the church. He was appointed canon of St. Paul's in 1793, made doctor of theology by Cambridge, and subdean of Lincoln, and soon after offered the rectory of Bishop-Wearmouth, where he spent the remainder of his life.

The most important of Paley's writings are the Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, 1780, 2 vols., for the copyright of which he received a thousand pounds, [and which went through fifteen editions in the author's lifetime]; Hora Paulinae, 1790; A View of the Evidences of Christianity, 1794, 3 vols.; Natural Theology, or Evidences of the Existence and the Attributes of the Deity, collected from the Appearances of Nature, 1802. His smaller works included sermons he composed after his death under the title Sermons and Tracts. The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy (German translation by Garve) was introduced as a text-book into Cambridge in 1788, where it was retained for many years. It represents the standpoint of empiricism, and called forth replies from Glaborn, Pearson, and others. As late as 1850, Dr. Whately edited an edition with notes.

The Evidences of Christianity was Paley's most important work, if we judge by its influence upon English theology. Until very recently it was the principal theological text-book of Cambridge, and in 1845 the examination extended to three hours. The author pursues the historical method. Bolingbroke and other deists had affirmed that the truth of Christianity ought to be proved by historical arguments. Paley and Lardner took the hint. In working out his plan, Paley seeks to establish the two propositions, that "there is clear proof that the apostles and their successors underwent the greatest hardships rather than give up the gospel, and cease to obey its precepts," and "other miracles than those of the gospel are not satisfactorily attested." To these evidences he appends "auxiliary" arguments drawn from the "morality of the gospel," "originality of Christ's character," etc., and a consideration of some popular objections. Paley's Evidences does not touch upon the pantheistic objections to Christianity current at the present day, and is consequently not fully adapted to our present wants. The author is conscious of originality, as the substance of his arguments had been given before in Lardner's Credibility, and the Criterion of Miracles by Bishop Douglas. A German translation appeared at Leipzig, 1797. The Hora Paulinae (German translation by H. P. C. Henke) is an able presentation of the "undesigned coincidences" between the Epistles of Paul and the Acts. The Natural Theology (German translation by Hauff, Stuttgart, 1837) is a clear popular presentation of the teleological argument for God's existence.

Able as Paley was as an apologist for Christianity, we miss in him just that deep conviction of sin, and the recognition of the central significance of the doctrines of the atonement and justification. See MEADLEY: Memoirs of W. Paley, Edinburgh, 1810; [and Lives by CHALMERS (in an edition of the author's works, 1821)]; EDMUND PALEY, 1825.

PALISSY, Bernard, better known as Palissy the Potter, a Huguenot artisan of humble origin, who by force of natural abilities, indomitable perseverance, and rare integrity of character, has won for himself an enviable place in history. He was born about 1510, at Chapelle-Biron, on the confines of the old French provinces of Périgord and Agénais, in the modern department of Lotet-Garonne. Little is known of his youth, except that he enjoyed few opportunities for obtaining an education. When he reached manhood, he set out on his travels through France, seeking to gain a living as a painter on glass, and at the same time to satisfy the cravings of a singularly inquisitive mind. At length, about 1539, he settled at Saintes, in the present department of Charente-Inferieure, where he shortly afterward married. Published after his death under the title Sermons and Tracts. The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy (German translation by Garve) was introduced as a text-book into Cambridge in 1788, where it was retained for many years. It represents the standpoint of empiricism, and called forth replies from Glaborn, Pearson, and others. As late as 1850, Dr. Whately edited an edition with notes.

The Evidences of Christianity was Paley's most important work, if we judge by its influence upon English theology. Until very recently it was the principal theological text-book of Cambridge, and in 1845 the examination extended to three hours. The author pursues the historical method. Bolingbroke and other deists had affirmed that the truth of Christianity ought to be proved by historical arguments. Paley and Lardner took the hint. In working out his plan, Paley seeks to establish the two propositions, that "there is clear proof that the apostles and their successors underwent the greatest hardships rather than give up the gospel, and cease to obey its precepts," and "other miracles than those of the gospel are not satisfactorily attested." To these evidences he appends "auxiliary" arguments drawn from the "morality of the gospel," "originality of Christ's character," etc., and a consideration of some popular objections. Paley's Evidences does not touch upon the pantheistic objections to Christianity current at the present day, and is consequently not fully adapted to our present wants. The author is conscious of originality, as the substance of his arguments had been given before in Lardner's Credibility, and the Criterion of Miracles by Bishop Douglas. A German translation appeared at Leipzig, 1797. The Hora Paulinae (German translation by H. P. C. Henke) is an able presentation of the "undesigned coincidences" between the Epistles of Paul and the Acts. The Natural Theology (German translation by Hauff, Stuttgart, 1837) is a clear popular presentation of the teleological argument for God's existence.
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the intolerant legislation of Francis I. soon put to death. From a convert, Palissy soon became a lay-preacher; and, though he never was ordained as a minister, yet he occupied in the formation of the Protestant church of Saintes. He has himself left us an affecting description of the wonderful change produced in the course of a few years upon the morals of the people of the city and its neighborhood by the work, of which his simple reading and expounding of the Bible was the humble origin. Toward the close of the reign of Henry II. the remarkable abilities of the Huguenot potter of Saintes at last obtained recognition. Constable Anne de Montmorency became his patron, and somewhat relieved his poverty by furnishing him the means of building suitable ovens for baking his novel productions. But even the safeguard given him by the constable did not prevent Palissy from being thrown into prison as a heretic, when in 1562, during the course of the first "religious war," Saintes was the scene of a violent re-actionary movement. At the request of Montmorency, Catharine de Medici issued an order for the potter's release, and from that time forward became his protector. In 1572 he owed his safety, during the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, to the queen-mother's commands. At that time, or shortly before, Palissy with his son was employed by Catharine (through whose influence he had received the formal title of "inventeur des nistiques figulines du roi") in decorating the gardens of the Palace of the Tuileries, then in process of construction. It was impossible, however, for so outspoken a Protestant to live in Paris unharmed during the troublous years of the close of the reign of Henry III. In 1588 Palissy was again in prison because of his faith. It was on this occasion that he is said to have been visited in the Bastille by the weak king, who in vain begged him to recant, at the same time informing him, that, should he refuse, he would be compelled to leave him to his fate. The fearless answer of the humble potter, as given by Agrippa d'Aubigné in his Confession de Sancy, has become famous in history: "Sire, you have several times told me that you pitied me; but it is I that pity you, who have uttered the words, 'I am compelled.' That was not spoken as a king. These girls my companions, and I, who have a portion in the kingdom of heaven, will teach you this royal language, that neither the Guises, nor all your people, nor you, will know how to compel a potter to bow the knee to images." There is no sufficient reason for doubting the substantial correctness of the reply, as it has been transmitted to us, although the form may be somewhat affected by the style of the epigrammatic writer to whom we are indebted for its preservation. It is certain that Palissy remained in the Bastille, together with other prisoners for the faith, until after the death of the king, and himself died there, of want and bad treatment, in 1590, at the age of about eighty years. The transcendent merits of the Huguenot potter as an artist have long been acknowledged; and his productions, many of which occupy places of honor in the museums of the Louvre, of Cluny, and elsewhere, are greatly sought after. It is only within our own times that the skilful artisan has been accorded a high rank as a sound thinker on political economy and as a writer of the French language inferior to few other men in the sixteenth century. Lamartine, no incompetent judge in such matters, has pointed to the impossibility not to proclaim this poor workman in clay one of the greatest writers of the French tongue. Montaigne does not excel him in freedom, Jean Jacques Rousseau in vigor, La Fontaine in grace, Bossuet in lyric energy." It may be mentioned as an historical curiosity, that a Roman-Catholic committee erected a statue to Palissy at Saintes in 1868, and in its proceedings on the occasion made light of the Protestantism of a man with whom religious convictions always held the highest position. The secretary of that committee naturally attempted to prove Palissy's reply to Henry III. to be apocryphal. Monographs on Palissy's life and works abound in the French language. For contemporary references to him, see LESTOILE : Journal de Henri III., and AGRI- PA D'AUBIGNE : Confession catholique de Sancy. The Bulletin of the French Protestant Historical Society contains numerous instructive articles. O. DOUEN contributes a thorough sketch to LICHTENBERGER : Encyclopédie des Sciences religieuses. See also HENRY M. BAIRD : Life of Bernard Palissy, N.Y., 1852, 2 vols. HENRY M. BAIRD.

PALLADIUS, the opponent of Epiphanius and Jerome in the Origenistic controversy; b. in Galatia about 368; went, when he was twenty years old, to Egypt, to make himself acquainted with the great fathers of monasticism. Though the hermits whom he first approached, in the vicinity of Alexandria, were so severe that he did not feel strong enough to join them, he lived for a long time among the hermits of the Nitrian Mountains, the Skitic Desert, and the Thebais. From Egypt he went to Palestine, where he spent three years among the monks of Mount Olivet, and became acquainted with Rufinus. In 404 he was consecrated bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia by John Chrysostom, at that time patriarch of Constantinople. As an ardent adherent of Chrysostom, he became in 403 entangled in the Origenistic controversy. The reports are obscure and confused concerning this point. It is certain, however, that he went to Rome, probably in order to invoke the aid of Honorius in behalf of the exiled Chrysostom. On his return to the East he was seized, and banished to Syene in Upper Egypt. After many sufferings, he was recalled, and made bishop of Asponsa in Galatia, where he died at the time of the Council of Ephesus, 431. Three works, still extant, have been ascribed to him; but only one of them, Historia Lausiaca, is of undoubted authenticity. It is a collection of lives of Egyptian and Palestinian monks, written c. 420, partly from own experience, partly from the work of Rufinus, and dedicated to Lausius, governor of Cappadocia. It is found in Migne, Patrologia, ser. graeca, vol. xxiv.; see also WEINGARTEN : Der Ursprung des Mönchturns, Gotha, 1877, and BARING-GOULD, in
the date of the death of the former made early enough to admit the possibility of his successor having a commission from Celestine, who died to Palladius. See Coigán: Acta sanctorum veteris Louvain, 1645, fol. robbert w. hall.

of Trent. In 1619 appeared the work of Paolo the Jesuit Terenzio Alciati was charged by Urban in April, 432. There is no good authority for the mission, together with the connection with St. Germain and other facts in the life of Palladius have been transferred to St. Patrick, and then the date of the death of the former made early enough to admit the possibility of his successor having a commission from Celestine, who died in April, 432. There is no good authority for holding as genuine any of the writings attributed to Palladius. See Colgan: Acta sanctorum ceteris et Majoris Scotia; seu Hibernia sanctorum insula, Louvain, 1645, fol. ROBERT W. HALL.

PALLAVICINO or PALLAGICI, Sforza, b. in Rome in 1607; d. there in 1877. He entered the order of the Jesuits in 1637, and was appointed professor of philosophy at the Jesuit college in Rome in 1639, and professor of theology in 1643. His principal work is his history of the Council of Trent. In 1819 appeared the work of Paolo Sarpi, and it was considered urgently necessary to encounter its violent attacks. Consequently the Jesuit Terenzio Alciati was charged by Urban VIII. with collecting the necessary materials; and when he died, in 1651, the execution of the work was confided to Pallavicino. The book, written in Italian, appeared in two volumes folio, in Rome, 1656, 1657, and was received with great satisfaction by Roman-Catholic critics, though it is very far from having overthrown the censures of Sarpi. The best edition of it is that in six volumes quartó, Faenza, 1792-99. The Latin translation of it was made by the Jesuit Giattinus, Antwerp, 1637, 3 vols. In 1659 the author was made a cardinal by Alexander VII.

PALLIUM (Latin pallium, "a cover," "a mantle"), a white woolen scarf of the breadth of a mile, and adorned with six black crosses, is an ecclesiastical ornament borne by the highest officers of the Roman-Catholic Church on the most solemn occasions. Its origin is variously explained; some referring it to the head-band of the Jewish high priest, others to the mantle of the Roman emperor. Most probably, however, it is connected with the super-numeric, shoulder-band of the high priest, which, by being adopted by the Christian Church, came to symbolize the Lord seeking after the lost lamb, and carrying it, when found, on his shoulder. From the East it was early transferred to the West, where it became a custom for the bishop of Rome to present it to the metropolitan or archbishop to obtain the pallium from Rome. See Würdtwein: Bonifaci Epioticae, Mayence, 1789, Ep. 78. Though the candidate might have been confirmed and consecrated, the title of Archi-priest and the full pontifical authority, the plenitude pontificalis officii, still depended upon the actual possession of the pallium; before receiving that, the archbishop could, for instance, not call a synod. On its reception, the archbishop took an oath of obedience to the pope. Originally the pallium was given gratis, but later on a very high price was paid for it. With respect to the fabrication of palliums, it was enacted that the wool should be taken only from certain sheep. On Jan. 21, the Day of St. Agnes, a number of white lambs are driven by the Vatican, where the pope speaks a benediction over them, into the Church of St. Agnes. The nuns of St. Agnes then take care of the lambs, cut and spin the wool, and make up the palliums. These are laid on the altar of the Church of the Vatican, that is, on the tomb of the apostle Peter; and on June 28, the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, the palliums are blessed by the pope. In the East every bishop has his pallium; in the West, only the pope, the metropolitans, the archbishops, and such bishops as are "except." When, in 1753, the pallium was presented to the bishop of Würzburg, though he stood under the authority of the metropolitan of Mayence, the measure aroused considerable criticism. See Casp. Barthel: De pallio, Bamberg, 1753 (pro); and J. G. Fertsch: De origine, usu et autoritate pallii archiepiscopalis, Heilbronn, 1754 (contra). H. F. Jacobson.

PALMER meant originally a pilgrim who returned home from the Holy Land, having fulfilled his vow, and bringing back with him the palm branch to be deposited on the altar of his parish church; but came afterwards to denote the perpetual pilgrim, who, without any fixed abode or any settled purpose, roved about from shrine to shrine. PALMER, Christian David Friedrich, eminent as a pulpit orator of the evangelical church in Württemberg; b. at Württemberg, near Stuttgart, Württemberg, Jan. 27, 1811; d. at Tubingen, May 29, 1875. He studied theology at Tubingen, 1828-33, and was appointed preacher at Marbach in 1839, and at Tubingen in 1843, and professor of practical theology in the university in 1851. He published Evangelische Homilie, Stuttgart, 1842, 5th ed., 1860; Der Kaiser und das Reich des Christi, 1844, 6th ed., 1875; Evangelische Kasuistik, 1846, 4th ed., 1865; Evangelische Predigten, 1852, 5th ed., 1882; Evangelische Predigten, 1857; Evangelische Predigten, 1857; Evans-
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He wrote eighty-one articles, mostly on homiletical topics, in the first edition of Herzog.

Palm er, Edward Henry, English orientalist; b. in Cambridge, Aug. 7, 1840; murdered by the Bedawin in the Wady Sudr, Desert of Et Tlh and Moab, Friday evening, Aug. 11, 1882. He was graduated at St. John's College, Cambridge, 1867; went with the British Ordnance Survey Expedition in 1868, 1869, and in 1869, 1870, in company with Mr. C. F. Tyrwhitt Drake, explored the Desert of Et Tlh and Moab, having acquired perfect familiarity with the language and manners of the Bedawin. On his return he was appointed Lord-Almoner's professor of Arabic at Cambridge, November, 1871. About the end of June, 1882, on the outbreak of the war between Egypt and England, he volunteered to attempt "to dissuade the Bedawin from attacking the Suez Canal, to collect camels for transport, and to raise the wild men of the Tlh against the rebels." For this end he landed at Jaffa, and came by the short desert route to Suez. He left Suez with two European companions, Capt. Gill and Lieut. Charrington, R.N., Aug. 8; but at midnight of Aug. 10, the little party was captured in the Wady Sudr by a large body of Tera-bin and Huwytat Bedawin, acting under the direction of the Turkish governor at Nakhl, who probably had received his orders; and the next night the three Europeans were shot. Palmer was a remarkable linguist, and performed very valuable services to literature. His works, bearing directly upon biblical and religious studies, were The Negeb, or South Country of Scripture and the Desert of Et Tlh, London, 1871; The Desert of the Exodus. Journeys on Foot in the Wilderness of the Sacred Land, 1871, 2 vols.; The Nomenclature of Sinai, the Bedawin of Sinai, and the Desert of Et Tlh, London, 1871, 2 vols.; Stone Age of Sinaic Peninsula, Friday evening, Aug. 11, 1882.

Palmer was chairman of the committee on the directory of worship, and the subject of catechising was especially committed to him. He then became chairman of the committee on the Catechism, and acted as such until his death, when Anthony Tuckney was appointed in his place. Palmer was also earnest for sabbath observance. He united with Daniel Caudrey in composing one of the best works on the sabbath in existence, e.g., Vindiciae Sabbathi, London, 1645-52, 2 vols. 4to. He was a moderate Presbyterian, and hesitated about the divine right of ruling elders, and favored a presiding bishop. He was appointed by Parliament one of the Committee of Accommodation in 1645. His deep piety is manifest in his Memorials of Godliness and Christianity, in three parts, 1644, 11th ed., 1673, 10th, 1708, including the Christian Paradoxes, wrongly ascribed to Lord Bacon. This work is equal if not superior to Jeremy Taylor's Holy Living. He frequently preached before Parliament. His sermons exhibit eloquence and power. He was an excellent linguist, especially in French and Latin, and was intrusted with drawing up the correspondence of the Westminster Assembly with the various churches of the Continent. He was a man of wealth, and used his means especially in the aid of candidates for the ministry. He was one of the noblest spirits among the Westminster divines. See Clar ke: Lives, London, 1677; Kidd: Memoirs, Paisley, 1811; and Grosbart: Lord Bacon not the Author of Christian Paradoxes.

C. A. B. RY G B.

Palm Sunday, the last Sunday in Lent, is celebrated in many Christian churches, both in the East and the West, in commemoration of the entrance of our Lord into Jerusalem, when the multitude saluted him by waving with palm branches, and strewing them before him (Matt. xxvi. 1-11; Mark xi. 1-11; John xii. 12-15). In the East the celebration dates back to the fifth century; in the West it is somewhat later.

Palm-tree. When the Bible speaks of palm-trees, it always means the date-palm, as the only other kind of palm-trees occurring in Palestine, the dwarf fan-palm, does not fulfil the various requirements of the passages. The date-palm — Hebrew, שְׁפִּיקָה, which in Aramaic and Arabic denotes the fruit — is found in various places in Palestine, both along the coast of the Mediterranean and in the interior of the country, sometimes in forests: Phoenicia is said to have received its name from it, פֶּלְיוֹנִיָה. At present it cannot ripen its fruit in Palestine, except in the sub-tropical climate of Jericho and the Dead Sea: it requires an annual average temperature of 18° 48' R.; and that of Jerusalem, for instance, is only 14° 16'. In antiquity it was not found wild, but was grown in the above-mentioned places. As the male and female flowers occur on different trees, it is necessary, in order to secure a plentiful harvest, to
facilitate the fructification by cutting off the male flowers, and suspending them above the female. Five months later on, the reddish, sweet fruit is ripe. It is eaten fresh or dried. A kind of wine and a honey-like sirup are made from it. The tree is very graceful, with its slender, branchless trunk, between one and two feet in diameter and from forty to fifty, rarely eighty, feet high, and its evergreen crown of from forty to eighty feathery leaves, which are shed each spring and soon replace the old ones, so that there is never any chance of its being entangled in the Origenistic controversy. In Philipi, an apology of Origen in five books, to which Jerome, derived so great advantages. It contained the Hexapla and Tetrapsal Origen, the Hebrew Gospel which was connected with the name of Matthew, and translated by Jerome, and many other works written by the hand of Pamphilus. As a great admirer of Origen, he became entangled in the Origenistic controversy. In 307, during the Maximianin persecution, he was thrown into prison by Urbanus, prefect of Palestine. In 306 he suffered martyrdom. During his imprisonment he wrote in connection with Eusebius, who (on account of the intimate relation in which he stood to him) bears the surname Pamphilus, an apology of Origen in five books, to which Eusebius afterwards added a sixth; but only the first book is still extant, and that only in a not so very reliable translation by Rufinus, found in the editions of Origen's works by de La Rue, Lommatzsch, etc. For the life of Pamphilus see EUSEBIUS: Hist. Eccle., vi., 32, 33; VII., 32; de Mart. Pal., 11; Socrates, Ill., 7; Jerome: Cat. 75; Photius: Cod., 118. W. MÖLLER.

PAMPHYL'IA, a province of Asia Minor, bounded south by the Mediterranean, east by Cilicia, north by Pisidia, and west by Lycia. Its chief cities were Perga and Attalia. Paul first entered Asia Minor through the city of Perga, coming from Cyprus (Acts iii. 18); and he again visited the same city on his return to the interior of the country (Acts xiv. 24), though he left Pamphylia through Attalia.

PANAQIA (παναχα, "all-holy"), a surname of the Holy Virgin, occurring in the later confessions, but also used among the later Greeks as a name for the consecrated bread and a cup of wine before the image of the Virgin. Prayers were then offered, incense was burned, and finally the bread and wine were distributed among those present. This rite, which was performed at the beginning of a journey, or some other important undertaking, was called παναχα εὐφημίως. See GOARUS: Eucholog., p. 867; CIDINUS: De officiiis, 7, 32.

PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD. This has become the popular title of certain conferences held at Lambeth (A.D. 1867 and 1878), to which all bishops in communion with the Primatial See of Canterbury were invited. In 1851 Archbishop Sumner invited the American bishops who derived their episcopate from his predecessors to unite in the celebration of the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and to the very cordial and fervent words in which he referred to "the close communion which binds our churches in America and England in one" must be attributed the awakening of a general desire for the open manifestation of this unity. Cordial responses were given to this invitation, and in 1867, on Washington's birthday, as it happened (Feb. 22), Archbishop Longley issued a call to the American and Colonial bishops "in visible communion with the United Church of England and Ireland," to assemble at Lambeth on the 24th of September in the same year, under his presidency. The sessions were limited to that and the three following days; and the subjects to be discussed were pre-arranged by the primate in correspondence with the home and foreign prelates. At the appointed time seventy-six bishops assembled accordingly, in the ancient chapel at Lambeth, when the Holy Communion was celebrated, and a sermon preached; none being present save the bishops only. The conferences were held in the great hall of the library, and the following were the subjects discussed, upon most of which conclusions were reached with very marked unanimity: (1) The best way of promoting the re-union of Christendom; (2) The establishment of new sees, how to be made known to the churches; (3) Letters commendatory, i.e., for intercommunion; (4) Colonial churches and their metropolitans; (5) Metropolitical discipline; (6) Courts for the same; (7) Appeals; (8) Colonial and home churches, conditions of union; (9) New missionary bishoprics, how to be made known to the churches; (10) Missionary jurisdiction. But the most interesting and most important result of this conference was the ratification of the sentence of deposition passed upon the bishop of Natal (Dr. Colenso) by the bishop (Gray) of Capetown and his comprovincial bishops, although this was not a formal act of the conference as such, which was not assembled for purposes of discipline. An encyclical letter was issued to the churches, and the same, in the Latin and Greek languages, was sent to divers parts of Christendom.

The second conference was held at Lambeth, in 1878, under the presidency of Archbishop Tait. It was attended by English, Scottish, Irish, and American bishops, "gathered from the Ganges to the Lake Huron." In the New Zealand and Australian quarters, from both shores of the Pacific, and from the Arctic and Antarctic circles." One of these was of African lineage. This conference, after pre-
PANGEGRICON. 1723 PANTHEISM AND PANTHEIST.

PANGEGRICON was in the Greek Church the name of a kind of homiliary, or collection of panegyrics on the saints, arranged after the respective saints' days. Manuscript collections of this kind are still current in the Greek Church, but they have no official character any more. See Leo Allatius: De libris Graeco-ram ecclesiasticis; diss. 1.

PANIS LITERE ("bread briefs") were letters of recommendation by which a secular lord ordered a monastery or hospital, or other institution of charity, to receive a certain person for support. The right of issuing such letters was connected with the duty, originally imposed upon such institutions, of rendering hospitality to princes and other great lords when they were travelling. During the middle ages the Emperor of Germany exercised a very extensive right of this kind; but the custom existed also in other countries.

PANORMITANUS, the common surname of the catechetical school of Alexandria that peculiar scientific stamp which it has retained ever since. See literature under Alexandria. w. molleu.

From Martin V. he received in 1425 the abbey of Maniacum, in the diocese of Messina, and was shortly after called to Rome, and made auditor of the Rota Romana and referendarius Apostolicus. In 1427, however, he entered the service of King Alphonso of Sicily, and was as his representative to the Council of Basel, where he took the side of Eugenius IV. When the latter removed the Council of Ferrara, Panormitanus remained in Basel (see his treatises of defence, in Mansi: Coll. Conv., XXXI., and Wurtzwein: Subsidia diplomatica, vii., 1429.) Anthonius Ciudad.
ty, nor are they found in the middle ages. Down
to the eighteenth century, all pantheistic doc-
trines were designated with the odious name of
"atheism." Even Boyle objects to Spinoza, not
that he was an atheist, but that he was the first
to bring atheism into system. Neither Leibnitz.
Wolff, nor the philosophers of the seven-
teenth century, know the word, though several
of them are adroit enough in combat-
ing the idea. The first to use it, and probably
its inventor, is the English free-thinker Toland,
in his Socinianisme Truly Stated . . . recom-
mented by a Pantheist to an Orthodox Friend,
1703. Four years later, the word "pantheism"
occur in J. Fay's Dejensioreliionis, 1709; and
after that time both names become frequent.

On the first page of his Pantheisticum sive for-
mula Societatis Socratici, etc., 1720, Toland thus
defines pantheism: Ex Toto quidem sunt omnia
et Toto mundus enim natura et nomen unum idemque
all the parts, and from all the parts comes the
whole "), which on p. 8 he further explains by
adding, "Vis et energia Totius, creatrix omnium et
moderatoria ac ad optimum finem semper tendens, est
Deus, quem Mentem dicas si placet et Animam Uni-
eri, unde Sociitates Socratiei appellatur Panthei-
tsunt ("To the pantheists nature and God are one
and the same thing"); and this vague formula
became the current definition, though Buhle, and,
in harmony with him, also Kant, gave him more
explicit descriptions, until with Schelling endeavored
Schelling endeavored
to dispense with the name "pantheism" in the strict,
and the same thing that is, divine, and God the mere
polytheism has never been propounded, — it is
Many suppose not only their identity and difference,
but also a third something; and he protests that
pantheism will always be the result whenever
the idea of the identity of God and the world succeeds
in throwing the idea of their difference into the
shade. A new constituent was introduced in
the definition of pantheism by A. Tholuck, in his
Sozismus sive theosophia Persarum, 1821: Emana-
tismus, he says, doctrina illa antiqua vocanda est
respectu ad placitum de origine mundi ex Deo, Pan-
theismus igitur, quod malum totum hominemque
prope modum in arqua ponit Deo: that is, the
doctrine of emanation and the doctrine of pantheism
are identical, with this only difference, that they,
that the former refers to the problem of the
origin of the world, and the latter to the problem
of the origin of evil; and, indeed, no pantheistic
conception of the world can admit the existence
of evil in the full sense of the word, nor explain
creation, without employing some form of emanation.
Whenever Hegel speaks of pantheism, he
always returns to the distinction between the
sense of "all," and the sense of "every thing":
protesting that the doctrine of the absolute
identity of the substance in the "all" is pure
monothelism, while the doctrine of the world in
"acosmism" by Spinoza's denial, not of the ex-
istence of God, but of the existence of the world.
while the doctrine that "every thing" which
exists has a substance, and that the substantiality
of all those "every thing" existences is God, is
an "idolatry" which no philosopher has ever
taught. H. Ritter, finally, in his Die Halb-
Kantianer und der Pantheismus (1827), written
against G. B. Jäsche's Der Pantheismus nach seinen
csichtigen Hauptformen (1826, 3 vols.), explains
pantheism as a dissolution of the difference be-
tween God and the world, either by the immer-
sion of God into the world, or by the immersion
of the world into God, "so that either God alone
is, or the world alone." See E. Böhmer: De Pan-
theismi nominis origine et usu et notione, Halle, 1851.

Amidst these differences of definition, what is
the true meaning of the term "pantheism"?
The Greek πανθεισμός means both "all" and "every
thing." In the latter sense, comprising all that
exists without any exception, it is left undecided
whether the "everything" is in any way held
together by some sort of a unity, or whether it is
split up in a mere multitude of separate things
indifferent to each other. According, however,
to the general acceptance of the word, "everything"
means simply the sum total of all the
things that are; but as Hegel is perfectly right,
when protesting that a doctrine making every
ing single thing that is, divine, and God the mere
sum total of existing things,—that is, an absolute
polytheism has never been propounded,—it is
necessary to refer the term "pantheism" to the
other sense of πανθεισμός, that of "all." Now, "all"
denotes, indeed, a unity of "every thing," a whole,
a totality; but here, again, it is left undecided
whether the totality indicated is an absolute
identity, excluding all but every thing, or an organ-
ization into unity of manifold differences.
In the former case, the apparent manifoldness
and difference which characterize existence must
be explained away as mere appearance, or illu-
sion—as the Eleatic school did, at least Parmenides
and Zeno, and as Spinoza did again when
he declared the "attributes" and "modes" of the
one absolute substance, God, to be mere subjec-
tive ideas of the human mind, dependent on the
peculiar organization of the organ of conception.
This form of pantheism may be called the ab-
stract, or absolute, excluding every and any dig-
ference between God and the world. Another
form of pantheism, the concrete and relative,
appears when the totality is conceived as a unity
of the manifold, a harmony of differences; and,
as a rapid glance over the natural growths of
religion shows, it presents a great variety of in-
dividual characteristics, according as the relation
between unity and multiplicity, between har-
mony and differences, is explained.

Tholuck remarks, that pantheism is as old as
the human race; and, so far as the religious de-
velopment of the view is concerned, he is right.
From Shamanism and Feticism, up to the most
elaborate mythologies, all natural forms of religion started, not from the delusion of some single natural or spiritual phenomenon, but from a vague and obscure idea of something abstractly divine, from an awe-inspiring feeling of a highest Being standing behind the phenomena as their true cause. Only by degrees, as knowledge of nature increased, this mysterious fundamental deity was gradually identified with some special natural power, which, beginning as its representative, ended with superseding it. But, even in the most developed polytheism, the pantheistic foundation never fully disappeared. See A. Wattske: Geschichte des Heidentums, Breslau, 1852; E. Burnouf: La science des religions, Paris, 1872; Max Müller: Introduction to the Science of Religion, London, 1873; Ulrici: Gott und die Natur, Leipzig, 3d ed., 1875; Réville: Problèmes de l'histoire des religions, Paris, 1881; [but see also Herbert Spencer: Sociology, i., London, 1879].

In the history of religion, the contrast, but a conflict ever going on; and as the chance without reason: the idea is the same. The star-worship of the Babylonians, Phoenicians, Arabs, etc., the so-called Sabeanism, the pantheistic idea of one God, seems at first glance lost in the multitude of gods and men, and animals and plants, issue forth from the bosom of Brahma, not to stay, and persevere in that diversity, but soon to sink back again into the Source whence they came, the one Absolute Being in which there is no form, no difference, no change. In the Persian religion a strongly marked dualism was developed; and the "all" was actually split into two halves under the rule, respectively, of Ormuzd and Ahriman. Nevertheless, the difference between the two gods was not merely a fixed contrast, but a conflict ever going on; and as the result of the conflict should be the overthrow of Ahriman by Ormuzd, and the swallowing-up of the realm of darkness by the realm of light, the pantheistic monism was still preserved. In the star-worship of the Babylonians, Phoenicians, the Neo-Platonists it penetrated in antiquity into Christianity through the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius and in the form of mysticism. Thence it was brought by the Gnostics to the mystics of the middle ages; but, the sharper and more logically it was developed, the more decided it again separated itself from Christianity. LIT. — Essay sur le Panthéisme, Paris, 3d ed., 1857; J. Hunt: An Essay on Pantheism, London, 1860; J. B. Fellenex: Le Panthéisme, Paris, 1873; R. Flint: Anti-Theistic Theories, Edinburgh, 1879; W. Driesenbergh: Theismus und Pantheismus, Vienna, 1880; C. E. Plumptre: General Sketch of the History of Pantheism, London, 1881, 2 vols. — H. Ulrici.

PANTHEON (πανθέων), a place consecrated to all the gods. The Pantheon of Rome, built on a circular foundation, surmounted by one of the largest domes in the world, was erected in 27 B.C., by Marcus Agrippa, the son-in-law of Augustus, and originally consecrated to Jupiter Vindictus, but afterwards destined to contain statues of all the gods. Despoiled of all its treasures by the barbarian invaders, it was falling into decay, when it was saved from ruin by Boniface IV., who in 608 restored it, and transformed it into a Christian church dedicated to the Virgin and the saints, and hence called Sancta Maria ad Martyres, or Sancta Maria Rotunda.

PAPACY AND PAPAL SYSTEM. According to the doctrine of the Roman-Catholic Church, Christ has, in founding the Christian Church as a visible institution, given to the apostle Peter the precedence of the other apostles, made him his representative and the centre of the Church, and conferred on him the highest sacerdotal, doctrinal, and administrative authority (Matt. xvi. 18, 19; Luke xxii. 32; John xxi. 15–17). Now, as the Church was founded for all time, Peter must have a successor; and, as the see of Rome was a foundation of Peter, the succession of the primacy, with all the rights therein involved, was forever united to that see. It descends from bishop to bishop; and in the bishops of Rome, the popes, Peter is still living. See the union decree of the Council of Florence, 1439, in Mansi: Coll. Con., 31, 1031; the Roman Catechism, P. i. c. 10, qu. 11, and P. ii. c. 7 qu. 24; and the Consilium Dogmatica, i., of the Sixth Oecumenical Council of Lyons, 1274. According to history, however, the primacy of the Pope is the result of a long development, going on for centuries, and so is the very doctrine of the Roman-Catholic Church itself. Of course,
the Romanists cannot deny, that, during the first period after the foundation of the Christian Church, the bishops of Rome exercised no primacy; but they protest, that, though not exercising it, they still possessed it.

It is true, that, as early as the second and third centuries, the congregation and the Bishop of Rome enjoyed great respect throughout the whole Occident. Not only was the Roman Church considered a foundation of Peter, but it was the only Occidental church which could boast of apostolic foundation. But though it may have tried in the third century to support its claim on precedence by an appeal to the succession from Peter, the prince of the apostles, the Council of Nicaea (325) knows nothing of a primacy of Rome over the rest of the Church. The much discussed Canon 6 places the Bishop of Rome, on account of his greater power,— that is, his right to ordain all the bishops of Italy,— beside the Bishop of Alexandria, who had the right to ordain all the bishops of Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis; but it does not contain the slightest hint of a primacy. It was other circumstances which proved decisive for the bishops of Rome in their endeavors to acquire a legally fixed and generally recognized primatial power: first, their riches; next, their residence in the political centre of the world, with the prestige it gave them and the immense facilities of communication it afforded; and, finally, the truly diplomatic position they assumed in the dogmatical controversies beginning with the fourth century,— cautious, persevering, always on the orthodox side. In 445 a council of Sardica allowed any bishop who had been deposed by a metropolitan synod to appeal to the Bishop of Rome, who might give a prima facie verdict, or institute a new examination of the case by his legate and a number of bishops, just as he found it necessary; and thus the see of Rome became established as a kind of supreme court. In 483 a council of Sardica allowed the Bishop of Rome to be the primate of the Christian Church, and that, not only in judicial, but also in legislative respects, authorizing not only the appeals which came to him, but also the orders which issued from him. The Council of Sardica, however, was never accepted as canonical; and the decree of Valentinian was valid only in the West, and enhanced the power of the pope, without emancipating him from the still higher power of the emperor. The claims, therefore, based on such a council and such a decree, might easily prove to be mere pretension. Nevertheless, in the latter part of the fifth century, Rome was able to make its influence felt in many important questions, even in the Orient. And though the process of centralization already begun was arrested by the invasion of the Germanic tribes; and though the new kingdoms which were organized in Britain, Gaul, and Spain, seemed to the administration of ecclesiastical affairs for the Pope,— Rome was as patient under adverse circumstances as it was bold when its opportunity came.

Though in Merovingian France the Pope was respected as the first bishop of Christendom, and though he was considered the head of the community of faith with him, he was, nevertheless, by law excluded from any direct interference in the affairs of the Frankish Church: he could even not send the pallium, a mere token of honor, to an archbishop without the consent of the king. The King retained the power of deciding in all ecclesiastical matters: he convened the national synod, and its decrees became legally binding only by his confirmation. In the course, however, of the eighth century, under the rule of the Carolingian Majores Domus, a change took place. They entered into communication with Boniface, and adopted his plans for the reform and reorganization of the Frankish Church. But Boniface acted as the legate of the Pope in accordance with instructions received from Rome: and thus it came to pass that the primacy of Rome was actually established in Gaul, though the Pope was not formally recognized as the highest authority. This state of affairs continued under Charlemagne, who exercised the highest power in the Church as in the State; and bestowed privileges and immunities on the Pope simply as the first bishop of his realm; but his whole ecclesiastical policy was at complete conformity between the Frankish Church and the Church of Rome. After the death of Charlemagne, during the political contests between Louis the Pious and his sons, and the ecclesiastical controversies between the Frankish bishops and their metropolitans, the royal and imperial power proved too weak to maintain its leadership of the Church; and gradually the moral influence which the Pope had hitherto exercised grew into a direct and decisive interference, not only in ecclesiastical, but also in political affairs. It was especially Nicholas I. (858–867), who, adroitly availing himself of every opportunity, proved successful in the realization of the grand papal scheme,— the subjection of every secular power to the Church, and of the Church to the Pope; and he received, in that respect, a mighty help from the Pseudo-Isidorean decreals, which became known just at that time.

But the policy of Nicholas I. was not allowed to develop without interruption. The dissolution of the Frankish Empire brought confusion also into Italy. Rome was under the thumb of an aristocratic faction, which again was swayed by a couple of scandalous women. Without the aid of the young German Empire the degraded Papacy would perhaps never have been able to raise itself from the mire. Now, it is very true, that, from the middle of the tenth century (Otho I., Roman Emperor, 962) to the middle of the eleventh century, the German emperor was the real ruler of the Church; but he ruled on another moral and legal basis than the Frankish emperor had done. He never arrogated to himself the highest judicial or legislative power in ecclesiastical affairs. If he considered himself the head of the universal State, he considered the Pope the head of the universal Church; and many of the most important branch of the administration of the Church he left entirely to the Pope, such as the foundation of new bishoprics, the enforcement of older ecclesiastical laws, the introduction of reforms, etc. Then, in the middle of the eleventh century, there arose in Rome, under the leadership of Hildebrand (Gregory VII., 1073–85), a party whose settled purpose it was to free the Papacy from any influence from any secular
power, and establish the Pope as the umpire of all the world, politically as well as ecclesiastically. Gregory VII. protested that he was subject to no judge on earth, that he had power to depose the emperor, that he had a right to wear the imperial insignia, that he alone could convene a general council, and depose a bishop, transfer him to another see, etc.

On the question of the right of investiture, it came to a deadly contest between the Papacy and the German Empire; but the result was the complete emancipation of the Pope from the imperial power. He stood from that moment as the highest, the absolute, authority in all ecclesiastical affairs; and, in his further conflicts with the German emperor, it was political rather than ecclesiastical questions which occupied the foreground.

He wanted to make himself the corner-stone of the political system of Europe; and under Innocent III. (1198-1216) the goal was reached. The Pope claimed to be the representative of Christ, of God on earth, and was considered as such. All power was consequently his, not only in spiritual matters, but also in matters of the world. His power in the latter sphere he left in charge of the princes, though under his control; but in the former sphere he exercised his power personally, and without responsibility to any judge on earth, not even to the ecumenical council. His power of legislation was not limited by the older canons or the ecumenical councils: it was only circumscribed by the dogma. His power of absolution and dispensation was absolute. He could appoint, depose, and transfer bishops ad libitum; and he could tax the clergy in general, or any individual church. Certain benefices were reserved exclusively for him, and appeals could be made to him from everywhere. Finally, he sent out his legates, to be implicitly obeyed according to his instructions: for not only was all power imagindable his, but all power existing was derived from him. This idea of the Papacy, the so-called Papal System, found its classical expression in the bull of Boniface VIII., Unam sanctam ecclesiam, 1302.

The rigid monarchical form, however, which the government of the Church had assumed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, could not fail to call forth a re-action; and in the fourteenth century the opposite tendency, leading to a more aristocratic form of government, the so-called episcopal system, began to develop. The episcopal system is based upon the view that Christ has conferred the power to bind and to loose on all the apostles equally, and given to Peter a kind of precedence only, in order to establish a visible token of unity. It is not opposed to the primacy of the Pope, or unwilling to grant him those rights and privileges without which no primacy could exist; but, considering the episcopate itself as a divine institution, the Bishop of Rome can never be any thing more than primus inter pares. In the ancient church these views were generally adopted, as may be seen, for instance, in the works of Catholics (Boniface VIII., 1302); and they were now again set forth with great force in the fourteenth and fifteen centuries by Pierre d'Ailly, J. Gerson, Nicholas of Clemanges, and others, while at the same time public opinion was well prepared to accept them by the startling encroachments of the curia upon all old established rights, by the scandalous behavior of many of the popes, and more especially by the great schism. They were espoused by the councils of Pisa, Basel, and Constance; and in the course of the sixteenth century they assumed definite shape in the French Church, with the articles of Perpignan, with Les libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane (1584), and the article "Gallicanism." Towards the close of the eighteenth century they found in Germany a brilliant spokesman in Nikolaus of Hontheim, and an ardent champion in Joseph II.; and, though steadily denounced by the Pope, they were steadily gaining ground in the Church up to the middle of the nineteenth century. But the reaction which set in everywhere in Europe after 1848 once more gathered the bishops around the Pope; and in 1870 it was possible for Pius IX. to have the episcopal system condemned, and the papal system formally recognized by an ecumenical council.

See, for list of popes, art. PAPAL ELECTION.
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PA'PHOS. 1738

PA'PHOS, a city of Cyprus; was visited by Paul, who converted the proconsul of the island, Sergius Paulus, and smote Elymas, the Jewish sorcerer, with blindness (Acts xiii. 7-13). See Lives of Paul by Conybeare and Howson, Lewin and Farrar. See also, for description of Cyprus, De CESSOLA: Cyprus, New York, 1870.

PAPIAS, Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia. He was born probably between 70 and 75 A.D., and died, perhaps, A.D. 163.¹ No fact save his episcopacy is definitely known about him, yet he is of great interest from his relation to the apostolic age. He was, according to Irenaeus (Adv. Hær., v. 33, 4), "a hearer of John the apostle, "a companion of Polycarp," an "ancient man," i.e., a man of the primitive days of Christianity. By "John," Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., iii. 39) understands the presbyter, not the apostle, of that name, and declares that Papias had no personal acquaintance with any apostles. Papias, who was certainly acquainted with the New Testament, wrote in Greek, about A.D. 130, An Interpretation of the Sayings of the Lord, in five books. His work appears to have been a collection of the words and works of the Master and his disciples, with explanatory matter derived from oral testimony. It has entirely perished, with the exception of a few small fragments preserved by Irenaeus and Eusebius. The "fragments" in later writers are somewhat dubious. The first passage Eusebius quotes (I.e.) is from the preface of Papias' work, as follows:

["But I shall not regret to subjoin to my interpretations, also, for your benefit, whatsoever I have at any time accurately ascertained and treasured up in my memory as I have received it from the elders, and have recorded it in order to give additional comfort to my testimony. For I have never, like many, delighted to hear those that tell many things, but those that teach the truth; neither those that record foreign precepts, but those that are given from the Lord to our faith, and that came from the truth itself. But, if I met with any one who had been a follower of the elders anywhere, I made it a point to inquire what were the declarations of the elders; what was said by Andrew, Peter, or Philip; what by Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other disciple of our Lord; what was said by Arian and the presbyter John, disciples of the Lord. For I do not think that I derived so much benefit from books as from the living voices of those that are still surviving."]

Besides quoting this passage, Eusebius speaks of Papias' stories of the daughters of Philip, who raised one from the dead, and of Justus, sur

named Barsabas, who drank poison with impunity (probably told by Papias in illustration of Mark xvi. 15), of Papias' strange accounts of the Lord's parables and doctrinal sayings, which were "rather too fabulous," and of his recital concerning a woman accused of many sins, apparently an allusion to the story of the woman taken in adultery, now found inserted in the textus receptus of John's Gospel (viii. 1 sqq.).

But of more account is the other verbal quotation from Papias which Eusebius gives (I.e.):

["And John the presbyter also said this, Mark being the interpreter of Peter, whatsoever he recorded he wrote with great accuracy, but not, however, in the order in which it was spoken or done by our Lord, for he neither heard nor followed our Lord, but, as before said, was in company with Peter and John, and gave him such instruction as was necessary, but not to give a history of our Lord's discourses. Wherefore Mark has not erred in any thing, by writing some things as he has recorded them, for he was not attentive to one thing, not to pass by any thing that he heard, or to state any thing falsely in these accounts... Matthew composed his history in the Hebrew dialect, and every one translated it as he was able."

Eusebius mentions Papias' use of 1 John, 1 Peter, and the Epistle to the Hebrews; the first two, probably, with the intention of showing that only these Epistles were rightly attributable to John and Peter. But out of the omission to speak in any way of the third and fourth Gospels and the rest of the New Testament, nothing can be made; for the failure to speak lies to the charge of Eusebius, not of Papias; and the silence arose merely from a present desire to quote a few characteristic things from Papias. The attempt to prove from this silence that Papias was ignorant of the other books is vain.

Besides the quotations already given, there are several fragments of Papias of interest. [See Routh, Reliquiae sacrae, vol. I., Eng. trans., in The Apostolical Fathers, Anti-Nicene, pp. 441-448.] Thus in the Scholia of Maximus Confessor on Dionysius the Areopagite's De coelesti hierarchia (c. 2, p. 32), it is stated, on the authority of Papias in the first book of his Interpretation, "The early Christian called those children who practised guilelessness toward God." Georgius Harnartolos (ninth century) cites in his Chronicle the second book of Papias as authority for the incredible statement that John, the brother of James, was killed by the Jews at Ephesus. Irenaeus (Adv. Hær., v. 33, 8) quotes the fourth book of Papias as authority for our Lord's saying:

["The days will come in which vines shall grow, having each ten thousand twigs, and in each true twig ten thousand shoots, and in every one of the shoots ten thousand clusters, and in every one of the clusters ten thousands of grains; and every grain when pressed will give twenty-five metretes (i.e., two hundred and twenty-five English gallons). And when any one of the saints shall lay the things thus written before another shall cry out, 'I am a better cluster: take me. Bless the Lord through me.' In like manner he said that a grain of wheat would produce ten thousand ears, and that every ear would have ten thousand grains, and every grain would yield ten pounds of clear, pure, fine flour; and that apples and seeds and grass would produce in similar proportions; and that all animals, feeding them only on the productions of the earth, would become peaceable and harmonious, and be in perfect subjection to man."

Eusebius apparently refers to this passage (Hist. Eccl., iii. 39) in proof that Papias interpreted the future millennium as a corporeal reign of Christ on this very earth, and further says that Papias misunderstood the apostolic mystical narrations. Eusebius, moreover, charges Papias with leading Irenaeus and most of the ecclesiastical writers to chiliasm.

¹ But as the date of Polycarp's martyrdom has by recent research been put back to A.D. 136, the date of his contemporaneous friend Papias must likewise be put about ten years earlier. — KD.]
of Ely, he published in Holland his La Fog reduite to the Shemitic race, because among them imaginary forms of speech in which an abstract idea is that he was pious, credulous, and industrious, intellect. By the word maschal, from a root denoting a small mind [referring to his allegorizing tendency]. The former statement lacks satisfactory manuscript support, and is probably an interpolation. Not enough of Papias is left upon which to form an independent judgment [except that he was pious, credulous, and industrious].

["The work of Papias was extant in the time of Jerome. Perhaps it may yet be recovered; for some work with the name of Papias is mentioned there (234, 267, 550) in the catalogue of the Library of the Benedictine Monastery of Christ Church, Canterbury, contained in a Cottonian manuscript, written in the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century (E. Edwards, Memoirs of Libraries, London, 1839, vol. i. pp. 122-225); and according to Monardus, the words 'I found the book of Papias on the Words of the Lord' are contained in an inventory of the property of the church at Nismes, prepared about 1218." — Donaldson, pp. 401, 402.]


PAPYRUS. See Bible-Text, Writing.

PARABLES. Figurative speech is natural to all primitive peoples, but especially to those of the Semitic race, because among them imagination and feeling have the ascendancy over the intellect. By the word maschal, from a root denoting "to compare," the Hebrews designate all forms of speech in which an abstract idea is clothed with an image; as, for instance, the maxims of Proverbs, consisting of two propositions, the one setting forth the image almost in the form of a riddle, and the other giving in a direct manner the corresponding moral truth. In the teaching of Jesus, figurative speech plays a conspicuous part; as, for instance, in the following passages: "And if the blind guide the blind, both shall fall into the pit;" "Ye are the light of the world;" "The salt of the earth;" "Neither do men light a lamp and put it under the bushel, but on the stand." The image may extend beyond the single sentence, and through a whole discourse; as, for instance (in Isa. v.), the song which the prophet sings to his well-beloved touching his vineyard; or (Ezek. xvii.) the picture of the great eagle and the highest branch of the high cedar; or, still more striking, the tale which Nathan tells David, and by which he compels the king to look into his own soul for the evil deed (2 Sam. xii.); or, finally, the fable in which Jotham, the son of Gideon, shows the people of Shechem that the man who would consent to become their king would be the one least worthy of the position, and most likely to become a scourge to them (Judg. ix.). It is to this last kind of figurative speech that the so-called parables of Jesus belong. The word "parable" from a root signifying to place things beside each other for the purpose of comparing them, is the Greek translation of the Hebrew maschal, and denotes, as a special term, a higher kind of figurative speech than the fable. The fable is inferior in dignity to the parable. It uses the image in order to inculcate natural truth and practical advice, or to turn certain faults into ridicule. It can consequently allow the imagination a very wide scope, putting beings into activities contrary to their nature, lending intelligence and speech to animals and plants, etc. It is play. The parable has a higher purpose. Its teaching refers to the kingdom of God and the salvation of souls. The imagery, consequently, by which it images forth the truth, must conform strictly to reality. Each being must act in accordance with its nature: each action must be described accurately as it could have occurred. The object of the representation is too sacred to allow the imagination free scope.

It appears from the Gospels that Jesus began to teach in parables at a certain given moment of his ministry; and that circumstance naturally leads us to ask why he did not do so from the very beginning. Of course, he always used images in order to express his ideas more strikingly. By the incompatibility of an old garment and a piece of undressed cloth, he demonstrated the impossibility of maintaining the old dispensation as it could have occurred. The object of the representation is too sacred to allow the imagination free scope.

It appears from the Gospels that Jesus began to teach in parables at a certain given moment of his ministry; and that circumstance naturally leads us to ask why he did not do so from the very beginning. Of course, he always used images in order to express his ideas more strikingly. By the incompatibility of an old garment and a piece of undressed cloth, he demonstrated the impossibility of maintaining the old dispensation as it could have occurred. The object of the representation is too sacred to allow the imagination free scope.

It appears from the Gospels that Jesus began to teach in parables at a certain given moment of his ministry; and that circumstance naturally leads us to ask why he did not do so from the very beginning. Of course, he always used images in order to express his ideas more strikingly. By the incompatibility of an old garment and a piece of undressed cloth, he demonstrated the impossibility of maintaining the old dispensation as it could have occurred. The object of the representation is too sacred to allow the imagination free scope.

It appears from the Gospels that Jesus began to teach in parables at a certain given moment of his ministry; and that circumstance naturally leads us to ask why he did not do so from the very beginning. Of course, he always used images in order to express his ideas more strikingly. By the incompatibility of an old garment and a piece of undressed cloth, he demonstrated the impossibility of maintaining the old dispensation as it could have occurred. The object of the representation is too sacred to allow the imagination free scope.
asked for an explanation (Matt. xiii., Mark iv., Luke viii.). The explanation, however (Matt. xiii. 10-17), is not so easy to understand. Some have found in that passage, simply the idea that Jesus concealed the truth of heaven with images in order to make them more intelligible, and imprint them with greater force on the mind of his hearers. At first glance the interpretation seems very natural. Nevertheless, a second reading of the words of Jesus cannot fail to show that they contain just the opposite meaning: “Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven; but to them it is not given. Therefore speak I to them in parables; because, seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.” How could the multitude who heard the parables of the sower and the tares, which Jesus told on that very occasion, ever understand those parables, when even the apostles themselves did not apprehend the meaning of Jesus, but were compelled to ask him about it? Was it, then, for the purpose of making his teaching unintelligible, that Jesus used the parable? There are some who think so. They consider that the moment had arrived when the people who had heard the appeals of Jesus without repentance, deserved no better than falling under that judgment of obduracy of which Isaiah speaks in the very words which Jesus quotes on the occasion. Of course, there is added, the parable was intended to make the divine truth clearer and more intelligible to those whose hearts had been prepared by repentance and faith; but at the same time it also served to veil the truth to the eyes of those who had not been moved by the teachings of Jesus. A kind of sorting, preparatory to judgment, was thus effected.

The latter explanation is certainly more in harmony with the words of Jesus than the former. Nevertheless, there is room for doubt whether it hits the sense exactly, and exhausts it. It seems probable that the divine truth was intended not to be transformed in a moment, but in a progressive and spiritual manner, that the judgment, separating the true members from the false, should not come until the end of the kingdom of heaven. To say such things to people who expected to see the Roman Empire overthrown, and the sovereignty of Israel over the universe established, by some grand revolution of the Messiah, would be like crying out from the roofs, that he, Jesus, was not the Messiah, and his work not the fulfilment of the prophecies. And yet the moment had arrived when it had become necessary to reveal the new order of things, of which the apostles were to take charge after his own death, and for which every faithful follower was to work. But that which it was necessary to reveal to some, it was necessary to conceal from others; and this double object could not have been attained by any other means so surely as by the parables which Jesus explained in private to those who ought to understand the secrets of God, while to others they were like a veil thrown over the truth. Compare the precept of Jesus (Matt. vii. 6).

The number of parables which have come down to us exceeds thirty, but cannot be precisely stated, as several pieces of the teaching of Jesus are by some considered parables, by others, simple metaphors; as, for instance, Luke xii. 35-40, 42-46, xiv. 34, 35, etc. Classifications of the parables have been attempted, on various principles. From an historical point of view, Goebel, in his Die Parabeln Jesu, 1880, arranges them in three groups: (1) those belonging to the stay of Jesus near Capernaum, and collected in Matt. xiii.; (2) those belonging to his journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, and collected in Luke xxi. and xii.; and (3) those not belonging to either of his last days in Jerusalem. The first group refers to the kingdom of heaven as a totality; the second, to the individual members of it; and the third, to the end of the existing economy and the judgment of the members of the kingdom. These observations are all very just. Nevertheless, we propose another classification, which seems to us to be more natural. Out of the thirty parables, properly speaking, six refer to the kingdom of heaven in its preparatory existence under the old dispensation; six, to its actual realization in the form of a church, that is, to the new dispensation from its foundation to its consummation; and eighteen, finally, to the life of the individual members of the church.

The first group consists of: 1. The Vine-dresser (Matt. xxi. 33-41), representing the criminal conduct of the Israelitish authorities against the Lord, acting through the prophets, and then through his sublimity of human teaching (Matt. vii. 28, 29). But the foundation and development of the kingdom of heaven were the secrets, or, as Jesus called them, the mysteries of God. They were the heavenly things between which and the earthly things he made a sharp distinction (John iv. 13). How could he say openly to the people, that the Messiah should not found the kingdom of God by a stroke of omnipotence, but by the slow and peaceable action of the Word and the Holy Spirit? that, in the new order of things, the wicked must not be transformed in a moment, but in a progressive and spiritual manner? that the judgment, separating the true members from the false, should not come until the end of the kingdom of heaven? To say such things to people who expected to see the Roman Empire overthrown, and the sovereignty of Israel over the universe established, by some grand revolution of the Messiah, would be like crying out from the roofs, that he, Jesus, was not the Messiah, and his work not the fulfilment of the prophecies. And yet the moment had arrived when it had become necessary to reveal the new order of things, of which the apostles were to take charge after his own death, and for which every faithful follower was to work. But that which it was necessary to reveal to some, it was necessary to conceal from others; and this double object could not have been attained by any other means so surely as by the parables which Jesus explained in private to those who ought to understand the secrets of God, while to others they were like a veil thrown over the truth. Compare the precept of Jesus (Matt. vii. 6).
it differs from it in several essential features; 4. The Strait Gate (Luke xiii. 24-30), in which Jesus predicts that the larger portion of the Jewish people shall be excluded from the kingdom of heaven, because they will not enter through the strait gate of humiliation, while the Gentiles shall enter in multitudes; 5. The Barren Fig-Tree (Luke xiii. 6-9), an image of the condemnation overthrowing over Israel, and the intercession of the Messias, which seems to have been the first perfect specimen of the power which alone averts the fatal blow; 6. The Two Sons (Matt. xxi. 28-32), in which Jesus places the conduct of the Pharisees (who pretend to obey God, but in reality are filled with revolt against him) over against that of the toll-gatherers, who externally refuse obedience, but at heart hesitate, and end with surrendering themselves.

The second group consists of: 1. The Sower, which seems to have been the first perfect specimen of this kind of teaching, and still stands forth as the typical parable (it describes the different reception which the Word finds in the hearts of the hearers, from complete indifference to perfect devotion; and thus it emphasizes the foundation of the kingdom of heaven by preaching the Word, and not, as the Jews expected, by a sudden intervention of the arm of God); 2. The Tares, representing the co-existence of good and bad members of the church as the true method of development in the new order of things, though so contrary to Jewish expectation; 3 and 4. The Mustard-seed and The Leaven, which form a pair of parables representing the same idea, but under two different aspects, a combination which occurs often (the final victory of the kingdom of heaven on the other side the only power which still possesses the kingdom, while the rest of this group refer to those who have already become members).

10 and 11, The Chief Seat (Luke xiv. 7-10), The Laborers in the Vineyard (Matt. xx. 1-16), inculcate humility — the former with respect to brethren, the latter with respect to God — as the true disposition of the faithful. 12 and 13, The King taking Account of his Servants (Matt. xxv. 14-30) and The Good Samaritan (Luke xxi. 1-13), inculcate charity: the former in spiritual things, — forgiveness of other people’s faults; the latter in practical things, — pity on other people’s sufferings. 14 and 15, The Unjust Steward and The Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 1-9 and 19-31), teach the right use of the good things of this world; not for the sake of a momentary and egotistic enjoyment, but in the service of charity. The same lesson is inculcated by 16, The Rich Man (Luke xii. 16-21). 17 and 18. The Talents and The Ten Virgins (Matt. xxv. 14-30 and 1-19) demand of the faithful that to the use of the talents which they have been given they should add a practical activity and perpetual vigilance in the service of Christ. The ten virgins represent the total membership of the church, of which some profess the faith merely swayed by an instantaneous and fugitive emotion; that is, they have no other provision of oil than that which happens to be in the lamp, and which may be soon exhausted, while others hold a separate provision of oil, which allows them to renew the flame of the lamp; that is, they stand in permanent communication with the very source of celestial life, — Christ.

Such is the system of the parables which the Lord told at different times and on various occasions. And what a wealth of religious and moral intuitions it contains! All the stages of the history of the kingdom of heaven, from its beginning under the old dispensation to its consummation at the threshold of eternity, are spread out before us. In some of the teachings of Jesus it is the powerful popular orator we admire; in others, their profound philosophical spirit. But in the parables it is the poet, or rather the painter, who lets the creations of his genius pass before our eyes and before our eyes. For in Jesus all the gifts of the human soul were united, and each and every one of them was put in play for the instruction and salvation of humanity.

light; the division of the one river into four, the
Philo, Paradise stood for virtue; its planting
toward the east meant its direction toward the
edge of hell, around which flowed the ocean, and
Paradise was a picture of the human soul, in which
flourish the seeds of Christian virtues; or a picture
of heaven, wherein the "trees" represent the
angels, and the "rivers" the outgoings of
wisdom and other virtues. He did not, however,
deny a literal Paradise: he only sought in allegorizing
the harmonization of the Mosaic and
New-Testament conceptions. To Ambrose, the
Pauline Paradise was the Christian soul. He
also distinguished between the litera and the
Pauline Paradise. Many of the other Fathers
interpreted in similar fashion with the sacred text.
II. Paradise was interpreted mystically. The
Mosaic and the New-Testament representations
of Paradise were considered identical, and
place was found for it in a mysterious region belonging
both to earth and heaven. The chief representatives
of this interpretation were Theophilus of
Antioch (ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΚΟΜ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ),
Tertullian (Apologeticus), Ephrem Syrus,
Basil (Oratio de Paradiso), Gregory of Nazianzum,
Gregory of Nyssa, Cosmas Indicopleustes (ΧΡΟΝΙΑ
ΤΟΥΡΚΟΥΟΙ και, and Moses Bar-Cepha (Tractatus
de Paradiso). Those who doubted the identity of the
two paradies were few, as Justin Martyr, the
Gnostic Bardesanes, and Jerome. The Scriptures
were not to blame for the identification,— for they
clearly set forth the geographical character of
the one, and the unearthly character of the other,—
but the commentators themselves. Excuse
for the latter is to be found in the laxness of the prevailing exegesis, in its ascetic character, in the
ignorance of the times respecting geography, and
in the influence of the classical mythology. In the
poems of Ephrem (fourth century), which
embody the speculations of Theophilus,
Tertullian, and Basil, Paradise was generally conceived
to have three divisions. The first begins at the
top of the hill, around which flowed the ocean, and
in a mountain which overtops all earthly
mountains. The one river of Paradise flows from under
the throne into paradise and cuts itself into four
streams, which, when they have reached the
border of hell upon the lowest division, sink under
hell, and, through underground passages, flow
to the ocean and a part of the earth, where they reappear in three different localities, forming in
Armenia the Euphrates and the Tigris, in Ethiopia
the Nile, in Asia Minor, the Danube (Fison).
Cosmas Indicopleustes (sixth century) represents the divisions as rising in trapezoid form, and understands by "Fison"
the Ganges. Moses Bar-Cepha (tenth century)
puts Paradise this side of the ocean, but behind
mountains which remain inaccessible to mortals:
PARAGUAY.
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PARAN (place of caverns), Wilderness of, bounded on the north by the Wilderness of Shur and the Land of Canaan, on the east by the Arabah and the Gulf of Akibah, on the south by a sand-belt which separates it from Sinai, on the west by the Wilderness of Etham. It is now called Badet et Tih ("desert of the wandering"), the scene of the thirty-eight years' scattering of Israel between Egypt and Palestine. It is a high limestone plateau, crossed by low ranges of hills. Its few water-courses run only in the rainy season. The vegetation is scanty. The north-eastern portion of this plateau is the Negeb ("south country") of Scripture. The caravan-route to Egypt crossed Paran.

PARÉDÉ, Richard Gay, Sunday-school worker; b. at Sharon, Conn., Oct. 12, 1811; d. in New York City, Feb. 11, 1869. He was a Presbyterian layman, from 1853 to 1863 agent of the New York Sunday-School Union, and all his life an enthusiastic and wise champion of the Sunday-school cause. He was the author of two widely used volumes, The Sunday-School Worker, and The Sunday-School Index.

PAREUS, David, b. at Frankenstein, Silesia, Dec. 30, 1549; d. at Heidelberg, June 15, 1622. He studied theology in the Collegium Sapiens in Heidelberg, and was in 1584 appointed teacher there, and in 1588 professor of theology. His so-called Neustadler Bibel, 1587, the text of Luther's translation, with notes of Pareus, involved him in a violent controversy with Agricola, Siegwart, and others; and his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 1609, caused still more strife, and was publicly burnt in England, on the order of James I. He was, however, not a controversialist himself: on the contrary, besides his commentaries, Summarische Erklarung der wahren Katholischen Lehr, etc., his principal work is his Irenicum sive de unione et synodo evangelico- rum libertatis, 1614, which, however, was not well received by the orthodox Lutherans. A life of him and a complete list of his works are found in the unfinished edition of his works, by his son, Francfort, 1847.

NEY.

PARIS, the capital of France, and, next to London, the most populous city of Europe, has for the past four or five centuries exerted an influence second to that of no other city in the world upon the destinies, civil and religious, of Christendom. In a sense in which it is true of no other capital, Paris has shaped and still shapes the prevalent sentiment of France, as it has again and again made and overturned its government. Under the name of Latetia Parisiorum, a small town existed in the time of Julius Caesar, on an island in the River Seine about a mile as having ten miles from its mouth, which is still known as the Ile de la Cité. This town gradually extended to the banks on either side, until, by the time of the Crusades, it had come to be regarded as one of the largest and wealthiest of European cities. Two special causes — Venice, 1673; Ibáñez: Regno da Socied., etc., Lisbon, 1770: Dugrati: La république de P., Brussels, 1864; Masterman: Seven Years in Paraguay, 4—III
establishment of the middle age. The University of Paris, under the patronage of the monarchs, and enjoying the services of such eminent teachers as Abelard and Peter Lombard, was thronged with scholars from all parts of the West, who were divided, according to their origin, into the four "nations" of France, Picardy, Normandy, and England. In the fifteenth century they are said to have numbered more than ten thousand; and so important an element of the population did they constitute, that the entire southern part of Paris, commonly called, even to the present day, the "quartier Latin," was known as the "Université." The various disasters of pestilence, famine, and siege, that have befallen Paris, have not checked its steady growth. A hundred years or more ago the city had spread far beyond its former fortifications, of which traces remain only in the line of its razed bulwarks (boulevards), now turned into broad and stately avenues. While the increase of the population of France has of recent years been alarmingly slow, Paris has advanced from 1,525,942 in 1856, to 1,696,141 in 1861, 1,852,000 in 1873 (despite the great loss of life during the siege by the Germans and the conflict of the Commune), and 1,988,806 in 1876. Of this immense population the most careful estimates allow 75,000 at the utmost for the adherents of Protestant churches (i.e., 35,000 Reformed, 30,000 Lutherans, and 10,000 belonging to other branches of the Protestant stock), and 32,000 to 35,000 for the Jews, chiefly natives of Alsace and Lorraine. With the exception of this small minority, all the rest of the Parisians are claimed by the Roman-Catholic Church, although no insignificant part is composed of more or less avowed free-thinkers or atheists.

The Roman-Catholic Church in the city of Paris is, perhaps, as thoroughly organized as in any other city of the world. The archbishop is assisted by a coadjutor and six vicars-general. The chapter of the cathedral church of Notre Dame consists of 98 canons, resident, titular, or honorary. The city and its suburbs are divided into three arch-deaconates. The archdeacon of Notre Dame has under him 50 curates, and 850 vicars; the archdeacon of Ste Genevieve, 70 curates and 144 vicars; and the archdeacon of St. Denis, 74 curates and 81 vicars; total, 144 curates, and 580 vicars. These figures do not include the clergymen constituting the Roman-Catholic faculty of the Sorbonne (seven professors and one adjunct professor), nor those engaged in the Seminary of St. Sulpice and in the University or Roman-Catholic Institute of Paris, in the Rue de Vaugirard, etc. There are sixty-three Roman-Catholic chaplains attached to the public prisons, hospitals, and other benevolent institutions. Their gradual removal is, however, believed to be only a question of a few years. The number of schools supported by the Catholic Church, both for primary and for secondary education, has heretofore been large; but the hostile attitude of the government in respect to clerical instruction, as well as the greatly increased efficiency of the government itself in the matter of education, has tended inevitably to the rapid diminution of the number of establishments under ecclesiastical control. In 1870 the annual appropriation made by the city for education was only about $1,200,000. In the first ten years of the present republic it has risen to three times that sum. Before the decree of June 10, 1870, authorizing the dissolution of all unauthorized congregations (or societies of friars and nuns) to take effect Nov. 5, 1880, there were 10 authorized and 24 unauthorized congregations of men. There were also 88 congregations of women, of which 40 were turned into broad and stately avenues. While in the line of its razed bulwarks (boulevards), now the increase of the population of France has of recent years been alarmingly slow, Paris has advanced from 1,525,942 in 1856, to 1,696,141 in 1861, 1,852,000 in 1873 (despite the great loss of life during the siege by the Germans and the conflict of the Commune), and 1,988,806 in 1876. Of this immense population the most careful estimates allow 75,000 at the utmost for the adherents of Protestant churches (i.e., 35,000 Reformed, 30,000 Lutherans, and 10,000 belonging to other branches of the Protestant stock), and 32,000 to 35,000 for the Jews, chiefly natives of Alsace and Lorraine. With the exception of this small minority, all the rest of the Parisians are claimed by the Roman-Catholic Church, although no insignificant part is composed of more or less avowed free-thinkers or atheists.

The Roman-Catholic Church in the city of Paris is, perhaps, as thoroughly organized as in any other city of the world. The archbishop is assisted by a coadjutor and six vicars-general. The chapter of the cathedral church of Notre Dame consists of 98 canons, resident, titular, or honorary. The city and its suburbs are divided into three arch-deaconates. The archdeacon of Notre Dame has under him 50 curates, and 850 vicars; the archdeacon of Ste Genevieve, 70 curates and 144 vicars; and the archdeacon of St. Denis, 74 curates and 81 vicars; total, 144 curates, and 580 vicars. These figures do not include the clergymen constituting the Roman-Catholic faculty of the Sorbonne (seven professors and one adjunct professor), nor those engaged in the Seminary of St. Sulpice and in the University or Roman-Catholic Institute of Paris, in the Rue de Vaugirard, etc. There are sixty-three Roman-Catholic chaplains attached to the public prisons, hospitals, and other benevolent institutions. Their gradual removal is, however, believed to be only a question of a few years. The number of schools supported by the Catholic Church, both for primary and for secondary education, has heretofore been large; but the hostile attitude of the government in respect to clerical instruction, as well as the greatly increased efficiency of the government itself in the matter of education, has tended inevitably to the rapid diminution of the number of establishments under ecclesiastical control. In 1870 the annual appro-
The number of electors is estimated at about $20,000 annually distributed to the needy. The number of electors entitled to vote for members of the consistory of Paris is 3,500. Of these 2,144 exercised their privilege in the election of May 14, 1882, in which the orthodox or evangelical party had a majority of 620 in all the parishes.

The "Confession d'Augsbourg" (Lutheran Church) is composed of Protestants of German origin, descendants, for the most part, of families belonging to Alsace and Lorraine. There are (1883) 21 pastors and assistants, including clergymen officiating in the German, Swedish, and Danish languages, and 16 churches and other places of worship. The number of electors is estimated at 1,300.

Belonging to the union of the free churches, there are five churches and chapels and seven ministers. The well-known Chapelle Taitbout is the principal place of worship. The Methodist Church has six places of worship, and five ministers preaching in French, besides two preaching in English. The Baptist Church has two places of worship, and four ministers.

The government supports at Paris a theological seminary lately established, in part, to take the place of the theological school for the training of young men for the ministry of the Lutheran Church, formerly, and until the session of Alsace to Germany, maintained by the State at Strassburg. The new seminary (Faculté de théologie protestante de Paris) is, however, intended to meet the wants of the Reformed as well as of the Lutheran Church. Of the ten professors and teachers, two teach respectively the Lutheran and the Reformed dogmatic theology.

The government supports at Paris a theological seminary lately established, in part, to take the place of the theological school for the training of young men for the ministry of the Lutheran Church, formerly, and until the session of Alsace to Germany, maintained by the State at Strassburg. The new seminary (Faculté de théologie protestante de Paris) is, however, intended to meet the wants of the Reformed as well as of the Lutheran Church. Of the ten professors and teachers, two teach respectively the Lutheran and the Reformed dogmatic theology.

The distinction between parochia and diocesis was first made in the Western Church by degrees, as it developed its great missionary activity. The dioceses were so large, that a district subdivision of them became necessary for administrative purposes. Churches were built in which complete service was celebrated every Sunday, and in which baptism, burial, etc., were duly performed by the appointed presbyter. These first subdivisions, however, tituliiores, ecclesia baptismale, were not yet the present parishes: they were still much larger, and corresponded, in many cases, to the present superiorities in certain Protestant countries. But by degrees, as the population grew denser, a new subdivision became necessary. Oratories and chapels were built in the castles, in the monasteries, or near by; and when, in course of time, these new subdivisions, the tituli minores, became definitely established, with well-defined boundaries and fully organized administrations, the present parochial system may be said to have fairly entered into existence, though of course, it was, and still is, subject to many modifications.

At what time the development was definitely completed cannot be stated; it took place at various times in the various countries. The city of Rome had forty fully organized parish churches before the end of the third century. Parish organization is spoken of in France in the beginning of the fifth century. In England the first legislation on the subject is found in the laws of
Edgar, about 970. Before the Reformation, however, the connection between the bishop of the diocese and the priest of the parish continued very close. The *plenitudo potestatis ecclesiastica* was vested solely in the bishop, and the priest was nothing but his representative. After the Reformation, the Roman Catholic countries, much laxer, and in many particular points the State assumed the power of the bishop; and, in more recent times also, the connection between the State and the parish has loosened, the whole idea of a parish system, as a system of territorial circumscriptions, gradually giving way to the idea of free congregations.

In the United States the Roman-Catholic and the Protestant-Episcopal churches have retained the parish system, though in a modified form, on account of the complete separation between State and Church.

**Parity**, a technical term first occurring in the instrument of the peace of Westphalia, 1648, denotes equality between various religious denominations in their relation to the State. Before the Reformation, the European States recognized only one religion within their respective dominions; but by the peace of Augsburg, 1555, the old legislation of the German Empire was cancelled, and parity was established between Roman Catholics and Protestants. It must be noticed, however, that the parity thus established concerned only the empire, not the particular states of which it was made up. In each single state the territorial system, with its *eius regio ejus religio*, prevailed, and it was only when the states met to decide upon the affairs of the empire, that Protestants and Roman Catholics had equal rights. In the separate states of the German Empire, parity was not introduced until the beginning of the present century. Prussia took the lead by the religious edict of July 9, 1788; and, later on, the great changes which took place loosened, the whole idea of a parish system, as a system of territorial circumscriptions, gradually giving way to the idea of free congregations.

Under Mary he lost every thing but his life. Soon after her accession, Elizabeth appointed him Archbishop of Canterbury, Reginald Pole having died just before. He no doubt commended himself to the politic queen by the middle position he occupied between the two extreme parties in the church; and by the relation he had sustained to her mother, Anne Boleyn. The consecration took place Dec. 17, 1559. The difficult work lay before him of building up the Anglican Church at a time of ecclesiastical confusion, and under a queen whose religious purpose at least seemed to be fickle. Without himself being a Puritan, he sought to modify the severity of the measures passed by Parliament, Jan. 1, 1565, against all who refused to take the oath of supremacy. But at the queen's command he became more rigorous, and carried out the *Advertisements* which prescribed the rules concerning dress, etc. by which the clergy were to obey in order to secure a license to preach. The Church of England honors his memory for his having enforced the Act of Uniformity. The Puritans blame him for forcing the division in the church.

Whatever may be the opinion about Parker's services to the church, there can be but one opinion about his services to letters. He was more prominent than any other single individual in arousing in England an interest in the records of antiquity, founded the Antiquarian Society, and was the instrument of rescuing a multitude of manuscripts from the ruins of the monastic establishments. The rich treasures of Corpus Christi and other colleges at Oxford are largely due to his assiduity. He was particularly interested in the antiquities of England, and had published the Chronicles of Matthew Paris, Thomas Walsingham, etc. It was with his co-operation that Ackworth wrote the *De Antiq. Britan. Eccles.*, 1572. His private virtues seem to have been many. He gave much away in charity to the poor, founded hospitals, endowed colleges, etc. His body lies buried in Lambeth. [Elizabeth, on one occasion, showed her resentment against Parker for his refusal to introduce the crucifix and ciborium, by an advertisement which was characteristic of her temper. When Mrs. Parker advanced, at an entertainment at Lambeth, to take leave of the queen, Elizabeth said, "Madam I may not call you, and 'mistress' I am loath to call you: however, I thank you for your good cheer." "Madam" was the title by which married ladies, and "mistress" the one by which unmarried ladies, were addressed.]


PARKER, Samuel, Bishop of Oxford; b. at Northampton, September, 1640; d. at Oxford, May 20, 1687. He was graduated B.A. from Oxford, 1659; became F.R.S., 1665; published *Tentamina physico-theologica de Deo*, which pleased Archbishop Sheldon so much that he made him one of his chaplains, 1667, and in 1670 archdeacon of Canterbury, in which he received the mastership of the bursary of the university. In 1672 Parker became chaplain to the daughter of Henry VIII., and in 1686 bishop of Oxford. He was a vigorous, if not formidable, defender of episcopacy, and was more than suspected of Romanism. See lists of his works in *Allibone and Darling*. 

**Parker**.
PARKER, Theodore, the son of John and Hannah (Stearns) Parker; b. at Lexington, Mass., Aug. 24, 1810; d. at Florence, Italy, May 10, 1860. His father—a farmer and wheelwright—and his mother were intelligent, highly respectable, and thoroughly conscientious. They had a large family, and but slender means of subsistence, so that they could do little for their children, except by their example and influence. Theodore seems to have inherited largely from both his parents,—from his father, an inflexibility short of sternness; from his mother, an emotional nature susceptible of great stress and tenderness of feeling. Theodore had in his boyhood little formal instruction other than that of the district-school, and that only in the winter after he was old enough to assist his father in the labor of the farm and the workshop; but by his greediness for knowledge, and his eager receptivity of whatever came within his reach, he attracted the special notice, interest, and aid of several of his teachers. At the age of seventeen he became a teacher, at first in a district-school, and continued to serve in that profession, in schools public and private, till 1834. Meanwhile he prepared himself for Harvard College, passed the examinations for admission in 1830, and subsequently pursued, or rather exceeded,—at least in the classical department,—the regular college course; so that, but for a required year of residence, he might have taken his bachelor's degree with his class. In the spring of 1834 he entered the Divinity School of Harvard University, having prepared himself to join the class that had entered the previous autumn. He had already studied the Hebrew language with a Jewish teacher then of high reputation, and had acquired sufficient proficiency in it to undertake the instruction of a class of under-graduates, and, during a long absence of the professor, to fill his place in the Divinity School. His capacity of continuous and various literary labor during his life at Cambridge, and, indeed, until the final failure of his health, can have been seldom equalled, perhaps never exceeded. At all times his reading of books demanding the closest attention was, perhaps, more at large, illustrated, and defended the views, incorporated in these but the mass of his acquisitions and his facility in their use, in classical learning, history, philosophy, and theology, were almost unprecedented.

He graduated at the Divinity School in 1836. His sermons during his novitiate had been severely criticised by the professor of homiletics as dry and scholastic; but he no sooner appeared as a preacher before a larger public than he was heard with eager interest, and was regarded as a man of marked ability and promise. After several months of highly acceptable service in various churches and places, he found himself permanently, he received and accepted an invitation to the pastorate of a church in West Roxbury, now a part of Boston. It was a small rural congregation, consisting in part of the families of intelligent and prosperous farmers, in part of persons who were disposed to rely on the neighboring city. It is difficult to determine the period when he began to diverge from the then prevailing type of Unitarianism which was his by birthright, education, early choice, and, for a time, sincere and devout loyalty. His private papers, obviously not meant for any eye but his own, yet unapprisingly used by his biographers, indicate the progress of serious, anxious, and often painful inquiry, and at the same time a pervading and profound sense of religious obligation, and a deeply devotional spirit; so that, however little quarter may be given to his theology, it is impossible to doubt the integrity of aim and purpose. Early in his ministry, it became known that he was latitudinarian in his opinions and in the expression of them; and the more conservative of the Unitarian clergy, while not formally dissolving fellowship with him, were no longer ready to admit him into their pulpits. He, meanwhile, became intimate with George Ripley, Alcott, and other leaders of what was then called the "transcendental school;" and though his was a mind adapted to make, rather than to receive, strong impressions, this association undoubtedly broadened for him the field of speculation, and stimulated him on the career of free thought by the consciousness of sympathy. He cannot be said to have belonged to their school, though his philosophy was certainly transcendental in contradistinction to the sensualism of Locke and his adherents. On the most fundamental of all religious truths—the personality of God, with the correlative truth, the reality of the communion of the human spirit with him in prayer—he seems never to have entertained a doubt; while in this entire region of thought they were utterly befogged and adrift, though some of them ultimately came out into clearer light, and upon solid ground.

Parker's first open and fully avowed dissent from prevailing religious beliefs was in 1841, in a sermon preached at the ordination of Rev. Charles Chauncy Shackford, at South Boston. The subject was The Transient and Permanent in Christianity, the text, "Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away." In this sermon, while maintaining the identity of Christ's teachings with the absolute and eternal religion, and presenting his character as the not formally dissolving fellowship with him, were no longer ready to admit him into their pulpits. He, meanwhile, became intimate with George Ripley, Alcott, and other leaders of what was then called the "transcendental school;" and though his was a mind adapted to make, rather than to receive, strong impressions, this association undoubtedly broadened for him the field of speculation, and stimulated him on the career of free thought by the consciousness of sympathy. He cannot be said to have belonged to their school, though his philosophy was certainly transcendental in contradistinction to the sensualism of Locke and his adherents. On the most fundamental of all religious truths—the personality of God, with the correlative truth, the reality of the communion of the human spirit with him in prayer—he seems never to have entertained a doubt; while in this entire region of thought they were utterly befogged and adrift, though some of them ultimately came out into clearer light, and upon solid ground.

In this sermon, while maintaining the identity of Christ's teachings with the absolute and eternal religion, and presenting his character as the not formally dissolving fellowship with him, were no longer ready to admit him into their pulpits. He, meanwhile, became intimate with George Ripley, Alcott, and other leaders of what was then called the "transcendental school;" and though his was a mind adapted to make, rather than to receive, strong impressions, this association undoubtedly broadened for him the field of speculation, and stimulated him on the career of free thought by the consciousness of sympathy. He cannot be said to have belonged to their school, though his philosophy was certainly transcendental in contradistinction to the sensualism of Locke and his adherents. On the most fundamental of all religious truths—the personality of God, with the correlative truth, the reality of the communion of the human spirit with him in prayer—he seems never to have entertained a doubt; while in this entire region of thought they were utterly befogged and adrift, though some of them ultimately came out into clearer light, and upon solid ground.

held a position which led to his virtual withdrawal from their body. But among the laity he had a strong following. In 1845 he was urged by many friends to commence a regular religious service in Boston, and early in the following year he became the minister of a congregation which assumed the name of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society. The permanent members of this society were not numerous; but they were, for the most part, of superior intelligence and culture, and of deservedly high social position, — some of them in full sympathy with him in opinion; some, who did not agree with him, won by his simplicity, frankness, earnestness, and fervor; some, attracted by his firmness in the advocacy of the great philanthropic enterprises then under popular odium; yet others, dissatisfied with the previously existing churches, and, from weariness of the old, inclined to make experiment of the new. His audience from the first were large. The smaller hall rented at the beginning for the Sunday service was soon found inadequate; and the Music Hall, to which the society early emigrated, with at least three thousand sittings, was always well filled, often crowded. His parochioners organized under his direction various local and general charities which were liberally sustained, while he busied himself equally in diligent parochial work, in the instruction of classes of his stated hearers, in the advocacy by voice and pen of the antislavery and temperance reforms, and in meeting the constant applications for counsel and aid which multiplied upon a city minister in proportion to his willingness to bear the burden. At the same time he carried through the press several volumes, and not a few sermons, lectures, and addresses. In fine, but for the evidence remaining in contemporary records, reports, and documents, the amount of labor crowded into the few years of his Boston pastorate would transcend belief.

But he was undoubtedly becoming a victim to overwork. Though in appearance robust and hardy, he had inherited from his mother a tendency to pulmonary disease; and, during his student life, he must have enfeebled his constitution, though unconsciously, by insufficient food and clothing, by scanting the hours of sleep, and by the utter neglect of exercise and recreation. As early as 1850 there are entries in his journal that indicate declining health, though his own is almost the only record of it for the seven following years. In 1857 the exposure and fatigue of a lecturing tour in the interior of New York resulted in an illness of several months' duration. After a brief but intensely busy period of convalescence, he was seized in 1858 with a severe hemorrhage from the lungs. It was then found that tuberculous disease was far advanced; and immediate arrangements were made for sending him, first to the West Indies, then to Europe. Change of scene and a genial climate may have retarded the progress of the fatal malady, but there were no signs of hope or improvement, and, after several weeks of extreme debility, he died in Florence on the 10th of May, 1860.

If Parker's theology be defined as anti-supernaturalism, the definition needs to be still further limited. There is a school of physico-theology, which, without denying the being of God, makes him the mere figure-head of a self-developing, automatic Nature. With this school Parker had no sympathy. His faith in the universal and discretionary providence of God, in his nearness to the individual soul, in the influence of his Spirit and man's need of that influence, and in the reality of prayer and of the answer to prayer, corresponded in all respects with the literal and commonly received interpretation of the Christian Scriptures. His private papers abound in devotional thought, which often, especially at marked epochs, as on a birthday, or the close of a year, takes the form of direct address to the Supreme Being in thanksgiving and petition. The Divine Providence, in his theory, assigns to every man his place, his endowments, his life-work: to some, pre-eminence; to others, subordinate offices. Jesus Christ was, like all others, a providential man, but unlike, because transcending, all others in the performance of the divine image borne in various degrees of resemblance by all God's children. Jesus he characterizes "as the highest representation of God we know;" and thus as holding in the divine will and purpose a unique and unapproached position as a teacher of eternal truth, and "as the noblest example of morality and religion." He regards the divine inspiration as the source of all in man that is not "of the earth, earthy;" of all in philosophy, art, and literature, that can enrich and ennable the spiritual nature; of all high aspiration, virtuous aim, and worthy endeavor; and of whatever of the true and the good there may have been in the ethnic religions. Inspiration in any given instance is a question, not of fact, but of degree. It is not the communication of truth, but the quickening and energizing of those perceptive and apprehensive powers by which truth is discerned and appropriated. There is no express revelation, nor is there need of any. There is absolute truth, in God, in nature, in the soul of man, which is perceived intuitively, and can be verified by intuition alone. Jesus Christ had a fuller, clearer, more profound intuition of absolute truth, and, during his life-tenure, as much as his pre-eminent godlikeness clarified and intensified his spiritual vision. His teachings, therefore, are of inestimable worth; and on all the essentials of religion and morality they are their own sufficient proof to the recipient soul. But they have, and from their very nature could have, no other verification. Objective truth can be proved only by becoming subjective, and thus forming a part of the believer's consciousness. But, while Christ's moral perfection made him inexpressive of false intuitions, on matters outside of the range of spiritual consciousness he was liable to errors. His predictions were mere conjectures. He had false notions as to the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures. He believed in a personal devil and in demoniacal possession. Nor was he entirely free from distinctively Hebrew prejudices.

Parker did not account miracles as impossible; but he regarded them as irrelevant and worthless as credentials of religious truth, as therefore improbable, and as resting on insufficient evidence. Nothing was more natural than that reverence for a teacher of superior sanctity and of commanding influence should surround his common
PARKHURST.
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life, and especially his deeds of mercy, with a supernatural halo; that such narratives should grow by tradition; and that biographies written in a succeeding generation should in perfect good faith blend myth with fact. In this respect Judaism and Christianity belong to the same category with other religions that have had their origin within the period covered by history.

The Hebrews were, according to Parker, endowed with a special religious genius, or aptitude; and their sacred writings have a superior religious and ethical value, though by no means free from gross anthropomorphism, false representations of the Divine character, and instances in which the Divine approval is ascribed to deeds, persons, and maxims, that merit disapproval and condemnation. With these qualifications, the Old Testament is, in large part, a veracious record of the development of the religious sentiment, under the most favorable auspices, in a people destined to hold the foremost place in the religious history of mankind. The Gospels are honest transcripts of such traditions with reference to the life and teaching of Christ, as were current in the Church at the period of their composition; and when allowance is made for exaggerations on the side of the marvellous, and for misconceptions incident to the limited intelligence of the writers, they may be regarded as furnishing an authentic biography of the Founder of our religion.

Parker's principal publications were, Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion, 1842; Critical and Miscellaneous Writings, 1843; Ten Sermons of Religion, 1853; Sermons on Theism, Atheism, and the Popular Theology, 1853; and four volumes of Speeches, Addresses, and Occasional Sermons, 1852 and 1853. To these must be added a very large number of articles, sermons, and lectures. A collective edition of his works, in twelve volumes octavo, was published in London in 1883–65. Among his earlier literary works should be named a translation of De Wette's Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, with annotations by the translator. This appeared in 1843. His Prayers were posthumously published, Boston, 1861, new ed., 1882. His Life has been written by Weiss, Boston, 1864, 2 vols., and by Frothingham, New York, 1874. A. P. Peabody.

PARKHURST, John, Church-of-England lexicographer; b. at Catesby, Northamptonshire, June, 1728; d. at Epsom, Surrey, March 21, 1797. He was graduated B.A. at Cambridge, 1748; entered into orders, but soon thereafter retired to his estate at Epsom, and devoted himself to bibli cal studies. He is remembered for his Hebrew and English Lexicon, without Points, with a Hebrew and Chaldee Grammar, without Points, London, 1762 (three editions in the author's lifetime, and five since); the prefixed Hebrew and Chaldee grammar was subsequently separately reprinted by James Prosser, London, 1840), and Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament, to which is prefixed a Plain and Easy Greek Grammar, 1769, last edition by Rose and Major, 1851. These works are now superseded, but they have done long and excellent service.

PARNELL, Thomas, D.D., b. at Dublin, 1679; d. at Chester, July, 1719 (or 1717); was educated at Trinity College, Dublin; ordained, 1700; archdeacon of Clogher, 1705; prebendary of Dublin, 1713; and vicar of Finglass, 1716. He frequently visited London, and was intimate with Pope and Swift. Pope published in 1722 his Poems, to later editions of which were added a portion of his life by Goldsmith. Another volume appeared, 1758: its contents were chiefly on sacred themes. His authenticity has been doubted, it would seem without reason. Campbell found "a charm in the correct and equable sweetness of Parnell;" and Goldsmith considered him "the last of that great school that had modelled itself upon the ancients." To the devout reader the later book ascribed to him is the more interesting of the two.

PARSEEISM was, under the Achemenides and the Sassanides, the ruling religion of Persia, but is now professed only by a few congregations, the so-called Parsees living in and around the Persian city of Yazd and in the western portion of India. To India the Parsees emigrated in the middle of the seventh century after Christ, in order to escape the persecutions of the Moslem caliphs; but very little is known of their settlement and later vicissitudes there. In 1852 they numbered 50,000 souls; of whom 20,184 lived in Bombay, 10,507 in Surate, and the rest scattered around in the districts of Baroth, Balsar, Nausari, and Ahmedabad. In 1879 they numbered 8,490 in Persia.

The origin of Parseeism dates back to prehistoric times. Its fundamental ideas must have been formed at a time when the Hindus and the Persians still lived together as one people; that is, at a time when the Vedas were not yet produced, at least fifteen hundred years before Christ. The contrast between light and darkness, the most prominent characteristic of Parseeism, must have been developed by both peoples in common, as also the first outlines of certain deities which afterwards, after the separation, assumed differently specialized features. — Among the Persians, Indra among the Hindus, Mithra and Mitra, Nasatyu and Nonghathys, and others. But it was only the very beginning of a religion and a civilization which was thus made. The two peoples separated, at what time and for what reason, we know not. And among the Persians the contrast between light and darkness was gradually raised to a moral contrast between good and bad, and developed into an elaborate dualism. Ormuzd, in the older idiom Ahura-Mazda, is the cause of every thing good, and dwells in the perfect light: Ahriman, or Angra-Mainyas, is the cause of every thing evil, and dwells in the densest darkness. The inscriptions of Darius mention the good principle, under the name of Aura, or Auramazda: the evil principle they do not mention, but it may be that the omission is accidental. Plato and Aristotle knew both the principles, as well as several of the subordinate spirits ranging under each principle.

On the relation between these two fundamental principles, Ormuzd and Ahriman, depends the whole visible world, its origin, the course of its history, and its end. The cosmology of the Parsees is somewhat differently held by the different sects. An elaborate representation of it is found only in writings from a later period. We give
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below the most common, and probably, also, the oldest, version of it which was known to Plutarch, at least in all its principal features.

From the very beginning, Ormuzd and Ahriman dwelt in perfect light, the one in complete darkness; but between them was an interval of empty space. Somehow, however, Ahriman discovered the existence of Ormuzd; and, full of wrath, he rushed against him to destroy him.

By virtue of his omniscience, Ormuzd was aware of the existence and movements of Ahriman; and he also knew that the contest with him would present formidable difficulties. The victory was, indeed, very doubtful; as the two principles were of equal strength, and each of them perfect in its own way. But while it is in the character of Ormuzd to think first, and then to act, it is in the character of Ahriman to act first, and then to think. Ormuzd, after taking a survey of his means of contest, saw that he could secure victory by protracting the contest. He then began creating spirits, or beings suitable for his purpose; and Ahriman immediately took up a corresponding effort. Three thousand years thus passed away. Then Ormuzd persuaded Ahriman to make a truce with him for nine thousand years; but hardly had the contract been concluded, before Ahriman understood its true bearing, and, seized with despair, he rushed down into the depths of darkness, and there he remained for three thousand years, dumb and idle. During this whole period Ormuzd continued creating; first the heaven, then the water, finally the earth with the trees, the cattle, and the human race. He was aided by the spirits he had first created (Bahman, the protector of all living beings; Ardibihist, the spirit of fire; Sharévar, the spirit of the metals; Spendarmat, the spirit of the earth; Chordad and Amerdád, the spirits of the waters and the trees), while the corresponding spirits created by Ahriman (Aco-man, Andar, Saval, Nkoghaiihtya, Taritéh, and Zaritéh) were doing their utmost to disturb him.

But Ahriman had no truly creative power. He could produce only the negations of Ormuzd's works. Thus when Ormuzd created the stars, four hundred and eighty-six thousand in number, and arranged them like an army to defend heaven (Tistär in the east, Sa'tevé in the west, Vanant in the south, Haptoirang in the north, and Mes-gáh in the middle), Ahriman created evil stars to counteract them, and placed Tir against Tistär, Ormuzdz (Jupiter) against Vanant, Anáhid against Sa'tevé, Behram (Mars) against Haptoirang, and Kevan (Saturn) against Mes-gáh. When the earth was done, it was lowered from heaven, and suspended as a kind of outpost in the empty space between the realms of Ormuzd and Ahriman. Meanwhile the latter awakened from his stupor, and saw with amazement what had happened, but determined to risk the last blow in succumbing. He bored a hole through the earth, and appeared on its surface. Ustieré and Gayomard, the first two human beings created, could not withstand him, but were utterly destroyed. Ormuzd then created Meshia and Meshiane; but they, too, fell a prey to the temptation of Ahriman; the earth, sleep, old age, sickness, and death were the result of their fall. Thus the earth became the true arena on which takes place the great contest between Ormuzd and Ahriman; but, however fearful this contest may be, there can be no question, that when the nine thousand years of the truce have run out, and the great battle begins, the power of Ormuzd will have increased so much that he will easily overthrow Ahriman.

For twelve thousand years the world shall last. Of this period the first quarter is taken up with the creation; the second reaches from the completion of the creation to the appearance of Ormuzd on the earth; and the third, from that moment to the birth of the great prophet of Parseeism, Zarathustra, or Zoroaster. This third quarter is the heroic or mythical age of Parseeism. Serpents, dragons, and evil kings — Dahak, Zohak, Afrasiab, and others — are poured down upon the earth by Ahriman; and Ormuzd is hardly able to counteract the effect by the creation of great heroes, such as Jenjib, Feridan, Caicobad, and others. To send his great prophet he dares not: the power of Ahriman is still too great. Not until the opening of the third quarter Zoroaster imitating him. He then presented himself before the king, Vishtás; and, by the miracles he wrought, he succeeded in gaining the king and his court over to the new doctrine. The accounts, however, of Zoroaster, are wholly legendary, and give not the smallest evidence with respect to time and place. Persian theologians simply tell us that Zoroaster was born three thousand years before the occurrence of the last judgment; and when foreign historians place him five thousand years before the Trojan War, or six hundred years before Xerxes, they have as little historical basis to support their stories. Vishtás is by some been identified with Hystaspes, the father of Darius; but the supposition is very little probable. The immediate result, however, of the appearance of Zoroaster is described as being very great; for the divine word which he brings along with him is a weapon which has the same effect on the supernatural adherents of Ahriman, the Devs, as natural weapons have on natural bodies. After the appearance of Zoroaster, the Devs are unable to assume an earthly body: they can act only invisibly. There are now, also, other ways in which Ormuzd can fight against Ahriman. Every thousandth year he shall send a new prophet; — Oshedar, Oshedar-máh, and Sosioth; and though mankind may still have many sore trials to go through, there can be no doubt that in the last moment, when the mountains sink, the ocean roars with streams of molten metals, and the whole earth is on fire, Ahriman will be utterly overthrown, and Ormuzd will gather the whole human race into the eternal light where he dwells.

The practical bearing of this theoretical construction is clear and decisive. Living on the earth, where sin, sleep, old age, sickness, and death are the result of their fall, Ormuzd and Ahriman, man is not allowed to remain neutral. He must make his choice.
be choose Ormuzd, it is not impossible that he may become very unhappy in life for Ahriman's power on earth is very great; and for the very same reason he may become very happy in life, though he chooses Ahriman. But the end of life is not the end of him. Three days after his death, judgement will be against him on earth. His good and evil deeds will be weighed in the balance. If there is an overweight of good, he will pass directly across the bridge Jinvad into Paradise; but, if there is an overweight of evil, the bridge will prove so narrow and steep, that he will become dizzy, and tumble down into the depths of darkness, where Ahriman and the Devas will receive him with laughter and scorn, and torture him until the day of the final judgment comes.

In his choice, however, the Parsee is not left without the necessary guidance. His sacred book, Avesta, contains the commandments of Ormuzd, by obedience to which he will soon find himself on the right path. First, he must believe in Ormuzd; and he must prove his belief, not only by his words, but also by his thoughts and actions, avoiding all arrogance and envy, all lying and slander, all unchastity, magic, and vice of any kind. Next, he must show his reverence for the Amsharpons by protecting those creations in which they live,—Bahman, by keeping sacred all clean living beings; Ardibihisht, by maintaining the fire; Sharevar, by preserving the metals pure; Chordad and Amerdad, by taking care of the trees and the waters. Nor must he neglect the still more subordinate spirits, but aid them in their working by his own doing. To gather a fortune by useful activity, to raise cattle, to make waste land fertile, to destroy serpents and weeds, and other vicious animals and plants, are meritorious works, which contribute to the extension of the realm of Ormuzd. But more especially he must always keep himself clean. Of all uncleanness, contamination by a corpse is the worst. As soon as the soul has left the body, evil spirits take possession of it; and any one who comes in contact with a corpse suffers guilt, generally consisting simply in ablations, but sometimes requiring ceremonies which cannot be properly performed without the assistance of a priest. It is, however, not enough to keep the body clean: also the soul must be preserved pure. Evil thoughts and passions are, indeed, nothing more or less than Drujas, a sort of evil spirits, less powerful than the seven Devas, which Ahriman has succeeded in introducing in the human soul. The way by which they enter is always some evil action; and the only means by which they may be expelled are free and open confession to a priest of the sin committed, and proper fulfilment of the penance he enjoins, which often consists in killing a certain number of vicious animals, but often, also, in saying a certain number of prayers. The Avesta, however, does not simply give a system of personal morals: it contains a complete code of civil law, based upon the two fundamental ordinances, to tell the truth, and to keep one's word. To tell a lie, and to break a promise, are still, in our times, by the Parsees considered as almost inexcusable crimes. Hence the reason why they everywhere occupy so respected and so influential a position in society. Of all contracts, marriage is considered the most sacred; and, probably on account of the great pride of the ancient Persian families, the best form of marriage is that between very near relatives. For the dead it is the duty of the Parsee to pray during the three days intervening between the death and the judgment. General prayers are also offered up for the dead during the last ten days of the year, as it is generally believed, that during that term the dead are allowed to revisit the earth.

Between Ormuzd and the spirit-world on the one side, and man on the other, the priest acts as a kind of mediator. Formerly the priesthood most probably belonged to one certain tribe; but at present it is not inherited, but acquired. The priest shall know the law by heart. He is ordained with many ceremonies, and his principal duty is to celebrate service every day. The service begins at midnight, the moment at which the spirits of darkness exercise their highest power, and lasts until morning. It consists of three parts: first, hymns, and offering of sacrifices; then hymns, and recitation of portions of the law; and, finally, hymns and prayers. As sacrifices are offered small breads, called Darun, of the size of a dollar, and covered with a piece of meat, incense, and Haoma or Hom, the juice of a plant unknown to strangers. The Darun and the Hom are afterwards eaten by the priest. Besides celebrating service, it is also the duty of the priest to confess his flock. It is, indeed, the duty of each Parsee family to have a confessor among the priests, to whom one-tenth of the income of the family shall be paid. The young Parsee becomes a member of the congregation when he is fifteen years old: after a preparatory instruction by the priest, he undergoes an examination, performs certain ceremonies, and then receives the sacred cord, the so-called Costi, which he never puts off any more.

The Parsees acknowledge that their sacred books such as they now exist are not complete. The teachings they contain were in old times rarely put down in writing, but simply confided to the memory; and, though it is now possible to understand how parts of them could be lost during the whirlwind which Alexander brought down upon Persia. What has remained falls into two groups,—an older and a younger. The older group contains, besides some minor collections of prayers and hymns, the Avesta; which again consists of the two liturgical works, Vispered and Yacna, and the law-book, Vendidad. These three books are sometimes put together in parts, such as they are used in the divine service, and sometimes separately, each provided with a translation, and with glosses, called Zend. The proper name of the book would consequently be Avesta and Zend, and not Zendavesta. The younger group contains, besides the older books translated into Pehlevi, a Persian dialect spoken under the Sasanides, the Bundehesh, a treatise on the creation, the Bahmanyascht, a treatise on the resurrection, the Minokhirod, a dialogue on moral questions, and the Arda-Viraf-name, a Persian transcription of the apocryphal ascension of Isaiah. The oldest translations of the Avesta are the French by Anquetil du Perron, Paris, 1771, and the German by Kleuker, Riga, 1776. The latest translations are the German by Spiegel (Leipzig, 1852-62,
more probable explanation of the origin of the sect may be found with Neander in the intercourse of Jews with Christians. It is, however, best to look to Palestine for their origin; the Trinity. Frederick II., in his law against Mediolan. 41), the excommunication which the archbishop of Milan pronounced upon the opponents of Pope Anacletus in 1133 was the occasion of high rank increased his dissatisfaction, and the carriagewas left behind on the bridge of Neuilly, when the horses ran over into the river, and the carriage was left behind on the bridge, is not to be regarded as having had much influence on his conversion. The strange document which was found, after his death, carefully wrapped up, and sewed in his coat, dated his conversion on Nov. 25, 1654. The document was designed to keep him always mindful of the divine grace which had impressed him so powerfully that night. A sermon by Singlin (Dec. 8) confirmed him in his new purpose; and at his death, which was determined to secure peace of heart by a severe ascetic discipline. Without assuming monastic vows, he resided at Port Royal, renounced....
censing the world, practising a strict discipline of fasting, nocturnal church attendance, wearing a girdle of thorns, etc., and enjoying the respect of all.

In the contest against Port Royal, which broke out after the Pope's condemnation, on May 31, 1653, of the five articles of Jansenism, Pascal took the side of Port Royal, and became its bold and wily advocate. On March 23, 1656, his first Provincial letter (Lettre écrite à un Provincial par un de ses amis) appeared, and was followed by seventeen others. They were, in the best sense of the word, tracts for the times; for, when Pascal was writing the first, he did not think of any others. Put in the form of a dialogue, and written in a lively style, they unmasked to the public the inconsistencies and weakness of the Jesuits' code of ethics. They were earnest in tone, and free from all scrurrility, and in this particular furnish contrast to the famous Epistolae obscurorum virorum. The authorship of the letters was not concealed for a long time under the pseudonym of Montalte. The letters were scattered far and wide. Their publication was forbidden, but the police strove in vain to stop the circulation. In the first three letters, Pascal defended the theological tenets of Arnauld; but in the fourth, reminded by a friend that a severe theological controversy would soon weary the reader, he passed over to a tilt with Jesuitism, and struck it at its most vulnerable point,—its moral principles, and their danger to the state. The depth of his nature and the strength of his Christian convictions are attested by thousands of passages in his Pensées, from those flashes of thought, acute observation of human nature and its needs, multitudes have drawn spiritual comfort, strength, and hope. He broke a new path for the defence of Christianity by emphasizing its adaptation to the needs of the human heart, and bringing out its ethical element. He is one of those rare religious characters whom both Catholics and Protestants love to claim; and his defence of Christianity is, to use the fine words of Neander, "a witness to that religious conviction which is founded in immediate perception, and is elevated above all reflection."

LIT. — Complete edition of Pascal's works by BOSUT, La Haye, 1779, 5 vols.; later editions, Paris, 1819, 1858, 1868, 1894, etc. The Provincial Letters at first appeared under the title Lettres écrites à un provincial par un de ses amis sur la doctrine des Jesuits, 1656 (no place), and later under the title Les Provinciales ou les lettres écrites par Louis de Montalte, Cologne, 1657, innumerable editions since. Latin translation by WINDROCK, 1658, Spanish by G. R. CORDERO, Italian by Cosimo BRUNETTI, German by Hartmann, 1850, English by Royston, 1657. The Pensées sur la Religion were published in 1670 (1697?) but, to soothe the Jesuits, with some changes. The original text was published by FAUERER, Paris, 1844, 2 vols. Innumerable editions have appeared, including those of CONDORCET, 1778, VOLTARE (with notes), 1778, ROCHER, 1873, J. DE SOYRES, English notes, Canbridge, 1880; Eng. trans. of Thoughts and Provincial Letters, by WIGHT, New York, 2 vols.

In 1728 Pascal's conversations with De Sacy about Montaigne and Epictetus were published. The literature about Pascal is very large. Lives by GILBERT PERIER, 1884; REUCHLIN: Pascal's Leben, etc., Stuttgart, 1840 (reliable); St. BEUVE: Port Royal, Paris, 1842-48, vols. ii. iii. (able, accurate, and elegant); MAYNARD, Paris, 1858; VENET: Études sur R. P., Paris, 1856 (Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1856); in the history of thought works of ENGEL, 1844, 5 vols.; in the History of Ethics works of ENGEL, 1844, 5 vols.; in the History of the 19th cent. works of H. WEINGARTEN: 2 vols. of Pascal als Apologist d. Christentums, Leipzig, 1863.
The passion, these two days, Friday and Sunday, would have an augmented significance, and the Lord's Supper was generally regarded as inappropriate to it. Every week was made to bear the impress of the week in which the Saviour was crucified. At the annual anniversary of our Lord's death the Christian festivals are known as the "Paschal Controversies." There is no doubt that Jesus died on the 14th of Nisan, according to John, he died on the 14th, "the preparation of the passover" (John xix. 14, 31). The attempts to reconcile this difference have proved unsatisfactory for the unprejudiced exegete. In the second century this difference was proved unsatisfactory for the unprejudiced exegete. In the second century this difference was unsatisfactory for the unprejudiced exegete. In the second century this difference was unsatisfactory for the unprejudiced exegete. In the second century this difference was unsatisfactory for the unprejudiced exegete. In the second century this difference was unsatisfactory for the unprejudiced exegete.
on which Christ died, because the Paschal lamb was the type of Christ’s sacrifice.

When, in the year 190 (according to Lipsius, 155), Polycarp of Smyrna visited Anicetus, bishop of Rome, the question of the passover was discussed. Anicetus could not persuade Polycarp to relinquish the observance of the 14th of Nisan as the day of the passover; the latter referring, in his justification, to the example of the apostle John, who had celebrated the passover on the 14th, and added that he himself had studied up the Scriptures, and would not be intimidated by Rome. Victor declared the Oriental churches heterodox, broke communion with them, and attempted to induce the other churches to do the same. Irenæus and many other bishops declared against this course. Victor was unsuccessful in influencing the other churches to follow him, and the rupture confined itself to Rome and Ephesus.

Between 160 and 190 there was another controversy, which fell in 170, and was confined to the churches of Asia Minor. Eusebius (IV. 26, 8) speaks of a “great controversy about the passover in Laodicea.” Melito and Apollinaris wrote about it, but only fragments of their writings are preserved.

The difference between Rome and the churches of Asia Minor is thus described by Eusebius (V. 29):

“The churches of all Asia believed, upon the basis of older traditions, that the passover of the Saviour was to be celebrated on the fourteenth day of the month, on which the Jews were enjoined to offer the lamb; so that the fast might be terminated on this day, no matter on what particular day of the week it fell. The other churches of the world did not adopt this practice, but held fast to the practice founded upon apostolic tradition, and still in vogue, that it was not fitting to break the fast on any day but the day of the resurrection.”

The synods, with the exception of that of Asia Minor, declared that the festival of the resurrection was only to be kept on a Sunday, and that not till that day was the Paschal fasting to be concluded.

From the above it is evident, that, as the churches of Asia Minor concluded their fasting on the 14th of Nisan, this day was regarded as the anniversary of the Lord’s death. This conclusion is confirmed by the later accounts of the Quartodecimans (the Fourteeners; that is, those who commemorated the Lord’s death on the 14th). Epiphanius states further (Her., L. 1), that the churches of Asia Minor continued only during a single day. The majority of the synods fixed the celebration by the day of the week (Friday) on which the crucifixion occurred; the churches of Asia Minor, by the day of the month of the Jewish passover.

The case was different with the Laodicene controversy of 170. Apollinaris, Clement, and Hippolytus opposed a party, which, proceeding upon the assumption that Jesus ate the Paschal meal on the 14th, and was crucified on the 15th, celebrated a feast on the 14th in commemoration of the last passover. These Quartodecimans, these three Fathers agree in opposing; on the ground that the true Paschal lamb suffered on the 14th. This party, although orthodox, had Jewish sympathies, and referred more especially to the Gospel of Matthew, the Gospel which the Ebionites used. It aroused the heated controversy at Laodicea, in which Melito of Sardis, and Apollinaris of Hierapolis, took part. A certain Blatius, who, Tertullian says (De praecr., 53), wanted to smuggle in Judaistic practices, transplanted the party to Rome, and secured a following (Eus., V. 15). The increase of these schismatic Quartodecimans undoubtedly formed the occasion of Hippolytus’ treatment of them in his Refutation of all Heresies. Baur, Hilgenfeld, and others falsely assert that the distinction between Christian and Judaizing Quartodecimans is an arbitrary one. The Laodicene discussion was only a passing act in the great passover controversy, and the Roman Church succeeded in securing a representative for its views in Apollinaris. The churches of Asia Minor continued to cling to the old Christian Paschal celebration as it had been introduced by John. It must be remarked (1) That every attempt to reconcile the fragments of the Paschal writings which have been preserved, and the notices about the practice of the churches of Asia Minor, has failed, so that the Laodicene discussion was not a mere passing act; (2) The Tubingene school goes upon the false assumption, that John, after Paul’s death, and in a hostile spirit, introduced the Judaistic practice; and (3) That the celebration of the Eucharist in Asia Minor was marked by features which distinguished it from the usual celebration in the church, and was more nearly like the celebration in the church of the first days, etc.

The church at large, appealing to the testimony of Peter and Paul, saw an approach to the Judaistic mode of observance in the practice of the churches of Asia Minor. The more intense the conflict of the Gentile churches was with Ebionism, the more keen was its vision to spy out Judaizing tendencies. The observance of the 14th of Nisan was beyond dispute, the only ground of this charge; and historians failed to observe that the spirit of the Paschal celebration in Asia Minor was as much at variance with Judaizing Christianity as was that of Rome.

In consequence of this divergence, and other differences in the time of observing the passover feast (the Romans putting the day of the sacrifice, the Christian churches agreeing to the new ordinances. (See EASTER.) In spite of the decree of the council, many Oriental congregations held to the old prac-
tice. The synod of Antioch (341) punished its advocates with excommunication. In the canons of the councils of Laodicea (364) and Constantinople (381) they were called τον αφότου βασίλειος, or Quartodeciman or "Fourteeners." In the fifth century, Peter, bishop of Alexandria (d. 311), had a controversy with a Quartodeciman, Theodosius. The latter rejected the accusation of Judaizing when he said, "We intend nothing else than to commemorate the passion of our Lord, and at the very time which the early eye-witnesses have handed down." Epiphanius distinguished three factions. Theodore, in the fifth century (Harett. Fabul., III. 4), states that the Quartodecimans "say that John the evangelist, when he was preaching in Asia Minor, taught them to observe the 14th; but, as they misunderstood the apostolic tradition, they do not wait for the day of the resurrection, but commemorate the Lord's passion on Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday, or any other day on which the 14th of Nisan might fall. The Quartodecimans seem to have completely disappeared in the sixth century. For the further history and celebration, see Easter.


G. E. STEITZ. (WAGENMANN.)

PASCHALIS. In the name of two popes and two archbishops, Paschalis, antipope, is ignored as a schismatic in the list of Jukes, but was chosen bishop of Rome in September, 687. Knowing that the infirmities of Pope Conon indicated the speedy termination of his life, he prevailed, by a bribe upon John, Exarch of Ravenna, to instruct his officials at Rome to vote for him as Conon's successor. A second candidate, Theodoras, was elected at the same time. The majority of the clergy finally agreed upon Sergius I., who was consecrated Dec. 15, 687; and Paschalis was shut up in a cloister, where he is said to have survived five years. See Muratori: Reg. Pontif.; Sybel: D. Schenkungen d. Karolingern; Steitz: D. Differens d. Occidentaiten u. d. Kleinaiaiten, in Stud. u. Kritiken, 1856 (pp. 751 sqq.), and arts. against Dr. Baur, in Studien und Kritiken, 1857 (pp. 772 sqq.) and 1859; Steitz: D. Differentia d. Occidentaiten u. d. Kleinaiaiten, in Stud. u. Kritiken, 1856 (pp. 751 sqq.), and arts. against Dr. Baur, in Studien und Kritiken, 1857 (pp. 772 sqq.) and 1859; Schübler: De controvo. paschalibus, 1869; Renan: L'église chrétienne, pp. 445 sqq.; [the Church Histories of Neander and Schaff (revised edition, vol. ii., 1883, pp. 209-220, where a different view is presented; art. "Paschal Controversy," in Smith and Cheetham: Dict. of Chr. Antiq.].
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Chartres and Peter of Porto thought the Pope had gone too far. The strict Gregorian party demanded the annulment of the concessions and the excommunication of Henry V.; but Paschalis remained true to his oath. The synod of Vienna of Sept. 18, 1112, and other synods, excommunicated the emperor. In 1117 Henry again marched upon Rome to take measures to prevent the gift of Mathilde of Canossa failing to the papacy, and to again treat about his right of investiture; fearing the Pope would give way. Paschalis fled from the city, and his death soon after his return stopped any further measures against the emperor. He was a man of religious earnestness and high ideals, but was destitute of firmness. See Vita a Petro Pisano, in Watterich, Pontific. Rom. rite, ii. 1 sqq.; JAFFÉ: Reg. Pontif. Rom. His letters are found in Migne, vol. 163; HASSE: Anselm von Canterbury, Hevele: Concilien gesch., vol. v.; GERVASI: Polit. Gesch. Deutschlands unter d. Re- gierung Heinrich V. u. Lothar III., Leipzig, 1841; Griesbrecht: Gesch. d. deutschen Kaiserzeit, 2d part, 4th ed., Braunschweig, 1857. — Paschalis, anti-pope (1161-68). See ALEXANDER III., p. 51. R. ZOEPFFEL.

PASCHASIUS, Radbertus. See RADBERTUS.

PASQUALIS, Martinez, b. in Provence in 1715; d. in St. Domingo in 1776. He was of Jewish origin, and the Cabala was the source from which he drew his ideas. He introduced cabalistic rites in several of the Masonic lodges in France, and finally developed them into a kind of theology, by the aid of which he pretended to be able to work miracles. He stated in Paris from 1768 to 1778, and formed a kind of sect called the "Martinista." One of his principal disciples, Louis Claude de St. Martin, was a quite prolific author. Perhaps the most characteristic of his works are Des erreurs et de la vérité, Lyons, 1782; L'esprit des choses, Paris, 1800, 2 vols.; L'homme de désir, new edition, Metz, 1802.


PASION-PLAYS. See RELIGIOUS DRAMAS.

PASION-WEEK. See HOLY WEEK.

PASIONIE, Dominic, b. at Fossombrone, Dec. 2, 1682; d. near Rome, July 5, 1761. He entered the service of the church; was used in various diplomatic missions, and was in 1738 made a cardinal, and librarian of the Vatican. He published Acta apostolica legationis Helenaec, Züg, 1724; and after his death his letters and his collection of inscriptions were published. — Inscript. Antiq., Luca, 1765.

PASIONISTI, The, or members of the Congregation of the Holy Cross and Passion of the Saviour (Congregatio clericorum ex coalitum SS. Crucis et Passionis), are an order of the Roman-Catholic Church, dating from the eighteenth century. The founder, Paolo della Croce (b. at Ovada in Piedmont, Jan. 3, 1694, d. in Rome, Oct. 3, 1755), was bishop of Ovada. At first fired with enthusiasm for military pursuits, he devoted himself to a religious life, and, with the sanction of the bishop of Alexandria, founded in 1729 the Order of the Cross, and in 1727 was consecrated priest. The first establishment of the new congregation was founded on Monte Argentario: the second, at Orbitello in Tuscany, etc. Benedict XIV., in 1741, sanctioned the order; and Clement XIV., in 1769, sanctioned it again. The latter pope sent a special letter to the founders, whose zealous missionary labors and penitential severity had won for him the fame of unusual sanctity. The object of the order is to preserve and propagate the memory of Christ's atoning passion and death. The members wear a black robe with the name of Christ printed on the left side, and a small heart, over which is a white cross. — PIUS IX. canonized Paolo della Croce on May 1, 1857. See D. M. Paul v. Kreuze Leben, Regensb., 1846; PIUS A SPIRITU SANTO: Life of St. Paul of the Cross, Dublin, 1868. ZÖCKLER.

PASSEVER, The, one of the three principal festivals of the Jews, is designated by the Hebrew word Pessah (ָפָסָחָ), which was also used of the lamb offered, and is derived from a verb meaning "to pass by." "To pass over" The Bible connects it with the exodus of Israel from Egypt. At the command of the Lord the people on that occasion killed and ate a lamb, striking the blood on the doorposts as a protection against the destroying angel (Exod. xii. 3-10). At that time the annual repetition of the custom was instituted. The laws governing its observance are preserved by the Elohist writer in Exod. xii. 1-20, 42-51; Lev. xxiii. 5-14; Num. ix. 10-14; xxviii. 16-25.

Celebration. — The celebration of the passover was put in the month of the exodus (Nisan). Every head of a family was commanded to choose, on the 10th of the month, a male lamb or goat, without blemish, and to kill it on the 14th, "between the two evenings" (Exod. xii. 6, margin). The Karaites and Samaritans explain the last expression to mean between sunset and darkness; the Pharisees, between three o' clock and sunset; Raschi and Kimchi, of the time just before and after sunset. The lamb was roasted, and eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. No bone was to be broken, and no parts were either to be removed from the house, or left over to the next day. The meal was to be taken in haste, the partakers having their loins girded, shoes on their feet, and staff in their hand (Exod. xii. 11). Only the circumcised could partake of the meal. This meal introduced the seven days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. From the 15th to the 21st, leavened bread was forbidden, on penalty of ex- termination. The first and last days were great holidays, on which no work was done, and people gathered for worship. Connected with this feast was the offering of the sheaf of the first-fruits (Lev. xxiii. 10 sqq.), which does not mean crushed grains of wheat, as Josephus supposes (Ant., III. 10, 5). The use of the harvest was, after this offering had been made. The Jehovist document contains accounts of the passover in Exod. xii. 21-39, xiii. 3-16. Here, likewise, the institution of the feast is connected with the exodus; and the failure to leaven the bread is explained as a result of the haste. Deuteronomy also gives an account of the pass- over (xvi. 1 sqq.), which is shorter than that of the Elohist, but presupposes more extensive regul
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lations. Distinct mention is made of only a few passovers in the historical books of the Old Testament, although there can be no doubt that the passover was the principal feast after the time of Moses. Moreover, it is plain that the Mosaic ordinances respecting it were not always rigidly obeyed (2 Chron. xxxv. 26). The faith of all Israel, from "Dan to Beersheba," to observe it, was, at least in part, due to the political troubles of the period. We have mention of the first passover celebrated after the crossing of the Jordan (Josh. v. 10), and two others are specially mentioned before the period of the exile. In the notice of the one under Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxx. 26), it is stated that such a feast had not been celebrated in Jerusalem since the days of Solomon, by which the length and ostentation of the festivities are meant, the feast lasting fourteen days. In the notice of the other passover, under Josiah, the same historian observes (2 Chron. xxxv. 18), that no such passover had been kept since the days of Samuel. He means by this, as a comparison of 2 Kings xxiii. 21 sqq shows, that in no case had the legal regulations been so strictly kept.

Meaning — The passover was at once an agricultural festival of thanksgiving and an historical anniversary. It was a feast of consecration at the beginning of harvest (Deut. xvi. 9), and an anniversary in honor of the emancipation from Egypt by the divine hand. Some modern scholars, like Hupfeld, Schultz, and Wellhausen, hold that the historical idea had a secondary place, and was associated with the harvest festival at a later period, and look upon the lamb as having been, in the first instance, an offering of the first-born, on the part of the shepherds. But this is mere assumption. All the accounts dating from Moses give no indication of any such idea, and agree in associating the passover with the exodus; and the unleavened bread is distinctly referred to, not as an offering of the first-fruits of the ground (Exod. xxiii. 19), but as the "bread of affliction," to remind the people of the Egyptian servitude. The sacrifice, the lamb, this would give a throng of nearly 3,000,000 in attendance upon the feast. The pilgrims could not find room in the city, and were obliged to resort to the surrounding towns, or live in tents. The time of celebrating the feast depended upon the condition of the harvest. If the fruits of the field were not far enough advanced in the middle of the twelfth month to seem to justify the harvest a month later, the twelfth month was regarded as an intercalary month, and a thirteenth month was added. The Sanhedrin announced when the Paschal month began as soon as the new moon had been seen, and the news was spread through the country by means of fire-signal. But when the Samaritans began to deceive the Jews by false signals, the news was communicated by messengers. The lambs were killed in the afternoon of the 14th of Nisan, at half-past two, and offered to the Lord, with prayers and offices, in the forecourt of the temple. For this reason the passover feast attracted an immense concourse of people to Jerusalem; — a fact which gave rise to great fear of, and precautions on the part of the Romans against, national revolts at this season of the year (Matt. xxvi. 5; Josephus, Ant., XVII. 9, 3, XX. 5, 3). The custom which the governor practised, of giving up a prisoner, was designed to make a favorable impression upon the Jews, and quiet them. A terrible fate overtook the people at the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, when they were shut in, and involved in its horrors. Josephus (Bell. Jud., VI. 9, 3) states, that a few years previous, the Paschal lambs were counted at the solicitation of Cestius, and found to number 255,500. Reckoning ten men to a lamb, this would give a throng of nearly 3,000,000 in attendance upon the feast. The priests could not find room in the city, and were obliged to resort to the surrounding towns, or live in tents. The time of celebrating the feast depended upon the condition of the harvest. If the fruits of the field were not far enough advanced in the middle of the twelfth month to seem to justify the harvest a month later, the twelfth month was regarded as an intercalary month, and a thirteenth month was added. The Sanhedrin announced when the Paschal month began as soon as the new moon had been seen, and the news was spread through the country by means of fire-signals. But when the Samaritans began to deceive the Jews by false signals, the news was communicated by messengers. The lambs were killed in the afternoon of the 14th of Nisan, at half-past two, and offered an hour later. If the day was the preparation of the sabbath, the killing began an hour earlier. The priests received the blood in silver vessels, and poured it upon the altar, and put the pieces to be offered up in another vessel. Then the Levites began to sing the Hallel. Not less than ten, seldom more than twenty, men partook of one lamb. The Talmud enjoined that each party should eat a portion, at least as large as an olive. Josephus and the Mishna assume that women also partook of the meal, but according to the Gemara they were not obligated to do so. After the first cup was drunk, the first-born son asked for an explanation of the passover ceremonies, whereupon followed a detailed account of their institution (Exod. xii. 26 sq., xiii. 5). The company then started to sing the first two psalms, drank the second cup followed by two others, and then completed the Hallel. It was after this that our Lord went out and sang a hymn with his disciples (Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 20).
PASTORAL LETTERS.

[The Samaritans still celebrate the passover at the same time as the Jews did; namely, on the full moon of Nisan. Dean Stanley, who witnessed the rites in 1862, describes the scene in a note appended to vol. i. of his Jewish Church. The community of Nabâs, numbering a hundred and fifty-two individuals, gathered on Mount Gerizim, a few hundred feet below its summit. At sunset the assembly broke up. Dean; and, after the chanting of some praises and prayers, six sheep were driven into their midst. The history of the exod was then recited, after which the sheep were killed, and the noses and foreheads of the children touched with the blood. The parties then all saluted one another with a kiss, and the sheep were fleeced, and roasted in holes dug in the ground. After midnight the feast began, and proceeded in silence, and as if in haste. In ten minutes all was consumed but a few remains, which were thrown into the fire, care being taken that none should be left.]


VON ORELLI.

PASTORAL LETTERS are letters addressed by the pastor, the shepherd, to his flock, generally by the bishop to the clergy under his jurisdiction, or to the laity of his diocese, or to both parties at once. At various times and in various places the secular government has claimed the right of exercising a kind of censure over such letters; but the claims have always been met with the most decided protest from the side of the clergy. The term also applies to letters issued by ecclesiastical bodies to the pastors under their jurisdiction, e.g., by a Presbyterian synod.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY. Theology is divided into two parts. — Theoretical and Practical. Under the second division are included Homiletics, Catechetics, Liturgics, and Poiména. Of these subdivisions the first three are treated in other articles under their respective headings: the fourth, Poiména, is the one to be considered here.

The qualifications and the call of the ministry are themes incidental and introductory, and may be passed without discussion, as the proper limits of this article demand. We have to do rather with the practical work of the pastor.

A presbytery, or other ecclesiastical body, in licensing a candidate for the ministry, passes its verdict upon his fitness for the service. That verdict is to be confirmed by the call of a church and congregation to the licentiate to become their pastor: without such a call, or its equivalent in a missionary appointment, the licensure is not to be consummated by ordination. The call of a candidate for the ministry is the one thing — it involves absolute and reciprocal obligations. These obligations are represented, but cannot be fully expressed, much less can they be limited by the terms of the call.

for the church and congregation owe the pastor, and the pastor owes them, more than can be put into any writing. Two things are involved in a contract: one, the sum of some promises and prayers, 'six sheep were driven into their midst. The history of the exodus was then recited, after which the sheep were killed, and the noses and foreheads of the children touched with the blood. The parties then all saluted one another with a kiss, and the sheep were fleeced, and roasted in holes dug in the ground. After midnight the feast began, and proceeded in silence, and as if in haste. In ten minutes all was consumed but a few remnants, which were thrown into the fire, care being taken that none should be left.]

lit. — rochert: hieroiicon, london, 1863 (i. pp. 551 sq.); spencer: de legg. hebraeorum, lips., 1705; hitzig: ostern u. pfingsten, heidelberg, 1838; bachmann: d. festgesetze d. penta-teuchs, 1858. for the later jewish rites; hottinger: juriæ hebrae. leges, zürich, 1855; otho: les rabbin. phil.; ewald: [antiquities of the old testament]; oehler: [theology of the old testament, n.y., 1883; stanley: hist. of the jewish church, vol. i.; e. schurer: üebet jüd. gewohnh. t. demos, john xviii. 28, gisscn, 1883.]

von orelli.

pastoral letters are letters addressed by the pastor, the shepherd, to his flock, generally by the bishop to the clergy under his jurisdiction, or to the laity of his diocese, or to both parties at once. at various times and in various places the secular government has claimed the right of exercising a kind of censure over such pastoral letters; but the claims have always been met with the most decided protest from the side of the clergy. the term also applies to letters issued by ecclesiastical bodies to the pastors under their jurisdiction, e.g., by a presbyterian synod.

pastoral theology. theology is divided into two parts. — theoretical and practical. under the second division are included homiletics, catechetics, liturgics, and poiména. of these subdivisions the first three are treated in other articles under their respective headings: the fourth, poiména, is the one to be considered here.

the qualifications and the call of the ministry are themes incidental and introductory, and may be passed without discussion, as the proper limits of this article demand. we have to do rather with the practical work of the pastor.

a presbytery, or other ecclesiastical body, in licensing a candidate for the ministry, passes its verdict upon his fitness for the service. that verdict is to be confirmed by the call of a church and congregation to the licentiate to become their pastor: without such a call, or its equivalent in a missionary appointment, the licensure is not to be consummated by ordination. the call of a candidate for the ministry is the one thing — it involves absolute and reciprocal obligations. these obligations are represented, but cannot be fully expressed, much less can they be limited by the terms of the call;
llest they disqualify for genial and effective converse with the common people. The scholarly must be qualified by the christly, then the small courtesies, which are of such value in the commerce of society, will not be neglected, and love will make the pastor a gentleman, welcome to every household and heart.

There is an old saying, as trite as true, “A house-going minister makes a church-going people.” The work of pastoral visitation must be systematized. A “calling-book” should be kept in which, with the name of each family, the names of the children should be recorded. The date of each call should be noted, so that the pastor can learn at any time where his next calls should be made. Only in this way can thoroughness, regularity, and impartiality be secured in the visitation of the people. The pastor in these calls should not be always preaching; for a minister who is always preaching, never really preaches. The aim should be to enter into the sympathies of the people, to know their home-life, and to win their confidence and affection.

Besides this general visitation there should be special calls made upon the sick and the afflicted. The tenderness and the sympathy of Christ as toward the suffering, and the words of promise, of counsel, and of comfort with which the Bible abounds, will suggest to the true pastor how he should minister among the sick and the sorrowing. Such calls should be short and frequent, and the words spoken should be few and careful.

Other special calls must be made to reach particular cases of spiritual need. As soon as may be, the pastor should inform himself concerning the spiritual condition of every member of his congregation. His work should begin with the officers of the church, to enlist them in active co-operation; then the membership of the church should be roused to prayer and labor; then Christians outside of the church should be urged no longer to delay confessing Christ. By this method of working from the centre outward, by the time he comes to seek those who are without Christ (beginning with the thoughtful, then approaching the careless, and then the sceptical), the pastor will find that the way has been prepared for him.

Meanwhile the course of preaching should correspond with the course of pastoral labor, beginning at the centre of the church, and working outwards toward those who are farthest from the truth. There will be morbid Christians, given to too much introspection, who make the radical mistake which Hamman has characterized as “the attempt to feel thought, and to comprehend feeling.” Such spiritual egotism can be cured only by Christian work. The morbid Christian must stop feeling his own pulse, and go out into the vineyard, and try to win souls for Christ: there can be no spiritual health and vigor without such work. Hence that pastor will be the most successful, who, instead of trying to do all the work of his parish himself, makes himself the center of the church to which he has been appointed leader.

There are many varieties of temperament, disposition, character, and condition, that the pastor must break from bondage to himself and to his experience, and learn just how, and learn just what, to say and do, and thus make large and generous allowances for differences that come from nature or of education, of antecedent and of present circumstances. In order to this, he must be a many-sided man, always studying in a docile way the endlessly varied manifestations of human nature. He must be stimulated and sustained in his systematic pastoral work, not by natural personal attractions, but by divine motives. He should school himself to see in each soul a special responsibility, for which he must account to Christ. He should see men, not in the common human way, but as made in the image of God, and as redeemed by the blood of the Son of God. This will make the pastor impartial, and faithful to all; and so his parochial work will not depend upon fitful impulses, but will be sustained by the deepest and divinest principles.

There are special relations which the pastor sustains to the officers of the church and congregation and to the heads or leaders in the organized work of the parish. The trustees, or those in charge of the secular interests of the congregation, may seek counsel of him, and then he should give it; but he should not interfere with them, always recognizing the principle that business men should manage the business interests of the parish. The pastor’s relations to the spiritual officers of the church should be cordial and confidential. He should not dictate to them, but rather counsel with them, treating them with studied respect and consideration, while maintaining his personal independence.

As to the heads or leaders in the organized work of the church, the general rule is, that the pastor should be loyal to their leadership, and should show respect for the positions they have been appointed to occupy. The sabbath-school should be under the care of the spiritual officers of the church, and the same may be said of the choir, or the conductors of the music. It may be remarked, however, in passing, that it would be an inexcusable egotism in the pastor to demand that the devotional music in the sabbath worship should be adapted only to his individual taste and culture, and not rather to the average taste and culture of the whole congregation. And of the other relation it may be said, that, for the sabbath-school, teachers should be selected, not primarily with reference to the good they may get by having such work to do, but rather with reference to their competency to do the children good. The sabbath-school is not a gymnasium for feeble Christians, but rather is it the institution for the religious education of the children of the congregation. Not all good people will make good teachers. The pastor should visit both the choir and the sabbath-school in the spirit of courteous Christian sympathy with the departments of church life there represented.

There may be within the church, organizations for varied Christian work; such as young people’s associations, young men’s Christian associations, Dorcas or self-study societies, foreign and home missionary societies, and to the leaders in these organizations the relations of the pastor are always delicate, and sometimes difficult. It is a question how far it is wise to multiply organizations within the church; since the church is itself the divinely appointed organization as against all evil, and for all good.
Some things must be said with reference to the pastor in his relations to the ordinances of public worship. Here we must not trespass upon the subject of homiletics, elsewhere treated. There is a danger in almost every parish, that the people will demand more frequent calls upon the pastor to make his study and pulpit. There should be a careful division of time between the claims of the study and the demands for household visitation. Five hours a day at least should be kept sacred for reading, study, and writing. During these hours, besides what is required for the preparations for the sabbath, some portion of time should be given to systematic courses of study. The time thus devoted should be protected in all possible ways from unnecessary interruptions. To be a good pastor, a minister must be a good preacher; and the converse is equally true,—to be a good preacher, a minister must be a good pastor. Nothing in the way of activity and zeal can take the place of systematic, close, sustained study; and no amount of study can take the place of systematic, house-to-house visitation. The two departments of work, pulpit and parochial, must not conflict, but be proportionate, harmonious, and mutually subsidiary. There should be preparation in the study, not only for preaching, but also for the other parts of public worship. The Scripture-reading should be, in spirit and manner, instructive and interesting. Reglar courses of reading, continued from sabbath to sabbath, with brief expository hints, may be profitable to both preacher and hearer. The hymns should be selected with care, not merely to enforce the lesson of the sermon, but mainly to kindle and express the devotions of the people. There should be thoughtful preparation for leading the people in prayer, so that the actual condition of the congregation and of the country may be represented in the thanksgivings and supplications of the sanctuary. The benedictions of the church constitute an important part of public worship. The pastor should not only keep himself informed concerning all the aggressive work of the church, so that he can inform his people, but he should study methods of reaching their hearts, so as to make them feel the claims of Christ in all departments of his work. They should be taught, not only that giving is worship, but that, under existing conditions, it is doubtful whether there can be true and acceptable worship unless the offerings of the heart and the lips are accompanied, sometimes at least, by the generous offerings of the hand.

The sacraments of the church involve some special pastoral obligations. As to baptism, the pastor should know the condition and habits of his people. He should know what parents have had their children baptized, and he should kindly and faithfully instruct such parents as to their covenant privileges and obligations. And, with those parents who are neglecting this ordinance for themselves and for their children, he should remonstrate, urging them to the performance of their duty.

As to the Lord's Supper, the pastor should exercise the greatest care, lest, on the one hand, he be the means of admitting to the ordinance those who are not truly regenerated; or, on the other hand, he may repel or restrain those timid and doubting Christians who need that spiritual refreshment which Christ gives only at his table. The celebration of the sacramental feast should be made bright and hopeful. He should strive, at the same time, to foster in his people that using it as a social service, which it was intended to be. To this end the pastor should be a good preacher, or, as it is sometimes called, the conference-meeting, under the sole conduct of the pastor, it is to be feared is fast changing into a mere lecture, and so is losing its social character. It is a question whether it is better that the prayer-meeting should be conducted by the pastor, or by such of the officers and members of the church as have the spirituality, the tact and skill, to make this social service both interesting and profitable. No one method should constrain the liberty of the pastor in this relation: a variety of methods is more conducive to the freshness and effectiveness of this important service. A schedule of topics may be prepared, printed, and distributed, so that the people will know from week to week the theme of the prayer. Questions may be sent in to the pastor to be answered in the prayer-meeting. A course of familiar exposition, if not too long or labored, may be tried with profit. The pastor should be bound by no method, but should impress his people with the deep significance, sacredness, and power of united prayer.

Unselfish consecration, the love of men for Christ's sake, power in the pulpit, tact, tenderness, a profound knowledge of human nature, and a Christlike manliness, are the fundamental necessities to success in pastoral work.

produced by the Crusades; but it is apparent that Paternus Romanus, who spread the heresy of the condemned marriage altogether. The name does not come, as Du Cange supposes, from a certain Paternus Romanus, who spread the heresy of the Cathari in Italy and Bosnia; for then one would have expected the name, which, under the name of pastorales or pastorells, took place several times in France, were no doubt chiefly caused by the excitement produced by the Crusades; but it is apparent that also other causes, such as hatred to the clergy, despair of the miserable state of affairs in general, etc., were at work. When, in 1251, the report reached France that Louis IX. had been taken a prisoner, a former Cistercian, Jacob of Hungary, announced that he was called by God to liberate the king, and placed himself at the head of swarms of peasants and shepherds, boys and girls, whose number soon swelled into several thousand. At first the queen looked with favor upon the movement; but when the swarms began to maltreat the priests, the monks, and the Jews, she was compelled to use armed force against them. Jacob was defeated at Bourges, his adherents were dispersed, and all the leaders decapitated. Half a century later on, in 1320, it was again the report of a new crusade which caused a similar rising in Southern France, under the lead of a deposed priest and a runaway monk. The Jews were massacred, the monasteries were robbed, and at last the swarms began to threaten Avignon, where the Pope and the cardinals promised rich spoil; but then the movement was put down with military force.

Paternes (Patarini, Patareni, Patarelli, etc.), a name given in the eleventh century to the clergy of the order of the Cathari in Italy and Bosnia; for then one would have expected the name, which, under the name of pastorales or pastorells, took place several times in France, were no doubt chiefly caused by the excitement produced by the Crusades; but it is apparent that also other causes, such as hatred to the clergy, despair of the miserable state of affairs in general, etc., were at work. When, in 1251, the report reached France that Louis IX. had been taken a prisoner, a former Cistercian, Jacob of Hungary, announced that he was called by God to liberate the king, and placed himself at the head of swarms of peasants and shepherds, boys and girls, whose number soon swelled into several thousands. At first the queen looked with favor upon the movement; but when the swarms began to maltreat the priests, the monks, and the Jews, she was compelled to use armed force against them. Jacob was defeated at Bourges, his adherents were dispersed, and all the leaders decapitated. Half a century later on, in 1320, it was again the report of a new crusade which caused a similar rising in Southern France, under the lead of a deposed priest and a runaway monk. The Jews were massacred, the monasteries were robbed, and at last the swarms began to threaten Avignon, where the Pope and the cardinals promised rich spoil; but then the movement was put down with military force.

PASTORELLS. Those risings of the lower classes, which, under the name of pastorales or pastorells, took place several times in France, were no doubt chiefly caused by the excitement produced by the Crusades; but it is apparent that also other causes, such as hatred to the clergy, despair of the miserable state of affairs in general, etc., were at work. When, in 1251, the report reached France that Louis IX. had been taken a prisoner, a former Cistercian, Jacob of Hungary, announced that he was called by God to liberate the king, and placed himself at the head of swarms of peasants and shepherds, boys and girls, whose number soon swelled into several thousands. At first the queen looked with favor upon the movement; but when the swarms began to maltreat the priests, the monks, and the Jews, she was compelled to use armed force against them. Jacob was defeated at Bourges, his adherents were dispersed, and all the leaders decapitated. Half a century later on, in 1320, it was again the report of a new crusade which caused a similar rising in Southern France, under the lead of a deposed priest and a runaway monk. The Jews were massacred, the monasteries were robbed, and at last the swarms began to threaten Avignon, where the Pope and the cardinals promised rich spoil; but then the movement was put down with military force.

**PATIENCE**

Patience is that moral power by which the soul preserves its equanimity under all exciting and oppressive circumstances, and freely submits to the unavoidable, with the presentiment that it is a divine dispensation. In the most general sense, patience is the soul's dependence upon itself as the accompanying chalice, and both must be blessed by the bishop.

The virtue of patience very early received a paramount place in the systems of Christian ethics. Thomas Aquinas,
however, in the middle ages, regarded it as a constituent of courage. Protestant students of ethics should properly honor it upon the basis of such passages as Rom. ii. 7, v. 3, viii. 25; Col. iii. 12; 2 Pet. i. 6; Heb. x. 36, xii. 1. As a fruit of Christian faith, patience is the persistence of the believer in a state of sanctification in spite of temptations. Born of Christian love, it proceeds of Christ. It gradually learns to bear all things, endure all things, hope all things, wait contentedly for the coming of the Lord (Ias. v. 7). Its foundation is the Lord's faithfulness. Scriptural songs of patience are found in Ps. xiii., xli., xlii., etc.

PATMOS, a rocky and barren island of the Ægean, twenty-five miles in circumference, and situated near the coast of Asia Minor, between Naxos and Samos. It was used as a place of banishment in the time of the emperors, and the apostle John wrote there his Revelation (Rev. i. 9). The cave in which he lived, where, according to tradition, he had his visions: above it stands now a celebrated Greek monastery, built by Alexius Comnenus. The island is now called "Patmo" or "Patmosa." See GUÉRIN: Description de l'Île de Patmos, Paris, 1838; Tischendorf: Reise ins Morgenland, Leipzig, 1848-49, 2 vols. (ii., 267 sq.), and Commentaries on the Apocalypse.

PATOUILLET, Louis, b. at Dijon, 1899; d. at Avignon, 1779. He entered the Order of the Jesuits, and taught for some time philosophy in their school at Laon. He published an enlarged edition of Colonia's Dictionnaire des Livres Jansenistes, Antwerp, 1752, which was put on the Index: La progrès du Jansénisme, Quiloa, 1758; Histoire du P'cianisme, Avignon, 1783-97, 2 vols.; and was one of the chief editors of the Supplément aux Nouvelles ecclésiastiques et Lettres édifiantes.

PATRIARCH, as a title in the Christian Church, was given in the fourth century as a mark of respect to bishops. For the proofs, see Suicer, Thesaur., 640 sq., and especially Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. 42, 23. It was used in this sense in Gaul as late as the fifth and sixth centuries (Vit. Romani, 2; Gregor. Tur., H. Pr., 5, 21). When the dioceses of Rome and Constantinople, and Jerusalem, asserted authority over the metropolitans, the title was limited to them. The ecclesiastical divisions corresponded to the political division of the Roman Empire,—dioceses, eparchies, and states (civitates). The bishoprics corresponded to the states; and the metropolitan sees, to the eparchies. At first there were no ecclesiastical divisions corresponding to the dioceses, but the metropolitan of the larger cities early began to lay claim to extra authority. Alexandria was the first metropolitan see to attain the position of diocesan or patriarchate authority. The sixth canon of Nicaea recognizes this. In the Meletian schism, the bishop of Alexandria assumed the right to call the synod which deposed Meletius. The situation was about the same at Rome and Antioch, except, that, in the case of the latter, the bishop only ordained the metropolitans, and occasionally the metropolitan (Mansi, vii. 361). The prominence of the metropolitans of the more important cities was the origin of the patriarchal system. The West never had a patriarch, the claims of Rome to the primacy being a sufficient assurance of her authority. By the second canon of the Council of Constantinople in 381, five larger districts (Alexandria, Antioch, Asia Minor, Pontus, and Thrace) are designated. Constantinople had already at this time taken the place of Heraclea as the centre of the Thracian diocese. The bishops of Ephesus (the central see of Asia Minor) and Cesarea in Cappadocia were given the central see of Pontus, and they assumed the dignity of the other three sees, and they were put under the authority of Constantinople by the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451, Mansi, vii. 389). To the three remaining patriarchates—Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople—Jerusalem was added. An abortive attempt to give it the patriarchal dignity was made at the Council of Ephesus in 481. Theodosius II. assured it by the subordination of the three eparchies of Palestine. This action was confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon (Mansi, vii. 178 sqq.). This same council gave to Constantinople the primacy (Mansi, vii. 361). The metropolitans of Ephesus and Cesarea in Cappadocia were hereafter called "exarchs" (Mansi, xi. 657, 889). For the patriarchate of the Russian Church, see art. GREEK CHURCH. The bishops of Aquileja, Grado-Venice, and Lisbon, bear the title "patriarch," but derive no special ecclesiastical prerogatives from it. [There are eleven patriarchates in the Roman-Catholic Church. Nine were present at the Vatican Council.]

See BINGHAM: Orig., 1. 282 sqq.; AUGUST: Denkwürdigkeiten, xi. 148 sqq.; HINSCHE: System d. kathol. Kirchenrechts, i. 593 sqq.; HEPEL: Conciliengesch., i. ii. HAUCK.

PATRICK, St., Apostle of Ireland. The early references to St. Patrick are few. The first is made by Cummanianus in A.D. 684; Adamnan, in the same century, also makes reference to the saint; and of later authorities there is no lack. Prosper of Aquitania, the Venerable Bede, Columban, and others are silent on the subject: the remoteness of Ireland is sufficient to account for this.

Our chief sources of information are two writings which seem undoubtedly to be the work of St. Patrick,—the Confession, and the letter to Coroticus. The former is found in the Book of Armagh, an Irish manuscript of about the year 800; and both, in later but independent manuscripts. The Armagh copy professes to be transcribed from an original in the handwriting of the saint. The earliest lives extant quote from the Confession, showing that at an early date the work was considered genuine: so the external evidence is not without value. The internal evidence is so overwhelming that the two treatises are accepted practically universally as authentic.

The poem known as The Hymn or Loricum of St. Patrick has been pronounced genuine. It is in very ancient Irish, gives no facts, and, whether genuine or not, is valuable as showing the simplicity of doctrine of the early Patrician Church.

The secondary sources of information are (1) The Hymn of Secundinus. This dates probably about A.D. 500, gives no facts, and has only the same value as the Loricum. (2) The Hymn of Fiac. This bears internal evidence of being later than A.D. 554. It gives only a few names, and already the miraculous and legendary has
The Acts of St. Patrick, by Muirchu Maccumachthenni. This life is found in the Book of Armagh, belongs to about A.D. 700, and is probably the oldest life of St. Patrick. The author admits that even then the facts of the saint's life were hopelessly obscured, and we see legend already gathered about it. The Acts of Tirenchan. This is also found in the Book of Armagh, and is of about the same date as the Acts, but contains more legendary matter. The mission is ascribed to Pope Celestine. The Annals of Armagh, belongs to about A.D. 700, and is that comparative study of the older lives might extract some truth; but at present, as historical authorities, we can only reject them. The mission is ascribed to Pope Celestine. It is impossible to settle the dates of St. Patrick's life. Nicholson labor to show that his work belongs to the third, instead of to the fifth century, but brings forward little in support of this view. Killen dates his mission A.D. 405 on insufficient and contradictory grounds. All the earlier ecclesiastical writers assume that St. Patrick was commissioned by Pope Celestine, and as fix the date of the mission A.D. 431 or 432. Todd makes out as strong a case as we can perhaps hope to have for about A.D. 440. A passage in the Confession fixes his age at this period as forty-five, which would give A.D. 395 for his birth: this passage is, however, doubtful, not being found in the Armagh manuscript. The Annals of Connaught make the year of St. Patrick's birth 336; Ússher, Tillemont, and Petrie, 372; Lannigan, 387; the Bollandists, 378. The year of his death is equally uncertain. Tillemont gives the year 465, the Bollandists 466, Lannigan, and many following him, 465; Ússher, Petrie, and Todd, 492 or 493. Lannigan's date (465), which is the favorite with recent writers, rests on the assumptions of the commission from Celestine and of a regular succession of bishops, such as prevailed at later date, at Armagh, of which St. Patrick was the first. There is nothing against the ordinary date of 492, and all tradition ascribes extreme old age to the saint.

From the Confession we learn that St. Patrick was carried away captive at sixteen from Bonavent of Tabernae in the "Britannia," and it is usually assumed that he was born there. His father, Calpurnius, was a deacon, and at the same time a Roman civil officer: his grandfather, Potitus, was a priest. The fact that a priest and deacon were married men does not seem to St. Patrick to have needed any explanation. Research has failed to identify Bonavent of Tabernae. The authorities are divided between some point on the coast of Armorica Gaul, possibly Bologne-sur-Mer, and the place since called Kilpatrick, near Dumbarton, in Scotland. The probabilities are in favor of Gaul; the strongest argument against the supposition, namely, that the Confession distinguishes between Gaul and Britain, being explicable. But it is quite possible that neither of these places is the right one.

The young Patrick, being carried away with many others, was sold in Ireland, Tirenchan tells us, to a chieftain called Milcho. There he was set to watch cattle, and at the age of twenty-five youth bore fruit. In six years, guided, as he believed, by a divine vision, he made his escape; and after long wanderings, and undergoing another captivity of sixty days, Patrick, now twenty-two years old, regained his friends. All is unknown until the mission to Ireland; and, if we assume his age at that period to have been forty-five, here is a gap unfilled of twenty-three years. His Latinity, his ignorance of the doctrine and practice of the Roman Church and of the Hieronymian Vulgate, show that the time was not spent in study under learned doctors, like St. Germain of Auxerre, or St. Martin of Tours. But we know nothing of his private life, which might explain all. We learn from the Confession, which is largely a justification of his life, that he formed the plan of preaching to the Irish himself, that he persisted in it in spite of the opposition of his friends, and that he attributed his mission to no pope, bishop, or church. Patrick was consecrated bishop, and sailed for Ireland with a few companions. Again the Confession fails us: we have almost no details of the work in Ireland. The pages of Lannigan and Todd may be consulted by any one who wishes to see arranged in the best form possible the conflicting accounts. We can gather, however, that the work was by no means the easy and perfect conquest of tradition. Danger and opposition were encountered, and the final success was only partial. Leoghaire, the over-king, lived and died a ferocious Pagan: heathen practices survived the saint many years. His plan, in fact, seems to have been to win the chiefs, and trust to tribe feeling to draw the clan. Such Christianization must, of course, have been superficial; but the work was done, and a native church with native clergy established. Of his death and burial: he died at 506; Nemius, 507; Lannigan, and many following him, 492; Ússher, Petrie, and Todd, 492 or 493. Lannigan's date (492), which is the favorite with recent writers, rests on the assumptions of the commission from Celestine and of a regular succession of bishops, such as prevailed at later date, at Armagh, of which St. Patrick was the first. There is nothing against the ordinary date of 492, and all tradition ascribes extreme old age to the saint.

From the Confession we learn that St. Patrick was carried away captive at sixteen from Bonavent of Tabernae in the "Britannia," and it is usually assumed that he was born there. His father, Calpurnius, was a deacon, and at the same time a Roman civil officer: his grandfather, Potitus, was a priest. The fact that a priest and deacon were married men does not seem to St. Patrick to have needed any explanation. Research has failed to identify Bonavent of Tabernae. The authorities are divided between some point on the coast of Armorica Gaul, possibly Bologne-sur-Mer, and the place since called Kilpatrick, near Dumbarton, in Scotland. The probabilities are in favor of Gaul; the strongest argument against the supposition, namely, that the Confession distinguishes between
of 1688, how Dr. Jenison called on him in the conversation with him on the subject, and how the Prince of Orange took an active part in the proposed revision of the historicalevents. He informs us how news reached the Englishpsalmody contains many interesting notices of passing wits in 1690 from an expected French invasion.

In the Liturgy. He was a voluminous author, his publications amounting to no less than fifty-one distinct works. He is best known as a commentator. His Paraphrases of Job and the Psalms appeared in 1678. They were followed in 1681 by others on Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song.

By others on Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song. Then came Commentaries on Genesis (1694), Exodus (1696), Leviticus (1698), Numbers (1699), Deuteronomy (1700). Joshua, Judges, and Ruth came out the same year; and, before the end of 1705, he issued volumes on Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. 1 He added to his critical work treatises on Christian Sacrifice, The Sacraments, and The Papish Controversy, and even attempted allegory in his Parable of the Pilgrims, first published as early as 1685. Of course it cannot be compared with John Bunyan's dream; but Southey says, though "poorly imagined, and ill sustained," it contains sound instruction, felicitously expressed. Burnet speaks of Patrick as a great preacher. He is ranked amongst the Cambridge latitudinarian divines through his connection with John Smith and Henry More, and he caught something of a Platonictonic tincture from his philosophical reading; but from the bolder spirit of inquiry cultivated in his day he was an utter alien. He was emphatically Anglican in his dogmatic teaching, and attached authority to the decisions of the early church. He attacked dissent in his Friendly Debate (1668), and that in no very friendly spirit; but in the House of Lords, after the Revolution, he expressed regret "for the warmth with which he had written against dissenters in his younger years." He was openly accused of favoring nonconformists, and on this account, it is said, "lost the love of the gentry." He was a good man, and aimed at maintaining in his diocese an unusual strictness of discipline. He wished to see an improvement in psalmody, and early published a Century of Psalms for the use of the Charter House. See Patrick's Autobiography, Oxford, 1839, and Complete Works, Oxford, 1856, 9 vols. His commentary was combined with those of Whitby, Lowman, and Auld (see those arts.).

PATRIPASSIANS (from pater passus, "the suffering father"), a name applied to those Christians, who, denying that there is a definite distinction between the personalities of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, said that the Father had suffered in the Son. It occurs for the first time in the treatise of Tertullian against Praxedis, about 200. See Christology, p. 453.

PATRISTICS AND PATROLOGY are the names of that department of theology which gives instruction concerning the lives, writings, and theological doctrines of the Church Fathers, and all else which has a direct bearing upon the study of the Church Fathers. If a distinction is to be made between the two names, then patrology concerns the external history, lives, etc., of the Fathers; patristics (patristica sicut doctrina), their doctrinal teachings.

1. Definition of a Church Father. — The honorable title "father" was used in the early church to designate ecclesiastical teachers and officers who had exercised a positive and permanent influence upon the doctrinal system or growth of the church. The term "church father" naturally implies that the Fathers were the theological witnesses to the system of doctrine of the Christian Church, and that the consensus of the Fathers was a source of ecclesiastical authority co-ordinate with the Scriptures. Such theological importance was ascribed to the Fathers by the great church councils; such as that of Chalcedon, when it speaks of obeying the faith of the Fathers (ut patrum fidelem servemus), or that of Constantinople (880), when it professes to follow the holy councils and the holy and chosen Fathers (τοῖς δύννοι καὶ εὐθυλίτοις πατρίσιοι). The Roman-Catholic Church now distinguishes three classes of church teachers. — writers, fathers, and doctors (scripores, patres, doctores).

The "holy fathers" must possess four requisites:
(1) Sufficient antiquity, a definition usually stretched to include Thomas Aquinas; (2) Orthodoxy — Origen, Tertullian, Lactantius, Eusebius, etc., for this reason being numbered only among the "writers;" (3) Sanctity of life; and (4) The approval of the church, which is doubtful in the cases of Hippolytus, Theodoret, etc. A "doctor of the church" must possess the additional quality of eminent learning (erudito eminens, comp. the Bull of Benedict XIV., Milliantis...
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Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory represent this dignity among the scholars of the Western Church; Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Chrysostom, of the Eastern Church. At a later time the number of doctors has been arbitrarily increased, and made to include Hilary, John of Damascus, Anselm, Thomas, Bonaventura, Alfonso da Liguori, etc. The Protestant Church includes under the designation Church Fathers all those teachers and authors of the ancient church who made essential contributions to the development of Christian life and doctrine. The period to which the designation may be properly regarded to refer is extended to Gregory the Great (d. 604), or to John of Damascus (d. after 754).

2. Scope of Patristics. — According to the old definition, patristics included all kinds of facts about the personal life, writings, and doctrines of the Fathers. It was, therefore, an introduction to church history and the history of Christian doctrine. In the stricter and more scientific sense patrology is concerned with the literature of the Fathers, its history and contents, and (1) investigates and determines the text of the writings and monuments of the patristic age, and (2) presents the biographies, literary works, and doctrines of the Fathers individually. Three periods are to be distinguished in the patristic literature, — that (1) of the early church in the apostolic and post-apostolic age, (2) the struggle in the ante-Nicene age, and (3) the victorious church. Others distinguish only two periods, — (1) the ante-Nicene, and (2) the post-Nicene. The Fathers of each of the various periods are distinguished into Greek or Latin; or, according to nationality, into Orientals, Greeks, Occidentals; or, according to the literary form and contents of their works, into dogmatists, writers on ethics, exegetes, historians, etc.

3. History and Literature. — We distinguish two periods separated by the Protestant Reformation. (1) The first preliminary work for a history of Christian literature was done by the historians of the ancient church, especially Eusebius. He gives many very valuable notices of Christian authors, and excerpts from their writings. The real father of patrology is Jerome, whose work on the writers of the church (De viris illustribus s. de scriptoribus ecclesiasticos), as he distinctly says in a note to his friend Dexter, was designed to "briefly describe all those, who, from the passion of Christ to the fourteenth year of Theodosius, had produced any thing worthy of preservation about the Holy Scriptures." Beginning with James and Peter, he gives in a hundred and thirty-five sections short biographies and notices of works. This production was much admired, translated into Greek by Sophronius, and continued by Gennadius of Massilia (who about 492 wrote notices of ninety-five or a hundred ecclesiastical authors, mostly of the fifth century), Ialdore of Seville (d. 608), and Ildefonsus of Toledo (d. 607). In the middle ages writings of the Fathers, carefully preserved them in the convents, and made collections of excerpts; but there was no critical study of these writings. Collections of notices were, however, made, some of which, uncritical though they be, are invaluable. Here belong the collections of Photius (d. 900), especially his Bibliotheca, or Μνημειατλα, the so-called Nomenclatores veteres, who continued or imitated Jerome’s Catalogue; especially Honorius of Autun (d. 1120), who beginning his work De luminaribus eccles., etc., with the apostles, carries it down to Anselm, Sigebert of Gemblours (d. 1112); and Johann Trithemius (d. 1516) who begins with Clement of Rome, and concludes with the author himself, nine hundred and seventy writers being noticed. (2) A new period in the history of patrology dates from the rise of Humanism and the Reformation. The immense strides in culture in the fifteenth century, the classical studies of the Humanists, the growing acquaintance with the Greek language in the West, the invention of printing, etc., all redounded to the interest of this science. Patristic writings were discovered, edited with notes, first those of Latin, then of Greek authors. Special mention in this connection is due to Erasmus, Beatus Rhenanus, Ecolampadius, and the learned book-sellers Robert and Henry Stephens, Froben, Oporn, and others. Editions appeared of Lactantius (1465), the Letters of Jerome (1485-70). Augustine’s City of God (1470), Leo’s Sermons, Cyprian’s epistles and (1540), Orosius (1471). In the sixteenth century the Reformation, in quick succession, issued editions of the works of Cyprian (1520), Hilary (1523), Jerome (1526), Irenaeus (1528), Ambrose (1527), Augustine (1528), [Epiphanius, 1529], Chrysostom (1530), [Origen, 1531], Athanasius, and also Basil (1589).

The Reformers, while denying to the Fathers an equal authority with the Scriptures, got weapons for the struggle in which they were engaged from their writings. Luther was well read in them; although he passed an unfavorable judgment upon Jerome, Origen, and Chrysostom. Melanchthon urged very earnestly the study of the Fathers, collected their opinions about the Lord’s Supper (Sententia patrum de cecans domini, 1530), etc. The Wurttemberg theologian, Schoff, wrote Academia J. Chr. s. brevia descriptio Patrum de Doctorum eccles. historiae, etc., (Jena, 1643); and Melin, who wrote the Medulla theol. Patrum (Amberg, Neustadt, and Heidelberg, 1598-1613, 4 vols.). Of the seventeenth century, deserve to be mentioned, Gerhard’s posthumous work, Patrologia s. de prin. ecc. doctorum vita et lucubrationibus (Jena, 1653, 1673), Hulsemann’s Patrologia (Leipzig, 1670), Melchior’s Corona patrum (Giessen, 1670), Olearius’ Abacus patrologicus (Jena, 1673, new ed. 1711, under the title Bibl. scr. eccl.). None of these works have any critical value. Of the seventeenth century, the Roman-Catholic Church did far more in this department than the Protestant. Among the Italians, Baronius and Belarmin deserve mention; the latter writing the liber de script. eccl. (The Writers of the Church, Rome, 1613, Paris, 1616), which was often republished, and supplemented by Labbé (1860) and Oudin (Paris, 1860). The Belgian theologian, Aubertus Miraus, published a Bibliothecaeccl. and Auctar. de script. eccl. (Antwerp, 1639; reprinted, A. Fabricius, Bibl. Eclcs., 1718). The French Congregation of St. Maur did a work of imperishable value in this department, by publishing editions (known as the “Benediction;” for list see Benediction) of the Fathers superior in

In England, Ussher (d. 1656) distinguished by his patristic investigations; as also Grabe (d. 1712), by his critical pointed permutations and his editions of Justin and Irenæus. Pearson (d. 1680), Henry Dodwell (d. 1711), William Cave (d. 1719), and Larner (d. 1768), who exhibits an abundant of patristic erudition in his *Credibility of the Gospel History*. [For the works of these authors, see the special articles.] Of the German works and authors of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the following Roman-Catholic works and authors deserve mention: Wilhelm, *Patrolog. ad usus acad.* (Freiburg, 1775), Schramm, *Anz. födel. opp. ss. Patrum et script. eccl.* (Augsburg, 1780–95, 18 vols.), Lumpere, *Hist. theol. crit. de vita, scriptis et doctr. Patrum*, etc. (Augsburg, 1758–99, 13 vols.), Permanander, *Patrol.* (Landshut, 1841–44, 2 vols.), and the treatises and text-books on patrology of Lochner (Mainz, 1887), Mühler (incomplete, Regensburg, 1840), Magon (Regensburg, 1864, 2 vols.), Alzog (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1866, 4d ed., 1878), J. Schmid (Freiburg, 1880), Nirschl (Mainz, 1881). Among the Protestant works, those of Fabricius deserve prominent mention as of special value; viz., his *Bibl. eccles.* (Hamburg, 1715), *Bibl. graeca* (1705–29, 14 vols., new ed. by Harless, 1790 sqq.), *Bibl. latina* (1867, new ed. of 1911), *Bibl. patr. medica et infima latinitatis* (Hamburg, 1734 sqq.). We mention further, Ittig, *Schediasma de auctoribus, etc.* (Leipzig, 1711), Walch, *Bibl. patrist.* (Jena, 1751, 1770, new ed. by Danz, Jena, 1834), Schonemann, *Bibl.* . . . *Patrum latin.* (Leipzig, 1792–94, 2 vols.), *Thilo, Bibl. patr. dogmat.* (Leipzig, 1854), and the treatises on patrology of Pestalozzi (Göttingen, 1811), Danz (Jena, 1839). For special editions of authors, see the special articles.

**LIT.** — In addition to the literature already given, see the Manuals of Church History, the Histories of Philosophy of Ritter and Ueber-...
[In Norway the right of patronage was never established, as Christianity was introduced in the country, not by the voluntary adoption of the people, but by the force of the disposition of the kings. In Denmark it was completely abolished by the constitution of June 6, 1840. In Prussia it was abolished during the revolution of 1848, but quietly re-established when the re-action came into power again in 1850. In England, where the great part of the privileges are not possessed, it has proved impossible to abolish patronage. As real patronage—that is, a patronage which belongs to the glebe, in contradistinction to personal patronage, which belongs to the person—and is extinguished with the family of the founder—has a market-value, and can be the object of buying and selling, its abolition would bring along with it a very difficult conflict with the established ideas of property; and in 1875 The Church Private Patronage Association was founded, for the purpose of maintaining, by every legal means, the inmemorial rights of private patrons. In 1843 patronage was abolished in Scotland, but re-established in 1860. Once more abolished in 1890, a pecuniary compensation having been voted to the patrons, it was suddenly restored by Queen Anne in 1712, and the patrons did not pay back the compensation received in 1890. The feeling against it was steadily increasing; however, and in 1842 a motion for its entire abolition was carried in the General Assembly. But the practical result was only the so-called "Lord Aberdeen's Act," in other words, a certain scope to objections from the side of the congregation. In the Roman-Catholic Church a patron saint is a saint who is chosen as a protector; it may be of a nation, a city, a village, a church, a class, or an individual. The earliest witness of this usage is Ambrose of Milan (366).]


PAUL THE APOSTLE AND HIS EPISTLES.

PAUL THE APOSTLE.

In Paterson was noble and self-denying. In time had only been spoken before. His work among the islandsof his dio-
death of Stephen, lead us to suppose that he left Tarsus at an early age. The object of his going to Jerusalem was to become acquainted with the teachings of a rabbi. He was the pupil of the celebrated Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3), whose moderation of spirit he did not imitate (Acts v. 34 sqq.). He probably, as Godet also affirms, witnessed the public activity of Jesus in Jerusalem; but nowhere is it said that he saw Jesus, not even in 2 Cor. v. 16, where the reference is to a carnal conception of him before his conversion. His sudden appearance at Jerusalem at the death of Stephen has suggested the idea that his sojourn there had been interrupted for a while (Neander, Mangold, Wieseler, Beyrich, etc.) Following the usual custom of the rabbis, Paul learned and practised a trade,—the trade of a tent-maker (Acts xiv. 11). During this period, Paul was a zealot for the law and the doctrines of the Pharisees. It has often been affirmed that Paul was married (Clem. Alex.: Strom., III 6; Origen: Op., IV., pp. 481 sqq.; Eusebius: H.E., III. 20; Luther, Grotius, Haurwitz, Ewald). Erasmus and others explain the term "yoke-fellow." in Phil. iv. 3, of a wife (Canon Farrar zealously defends the theory of Paul's marriage, on the ground of his alleged membership in the Sanhedrin (Acts xxvi. 10), his accurate description of domestic life, etc.; but the way Paul writes of his confinement in 1 Cor. vii. 7, and his argument in 1 Cor. ix. 5, absolutely forbid the view that he was married. Paul was bitterly hostile to Christianity, as his share in the stoning of Stephen as an approving witness of the bloody scene shows. In the persecution which began at that time, he took a zealous and fanatical part, going from house to house, dragging Christians to prison and to death (Acts xx. 1 sqq.).

In the midst of this persecuting activity an event occurred which completely changed the attitude of the inquisitor Paul to Christianity. On his way to Damascus to persecute the Christian sect, he was suddenly arrested by a brilliant light, above the brightness of the noonday sun. Paul declares he had seen Christ (1 Cor. ix. 1); but this can hardly have been the historical Christ, as he derived his apostolic dignity from the teaching of Jesus, and refers in his Epistles to sayings of Jesus (1 Cor. vii. 10, 25, etc.; compare Acts xiii. 25; xx. 35). To this were added special revelations (Gal. i. 12, ii. 2; 1 Thess. iv. 15) and ecstatic visions (2 Cor. xii. 1 sqq.).

Arbitrary as this explanation is, it fails to explain Paul's conversion. According to Luke, the real objective appearance of Christ made the Christian; and Paul's own testimony (1 Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 13; Phil. iii. 5) forbids the thought that a psychological preparation had been going on in Paul's mind through the influence of Gamaliel and the speech and calmness of Stephen, as Olshausen, Neander, [Farrar, Schaff, and others] urge.

The date of Paul's conversion has repeatedly been derived from 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33 (comp. Gal. i. 17 sqq.; Acts ix. 19 sqq.), and, according to the best view, is put in 44.

2. From the Conversion to the Roman Imprisonment. — Paul's conversion opened up to him a world-wide mission. He enjoyed a valuable external preparation. He had no graces of person. The descriptions of the Acta Pauli et Thecla and Nicephorus (H.E., II. 37), which Renan accepts, are to be put down as distorted fancies; but from 2 Cor. iv. 7, x. 10, Acts xiv. 12, we gather that he was insignificant in stature; and in 2 Cor. ii. 3, Gal. iv. 13, physical infirmities are mentioned. The "thorn in the flesh" (2 Cor. xii. 7) from which he prayed in vain to be delivered, was not a spiritual temptation (Luther), but either an ophthalmic infirmity (Howson, Farrar, Plumptre), or epilepsy (Holsten, Ewald, Haurwitz, Lightfoot, Schaff). For pictorial representations of Paul, see Schultze: D. Katakomben, Leipzig, 1882, pp. 149 sq.; [Howson: Life of St. Paul, chap. viii.; Mrs. Jamieson: Legendary Art]. Paul had received ineffaceable impressions from the Greek world of culture, although he did not possess encyclopedic learning (Schramm: De stupenda erudizione Pauli, Herb., 1710), or exhaustive knowledge of philosophy (Zobel: De Paulo philosopho, Alt., 1731) or jurisprudence (Stryck: De jurispr. Pauli, Hal., 1895; Kirchmaier: De jurispr. Pauli, Vit., 1750; March: Specimen jurispr. Pauli, Leipzig, 1730).

He cited Greek poets (Acts xvii. 8), but such sentences were too proverbial in their tone to justify us in attributing the apostle large acquaintance with Greek literature. At Tarsus, Paul became thoroughly conversant with the Greek language, although he did not possess encyclopedic learning (Ehrhardt: De latinitate Pauli, 1755). Paul's spiritual preparation for his apostolate was derived from his conversion. He undoubtedly had, prior to that occurrence, some historical knowledge of the life and teachings of Jesus, and refers in his Epistles to sayings of Jesus (1 Cor. vii. 10, 25, etc.; compare Acts xiii. 25; xx. 35). To this were added special revelations (Gal. i. 12, ii. 2; 1 Thess. iv. 15) and ecstatic visions (2 Cor. xii. 1 sqq.).

Baptized by Ananias (Acts ix. 17), Paul went from Damascus to Arabia (Gal. i. 17) for the purpose of avoiding the influence of the other apostles, and devoting himself to meditation. Three years later he returned to Damascus, where he was rescued from a plot (Acts ix. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 32). Thence he went for the first time to Jerusalem to become acquainted with the apostles (Acts ix. 26; Gal. i. 17). Thence he went to his old home at Tarsus where Barnabas sought him out, and took him to Antioch in Syria (Acts xi. 26), where he labored successfully, making the local church the mother of...
the Gentile churches. In company with Barnabas, he went up to Jerusalem with the collection of the Antiœchan Christians (xi. 30). Retiring to Antioch, and under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, he started out with Barnabas and John Mark on his first missionary journey, the account of which is preserved in Acts xiii. xiv. The route was to the Island of Cyprus (where the sojourner Bar- jeus was humbled, and the procurser Sergius Paulus converted), to Perga in Pamphylia (whence Mark returned to Jerusalem), Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe. At these places, Paul preached, first to the Jews, and then to the Gentiles; and, although he received harsh treatment, his preaching won converts. The journey was brought to a close by the return of the two missionaries to Antioch in Syria after an absence of probably two years (46-48?).

After Paul had been for some time (Acts xiv. 28) in Antioch, extreme Jewish Christians from Jerusalem (“the Ulromantoues of that age,” Hilgenfeld) came, insisting that Gentile converts should submit to circumcision. This was the occasion for Paul and Barnabas to go up to Jerusalem, and discuss the question of liberty with the local church. An account of this council is given in Acts xv. 1 sqq. and Gal. ii. 1 sqq. The differences, real or apparent, cannot be explained from the different aims of the two accounts.” After Paul’s return, Peter met him at Antioch. Paul rebuked Peter for demanding, in spite of his own example, the Gentile Christians to live as the Jews. Barnabas was likewise carried away into the same error; and perhaps it was differences growing out of this difficulty that led Paul to refuse the proposition of Barnabas (Acts xv. 36-30) to take Mark with them on a second missionary journey. Paul chose Silas as his companion.

The account of the second missionary journey is given in Acts xv. 40-xviii. 22. After visiting some of the churches in Syria, Cilicia, and Lycaonia, accompanied by Timothy, a disciple of Lystra (Acts xvi. 1-3), he went in a north-westerly direction to Phrygia and Galatia (a province settled by Celtic tribes about 250 B.C.), where he met with a warm reception (Gal. iv. 14 sq.). Travelling thence through Mesia, he came to Troas, where he received a vision of a man of Macedonia calling him to Europe (Acts xvi. 6 sqq.). Joined by Luke, the little company of four crossed over the sea, and preached at Philippi, where Lydia, Paul’s first European convert, was admitted to the church, and Paul and Silas, thrown into prison on account of the healing of a sorceress, were miraculously delivered, and the jailer converted. From Philippi, Paul went to Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 1), where he formed his first Christian church (Acts xvii. 2), in Greece from Jewish and Gentile converts (Acts xvii. 4), and, forced by the violence of the Jews to leave, went to Berea, which he was likewise compelled to leave by the violence of Jews from Thessalonica. Leaving Silas and Timothy behind, the apostle went to Athens, probably taking as an excuse the writing of the law, on the part of legalistic Jewish Chris-
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tians. In order to preserve peace, he gave a proof of his regard for the law by submitting as a substitute to the Nazarite's vow (Acts xxii. 18-26). But his efforts were in vain. Fanatic Jews from Asia Minor excited a mob against him, which, but for the protection of Claudius Lysias, would have killed him. His defence before the people, and subsequently before the Sanhedrin, was without effect. In order to elude a Jewish conspiracy, Claudius conveyed him by night to Caesarea, where he came under the jurisdiction of the procurator Felix, and remained his prisoner for two years, till the arrival of his successor, M. Porcius Festus. Another hearing was granted him (xxvi. 1-23); and he might have been released, but for the fact, that, earnestly desiring to see Rome (Acts xix. 21, xxiii. 11; Rom. xv. 24, 28), he had used his right as a Roman citizen to appeal to the emperor (Acts xxvi. 32). Under the guard of Julius, he sailed from Caesarea, changed vessels at Myra, but, after a stormy passage, was shipwrecked off the coast of Malta (Boysen: Eclogue arch. ad difficile Pauli iter, Hal., 1713; Eskuche: De naufragio Pauli, Bern, 1780; Walch: Antiq. manussae ad itin. Pauli rom., Jena, 1767, Antiqua naufragi in itin. Pauli, Jens, 1767; Lassen: Tentam. in iter Pauli, etc., Aarhus., 1821; J. Smith: The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, 4th ed., London, 1880). Paul reached Rome by way of Syracuse and Rhegium. His arrival occurred in the spring of 61, Festus having become procurator in the summer of 60. Paul's conversion is set by Wieseler in the year 40; Anger and Ewald, 38; Schott, Godet, [Alford, Schaff], etc., 37; [Howson, 36]; Meyer, [Usheer], 35; [Bengel, 31]. For a tabular view of the chronology of Paul's life, as fixed by various chronologists, see Lange's Com. on Acts, and Farrar, Life and Work of St. Paul, ii. 625.

3. The Period beginning with the Roman Imprisonment. — Paul wascordially received by the Christians of Rome. He had been familiar with the condition of the local church, as the Epistle to the Romans proves (i. 8, ii. 17 sqq., iv. 1, xvi. 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12). It had probably been founded at an early date, perhaps by some of the converts of the first Pentecost (Acts ii. 10). Paul remained two years in Rome, guarded by a Praetorian soldier, yet dwelling in his own hired house (Acts xxviii. 16, 30 sqq.). Four of his Epistles were written during this captivity. The Epistle to Philemon commends the slave Onesimus to the generous treatment of his master Philemon, from whom he had fled. The Epistle to the Ephesians is encyclical in its character, as is clear from the inscription (i. 1), the general statement of the truth, and the absence of greetings. Ephesus is mentioned, because it was a metropolitan city. This Epistle is probably the same as the Epistle to the Laodiceans (Col. iv. 16; see Anger: Ueber d. Laodicerbrief, Leipzig, 1843). The Epistle to the Colossians and Philippians likewise belong to this period.

There are no reliable records of the length of Paul's life. Only of this are we sure, that the apostle suffered martyrdom under Nero. Clement of Rome (Ad Corinth. V.) indicates this. According to Dionysius of Corinth (Euseb., ii. 26), and Irenæus (Adv. Haer., III. 1), Peter and Paul were put to death at the same time; and Caius, Roman presbyter (Euseb., II. 25), states that their graves were sacredly kept. Others speak of the time of Paul's martyrdom and the place of his grave (Euseb., II. 25). A difference of opinion exists as to whether Paul suffered martyrdom at the close of the Roman imprisonment, with which the Acts closes, or whether that event occurred after a period of freedom, during which he preached the gospel in Spain. The theory of a second imprisonment is advocated by Michaelis, Bertholdt, Hug Credner, Neander, Bleek, von Hofmann, Lange, Godet, [Usheer, Howson, Farrar, Lightfoot, Schaff, Plumtre], and denied by Dr. Wette, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Reuss, Hausratr, Wieseler, Otto, Thiersch. The theory is not excluded by any thing in the Acts. Paul was not kept a prisoner by the procurator because he was a Christian, but because he had appealed to Caesar. He himself hoped to be liberated (Phil. ii. 25 sq., ii. 24). It is supported by some ancient testimonies, as the statement of Clement of Rome, who speaks of Paul's going to the extremity of the west (ἐκ τῶν ἐξωτερικῶν τῆς δῆμου), referring, no doubt, to Spain. The Muratorian Fragment says definitely that Paul journeyed from Rome (ad urbem) to Spain. The authenticity of the three Pastoral Epistles depends upon this assumption of a second imprisonment. They are addressed to two of Paul's companions in work (Timothy and Titus), are directed against the same heresy, and have the same peculiarities of style. Attempts have been made to find a place for the composition of these Epistles before the close of Paul's first imprisonment. Titus has been put before 1 Corinthians (Reuss, Otto), or between 1 and 2 Corinthians (Wieseler); 1 Timothy, between Galatians and 1 Corinthians (Planck, Schrader, Wieseler, Reuss); and 2 Timothy has been referred to the Cesarean imprisonment (Bottger, Thiersch), or the beginning (Otto, Reuss), or close of the Roman imprisonment (Wieseler). The contents of the letters preclude these dates; and, in our view, the genuineness of the three stands or falls with the theory of a second Roman imprisonment. The second imprisonment closed with the great Roman conflagration in 64, the date of the great Roman conflagration. He then went by way of Crete (Tit. i. 5), Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20), and Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 3, to Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3), where he wrote 1 Timothy. Then returning by way of Troas (2 Tim. iv. 19), Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20), and Nicopolis (Tit. iii. 12), he went to Spain, and was again imprisoned at Rome.

Scope and Contents of the Epistles. — The Epistles of Paul were, in the best sense of the word, tracts for the times (Gelegenheitschriften), intimately connected with the writer's circumstances at the time of composition, and the needs of the correspondents. The investigations of Mangold, Weizsäcker, and others, have shown this to be true of the Epistle to the Romans. Side by side with letters full of messages of friendship (Philemon, Philippians) are letters with a decided polemical purpose, with strong words of rebukes (Galatians, Colossians) and others prevailing didactically in aim, and dialectic in method (Romans and Ephesians). Of the lost letters of Paul — if there be any such — no fragments remain; the Latin letter to the Laodiceans (Fabricius) not being found in the Muratorian Frag-
merce, but mentioned by Jerome (Cat., 5). The Latin correspondence, in six letters, between Paul and the philosopher Seneca, mentioned by Jerome (Cat., 22), is also spurious. Paul wrote in Greek, and not in Aramaic (Bolten, Bertholdt). His training and personality are plainly reflected in his writings. With the exception of the letter to the Galatians (vi. 11), and perhaps Philemon (19), Paul did not write his Epistles with his own hand (Rom. xvi. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18; 2 Thess. iii. 17). [It is held by Farrar and others that this was due to his weak eyes.] The traces of rabbinic culture are everywhere patent. He employs Hebraic and Chaldean terms (abba, Rom. viii. 15, etc.; amen, Rom. xv. 33, etc.; maranathah, 1 Cor. xvi. 22; pascha, 1 Cor. v. 7, etc.), Hebraistic combinations (respect of persons, προσωπολογία, Rom. ii. 11, etc.), turns of expression (1 Cor. xv. 50; Eph. iv. 18; Col. i. 21), parallelism of clauses (Rom. ii. 7, xi. 12, etc.), and uses Judaistic dialectics in striking antitheses (Rom. i. 23, iii. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Phil. iii. 7, etc.), in short interrogations (Rom. iii. 9, vi. 15; Gal. iii. 19), etc. He also resorts to the rabbinical method of allegorical exposition, as in the typical meaning of Abraham's faith (Rom. iv. 1 sqq.; Gal. iii. 6 sqq.), the allegory of Sara and Hagar (Gal. iv. 22), etc. The Greek, however, Paul had at his command, as the rich use of alliteration (Rom. i. 29, 31, xi. 17; 1 Cor. ii. 13; 2 Cor. vii. 22, etc.), the participial construction (1 Cor. xv. 56; Phil. ii. 7, etc.), and single words (2 Cor. vi. 14 sqq.), show. The consummate art of the psalm of trusting love (1 Cor. xiii.), and the noble dithyramb of faith, in Rom. viii. 31 sqq., led Longinus to place over the heathen world, that it possessed the new covenant is contrasted with that of the old covenant; and no one was better fitted, by traditions of the letter, and books (Rom. i. 24, etc.) and passions (Rom. i. 26, etc.). The law was given because of transgression, and was designed to be a schoolmaster to lead Israel to Christ (Gal. iii. 24). To Israel the promise was given of redemption, and with its fulfillment the reign of grace began (Rom. vii. 4). Grace excludes works (Rom. ii. 6), and righteousness henceforth is a gift (Rom. iii. 24). The mediator of grace is Christ. The two facts in Christ's life most prominent before Paul's mind are his resurrection and glorification. He was declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection (Rom. i. 4), who, after that event, ascended into heaven (Col. i. 19). He is the propitiation for sin, and on account of him God declares the sinner righteous (Rom. iii. 25 sq.). The sinner becomes partaker of the benefits of Christ's work by faith, which is not merely knowledge, but an act of the whole man, mind, will, and affections (Rom. x. 10), resting upon Christ as its Mediator with God, and Redeemer. But faith is not a work of human merit, but rather an operation of God in the human soul. The sinner is pronounced righteous on the ground of such faith, and kept from the wrath of God (Rom. iv. 8, v. 9; 2 Cor. v. 19). The aggregate of those who believe constitute the church of God (1 Cor. x. 32), which is represented under the figure of a temple (1 Cor. iii. 18 sqq.) and a body (1 Cor. x. 7). The Spirit of God dwells in it (2 Cor. vi. 18); but in its present condition it is not an ideal organization. It will be consummated after the final crisis (1 Thess. iv. 17; 2 Thess. ii. 1, etc.), which will be preceded by the culmination of apostasy in Anti-christ (2 Thess. ii. 3 sq.).

The Epistles of the imprisonment have been aptly called "the Christological Epistles." They emphasize, if possible, more strongly, the redemption of the world through Christ. He is equal with the Father (Phil. ii. 6), the Creator of the world (Col. i. 15 sqq.), and possesses the fullness of the Deity (Col. ii. 9), but emptied himself, and humbled himself even to the death of the cross. The true Christian is a new man (Col. iii. 10), belongs to heaven (Phil. iii. 21), lives in the world, but is not of it (Col. iii. 3), and will be led by Christ to absolute purity (Eph. v. 27); so that, through Christ, all separation from God is overcome. The church is an ethical organization.

The contents of the Pastoral Epistles are determined largely by the obstacles to the growth of the church to which the apostle directs himself. They emphasize that a sound faith depends upon sound doctrine, which is found in the word of God (1 Tim. iii. 15). The church, which is the organization of God's chosen people, should be well organized, its affairs properly managed by chosen and godly officers (1 Tim. iv. 18; 2 Tim. i. 6, etc.),—presbyters, deacons,
widows, deaconesses. The core of the Christian life is described as piety (πίστις), godliness of heart. He stressed the importance of the New Testament, except in the Acts and 2 Peter (1 Tim. ii. 2, iv. 7 sq.; 2 Tim. iii. 5; Tit. i. 1, etc.). Its principal fruit is self-control (σωφροσύνη). The expression is a different one, but no new doctrine is argued by Paul in the Pastoral Epistles. They, too, strongly urge, as the only ground of salvation, the self-sacrifice of Christ (1 Tim. ii. 6; Tit. ii. 14), and the destroyed death (2 Tim. i. 10). Righteousness comes not by works (Tit. iii. 5), but by grace. The destroyed death is urged by Paul in the Pastoral Epistles. They, too, strongly urge, as the only ground of salvation, the self-sacrifice of Christ (1 Tim. ii. 6; Tit. ii. 14), and the destroyed death (2 Tim. i. 10). Righteousness comes not by works (Tit. iii. 5), but by grace.


[Commentaries.— Among the innumerable Commentaries upon St. Paul's Epistles, those by the following recent writers deserve to be mentioned. On all the Epistles.— Meyer (English trans.), De Wette, Lange (various authors, American edition), Whedon, Ellicott, Cowles; Bible Dictionary (Speaker's Commentary); in the New Testament, except in the Acts and 2 Peter (1 Tim. ii. 2, iv. 7 sq.; 2 Tim. iii. 5; Tit. i. 1, etc.). Its principal fruit is self-control (σωφροσύνη). The expression is a different one, but no new doctrine is argued by Paul in the Pastoral Epistles. They, too, strongly urge, as the only ground of salvation, the self-sacrifice of Christ (1 Tim. ii. 6; Tit. ii. 14), and the destroyed death (2 Tim. i. 10). Righteousness comes not by works (Tit. iii. 5), but by grace. The destroyed death is urged by Paul in the Pastoral Epistles. They, too, strongly urge, as the only ground of salvation, the self-sacrifice of Christ (1 Tim. ii. 6; Tit. ii. 14), and the destroyed death (2 Tim. i. 10). Righteousness comes not by works (Tit. iii. 5), but by grace.


Woldemar Schmidt.

Chronology of the Life and Writings of the Apostle Paul.

Paul's conversion 37

First journey to Jerusalem after his conversion (Gal. i. 18), sojourn at Tarsus, and afterward at Antioch (Acts xi. 26). 37-49

Second journey to Jerusalem, in company with Barnabas, to relieve the famine. 44

Paul's first great missionary journey, with Barnabas and Mark; Cyprus, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe; return to Antioch in Syria. 49-54

Apostolic council at Jerusalem; conflict between Jewish and Gentile Christianity; Paul's third journey to Jerusalem, with Barnabas and Thecla; the Christian church bears out the difficulty; agreement between the Jewish and Gentile apostles; Paul's return to Antioch; his collision with Peter and Barnabas at Antioch; the temporary separation from the latter. 50

Paul's second missionary journey from Antioch to Asia Minor, Cilicia, Lycaonia, Galatia, Troas, and Greece (Philippi, Thessalonica, Berosus, Athens, and Corinthus). From this tour dates the Christianization of Europe. 61

Paul at Corinth (a year and a half); First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians. 52-53

Paul's fourth journey to Jerusalem (spring); short stay at Antioch; his third missionary tour (autumn). 54

Paul at Ephesus (three years); Epistle to the Galatians and Ephesians; First Epistle to the Corinthians (spring, 67); Second Epistle to the Corinthians (spring, 67), Paul's departure from Ephesus (summer) to Macedonia. 56-57

Second Epistle to the Corinthians. 57

Paul's third sojourn at Corinth (three months); Epistle to the Romans. 56-57

Paul's fifth and last journey to Jerusalem (spring), where he is arrested, sent to Caesarea, and thence to Rome (Gal. iii. 20; Acts xvi. 6, 7). 57-58

Paul's captivity at Caesarea; testimony before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa (the Gospel of Acts commenced at Caesarea, and concluded at Rome). 60-65

Paul's voyage to Rome (autumn); shipwreck at Malta; arrival at Rome (spring, 61). 60-61

Paul's first captivity at Rome; Epistles to the Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, Philemon. 61-63

Paul's captivity at Rome (duly); Neronian persecution of the Christians; martyrdom of Paul (?). 64

Hypothesis of a second Roman captivity, and preceding missionary journeys to the East, and possibly to Spain; First Epistle to Timothy; Second Timothy. 63-67
PAUL is the name of five popes.— Paul I. (757-767) was raised to the papal throne, April 26, 757, at the death of his brother, Pope Stephen II. He was supported by the Frankish party, and followed his elevation with a letter to Pippin, the Frankish king, asking him to confirm his elevation upon his promising “to be held and mightily protected.” The hostile attitude of Desiderius, king of the Lombards, soon made this aid necessary. Desiderius laid hands upon the Duchies of Spoleto and Beneventum, which had placed themselves under the protection of the Frankish king and the Pope, and refused to deliver Bologna and other cities to the papal see. With the aid of France, Paul secured most of his demands, but practised a double-faced policy with Desiderius to do it. Paul lived in constant anxiety lest the Byzantine emperor should form an alliance with the Lombards or Pippin. He died June 26, 767. See his Life, in Liber pontif. (Muratori, Rer. Ital. iii., 172 sq.), his Letters, in Migne (vol. lxxx.) and JAFFÉ (Bibl. rer. Germ., pp. 67 sq.); JAFFÉ: Reg. Pontif.; BARONIUS: Annales, the histories of the city of Rome of Redmont and Gregorovius; HEFELLE: Conciliengesch. vol. iii. pp. 420, 431 sqq. (2d ed.).— Paul II. (1464-71), whose civil name was Alexander Farnese, was b. at Carino, Feb. 28, 1468; d. at Rome, Nov. 10, 1549. His mother’s family had given Boniface VIII., who sustained a forbidden relation to his sister. At the death of Leo X. (1521) he came within two votes of being made pope; was again unsuccessful at the death of Hadrian VI. (1523), but secured the prize at the death of Clement VII., and at his suggestion. Alexander’s ability to secure the favor of one pope after another is a sufficient evidence of his diplomatic endowments. His election as pope occurred Oct. 13, 1534, and was in spite of his transgression of the rule of celibacy. He had four children, one of whom, Pier Luigi, became notorious for his debauched habits. Alexander adopted the name of Paul III., and soon after his promotion, Dec. 18, 1534, gave his grandchildren (Alexander Farnese, a boy of fourteen, and Guido Ascanius Sforza, a boy of sixteen) cardinal’s hats. The remonstrance of the emperor the Pope answered by saying that boys had been appointed cardinals in the cradle. The bad impression created by this act was counteracted by the speedy admission of learned and devoted ecclesiastics to the college of cardinals, such as Contarini, Pole, and Sadolet. The Pope declared in favor of an oecumenical council to correct the abuses of the church, and stem the tide of the Reformation, and, encouraged by the emperor, issued a bull (June 2, 1536) for its convention at Mantua. The Duke of Mantua declining to receive the council unless all the expenses were paid by the Pope, it was appointed for May 1, 1538, at Vienne. In June, 1538, he secured the conclusion of a peace between Charles V. and Francis I. at Nice. In 1538 Paul appointed a commission to prepare a programme for the council, which brought in thirty propositions for the reformation of the church (consilium de emendanda ecclesia). These propositions, which were not received with favor, were translated by Luther into German (1538), with preface and notes, who, ignorant of the good intentions of the commissioners, calls them “distracted fellows, who want to reform the church with the tails of foxes.” Paul’s deep interest in the proposed council is vouched for by the excommunication of Henry VIII. of England (1538), under the protection of the Prankish king, asking him to confirm his election, Dec. 18, 1534, gave his grandchildren (Alexander Farnese, a boy of fourteen, and Guido Ascanius Sforza, a boy of sixteen) cardinal’s hats. The Pope declared in favor of an oecumenical council to correct the abuses of the church, and stem the tide of the Reformation, and, encouraged by the emperor, issued a bull (June 2, 1536) for its convention at Mantua. The Duke of Mantua declining to receive the council unless all the expenses were paid by the Pope, it was appointed for May 1, 1538, at Vienne. In June, 1538, he secured the conclusion of a peace between Charles V. and Francis I. at Nice. In 1538 Paul appointed a commission to prepare a programme for the council, which brought in thirty propositions for the reformation of the church (consilium de emendanda ecclesia). These propositions, which were not received with favor, were translated by Luther into German (1538), with preface and notes, who, ignorant of the good intentions of the commissioners, calls them “distracted fellows, who want to reform the church with the tails of foxes.” Paul’s deep interest in the proposed council is vouched for by the excommunication of Henry VIII. of England (1538), after he had declared against the council in two tracts. The Pope was intensely loyal to his family, and got into wars and controversies in the endeavor to promote the interests of his grandchildren and nephews. The refusal of Perugia to pay a salt tax which he levied, called forth from him in 1540 an interdict, and was punished with the army he sent out under his son. In 1540 he confirmed the order of Ignatius Loyola, which helped him to check the progress of Protestantism by violent measures. But he did not give up the idea of settling matters through a council, sent delegates to the disputation at Worms (1540, 1541), and Cardinal Contarini to the Colloquy of Regensburg. In consequence of a meeting between the Pope and the emperor at Lucca, the proposed council was appointed for Nov. 1, 1541, at Trent. This delay afforded time for the consolidation of the Reformation, and checking the spread of heresy. Cardinal Caraffa proposed that all heresies should be crushed from Rome as a centre; and Paul, acting upon the idea, issued the bull Licet ab initiio (July 21, 1542), and appointed a tribunal of inquisitors, with headquarters at Rome, whose office it was to extirpate
hersery. It was the aim of Charles V. to gain Paul's influence on the side of Francis I. Hostilities again broke out, and the Council of Trent was suspended July 8, 1543. In the mean while the Inquisition had done its work well in Italy. Paul's feelings against Charles V. were intensified by his concluding peace with France (Sept. 18, 1544) without consulting him, and granting some concessions to the Protestants at Spires (June 10, 1544); and he wrote to the emperor, comparing him to the worst persecutors of the Inquisition(freeing the prisoners), broke his statue, and ordered his execution. Paul's fear that the emperor, who by this time was Giovanni Pietro Caraffa; of a noble Neapolitan family; was b. June 28, 1745; d. at Rome, Aug. 18, 1559. He enjoyed the favor of his uncle, Cardinal Oliviero Caraffa, who opened to him the way to ecclesiastical promotion. Julius II. made him bishop of Chieti (Theate) in 1504, and used him for political missions. Leo X. despatched him as papal legate to England to demand the payment of Peter's pence, and to Spain to induce Ferdinand to form a general alliance of Christian princes against the Turks. The second mission was unsuccessful; but Caraffa secured the Spanish king's favor, and received the appointment of vice grand chaplain, which he held for several years. Soon after the king's death he returned to Italy, and after 1520 resided in Rome. He was one of the commission of eight appointed by Leo X. to destroy the hydra of heresy, but was disappointed in its failure to take energetic measures. He was a member of the Oratory of the Divine Love, which developed into the Order of the Theatines. Caraffa, true to its profession, set the example in renouncing worldly possessions. In 1527 he was in Venice, and began the rôle of a violent enemy of the heretics, which he pursued for thirty years. In a letter to the Pope, he said, "Heretics are heretics, and must be treated as such," etc. Paul III. made him cardinal; and he soon took sides in the conclave against the party led by Contarini, which was in favor of mild and conciliatory measures towards the Protestants. After Contarini's failure to come to any agreement with the Protestants at the Regensburg Colloquy (1541), the radical party at Rome secured the preponderance of influence. Caraffa was energetic in spying on any indications of the Reformation in Italy; and by the bull Licet ab initio, promulgated July 21, 1542, the Holy Office of the Inquisition was established at Rome. Caraffa threw all his force into it. His elevation to the papal throne, May 23, 1555, enabled him to carry out his plans fully, covering Italy with a network of Inquisition offices. He extended his efforts in opposition to the Reformation, to Spain, France, and England; and the order of the Jesuits was favored by him to such an extent, that he was hailed as its second founder (Orlandini, i. 15). His last dying words to the cardinals assembled at his death-bed were in commendation of the Inquisition. His death was hailed with jubilation by the people, who stormed the house of the Inquisition (freeing the prisoners), broke his statue, and dragged the head through the streets. But the next day all Rome thronged to see the remains of the great Pope, who had impressed the stamp of his mind and will upon the future history of the Papacy. See notices of the early lives of Paul in Bromato: Storia di Paolo IV., Ravenna, 1748-63, 2 vols. Very important is the manuscript work, Vita del Papa Caraffa, in the British Museum, etc. Ranke: History of the Popes (an excellent description of his character.
and work). [See also the Histories of the Reformation of Fisher. See also Benavente.]

Paul V. (1605-21), whose civil name was Camillo Borghese, was b. Sept. 17, 1552, at Rome; studied philosophy at Perugia, and law at Padua; d. Jan. 28, 1621, at Rome. He was made cardinal in 1590 by Clement VIII., in recognition of his service as papal legate in Spain, and afterwards in England, where he conducted the education of Adelberg, daughter of the Lombard king Desiderius. He entered the clerical order, and became a canon of Liudmagnre, at whose court he remained for some time. In 1587 he returned to his former cloister at Monte Carlo, Italy. Paul was versatible as a writer. From one of his poems on John the Baptist, Guido of Arezzo got names for the notes:—

His historical works are a Life of Gregory the Great (a compilation from Beda, and Gregory's own writings), Gesta episcoporum Mettensium (a History of Rome down to the time of Justinian, written for Adelberg), and especially a History of the Lombards to Liudmagnre's death (744), which preserves many valuable popular traditions. German translations of the last work by Spruner (Hamb., 1838) and Abel (Berlin, 1849); Dahn: Des Paulus Diaconus Leben und Schriften, 1870; Wattenbach: Deutschland's Geschichtsgauen, 4th ed., Berlin, 1872.

Paula, a Roman lady of the highest rank and of great wealth; married, and mother to four children; settled, after the death of her husband Toxotes, most of her property on her children, and followed Jerome to the Holy Land, where she founded a monastery, nunnery, and hospital at Bethlehem, and spent her life in devotional practices. She died in 404, and is commemorated by the Roman-Catholic Church on Jan. 26. See Act. Sanct. Boll., Jan. 26.

Paulicians, a dualistic sect of the Orient, whose name was derived from their respect for the apostle Paul, rather than from their third leader, the Armenian Paul, as Photius and Petrus Siculoz affirm.

History.—The founder of the sect was a certain Constantine, who hailed from Mananalis, a dualistic community near Samosata. He studied the Gospels and Christian doctrines, and, upon the basis of the former, vigorously opposed the formalism of the church. Regarding himself as called to restore the pure Christianity of Paul, he adopted the name Silvanus, one of Paul's disciples, and about the year 680 founded his first congregation at Kiboza in Armenia. Twenty-seven years afterwards he was stoned to death by order of the emperor Simeon, the court official who executed the order, was himself converted, and, adopting the name Titus, became Constantine's successor, but was burned to death in 690 (the punishment pronounced upon the Manicheans). The adherents of the sect fled, with the Armenian Paul at their head, to Episparis. He died in 715, leaving two sons, Gennadius (whom he had appointed his successor) and Theodore. The latter, giving out that he had received the Holy Ghost, rose up against Gennadius, but was unsuccessful. Gennadius was taken to Constantinople, appeared before Leo the Isaurian, was declared innocent of heresy, returned to Episparis, but, fearing danger, went with his adherents to Mananalis. His death
(in 743) was the occasion of a division in the sect; Zacharias and Joseph being the leaders of the two parties. The latter had the larger following, and was succeeded by Baanes, 775. The sect grew to an extent that many additional sermons were added to the scriptures in the form of image-worship. Baanes, an immoral man, was supplanted by Sergius, 801, who was very active for thirty-four years, and was received into the number of the saints. His activity was the occasion of renewed persecutions on the part of Leo the Armenian. Obligated to flee, Sergius and his followers settled at Argaum, in that part of Armenia which was under the control of the Saracens. At the death of Sergius, the control of the sect was divided between several leaders. The empress, Theodora, instituted a new persecution, in which a hundred thousand Paulicians in Grecian Armenia are said to have lost their lives. Under Karbeas, who fled with the residue of the sect, two cities, Amara and Tephrica, were built. His successor, Chrysocheres, devastated many cities; in 867 advanced as far as Ephesus, and took many priests prisoners. In 886 the emperor, Basil, despatched Petrus Siculus to arrange for their exchange. His sojourn of nine months among the Paulicians gave him an opportunity to collect many facts, which he preserved in his "Istoria per της κενής και ματαιας αδρετοις των Μανιασων, των και Παύλικηνος λεγομενον ("History of the empty and vain heresy of the Manichaeans, otherwise called Paulicians"). The propositions of peace were not accepted, the war was renewed, and Chrysocheres killed. The power of the Paulicians was broken. In 970 the emperor, John of the empty and vain heresy of the Manichaeans, James, Jude, and an Epistle to the Laodiceans, which they professed to have. The Old Testament they rejected. They rejected the title of θεοτοκος (mother of God) and the word worship to Mary. Christ came down from heaven to manipulate men from the body and from the world, which are evil. The reverence for the cross, they looked upon as heathenish. The outward administration of the sacraments of the Lord's Supper and baptism, they rejected. Christ himself is our baptism. Their places of worship they called "places of prayer" (εσπαναρχαι). Although they were ascetics, they made no distinction in foods, and practised marriage.

The Paulicians were not a branch of the Manichaeans, as Photius, Petrus Siculus, and many modern authors have held. Both were dualists, but the former ascribed the creation of the world to the evil God; Manes, to the good God; and the former held the Scriptures in higher honor. They even condemned Manes, comparing him to Buddha. Gieseler and Neander, with more probability, derive the sect from the Gnostic Marcionites. Muratori, Gibbon, and others regard the Paulicians as the forerunners of the Cathari; but the differences between them in organization, ascetic practices, etc., forbid this opinion. [The Seventh Council of Twin (719) forbade all intercourse with them.]


PAULINUS OF AQUILEIA, one of the ornaments of the Carolingian period; was b. in Friuli, Italy; d. about 802. Elevated by Charlemagne in 787 to the patriarchal chair of Aquileia, he took an active part in the ecclesiastical controversies of the day, and was one of Charlemagne's chief counsellors in matters of ecclesiastical concern. He took part in the synods of Regensburg (792) and Frankfurt (794) against the Adoptionists, and in 796 held a provincial synod, at Forum Julii, against the Greek doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit and the Adoptionists. The acts of the last synod are given in Mansi and Hefele. Alcuin, who was very intimate with Paulinus, never wearied of his praises. Paulinus left behind him a number of Letters to Charlemagne, Leo III., and Heistulf (at one time ascribed to Stephen V.), who murdered his wife on the suspicion of adultery, and the following works: Sacrosyllabus contra Elipandum (a statement against Adoptionism); Libri tres contra Felicem, Lib. exhortationes seu de salutariis argumentis (a work dedicated to Henry, Duke of Friuli, enumerating the vices he should avoid, and the virtues he should practise, and at one time ascribed to Augustine); a tract, Sententiae, in honor of him by the Histoire litteraire de la France, and some poems, among which, a statement of faith in the Trinity and Incarnation, under the title De regula fidei metrica, etc., deserves special mention. The works of Paulinus have been edited, with a Life, by MAURIUS (Venice, 1737).
PAULINUS.

PAULINUS. Pontius Meropius Anicius, usually called Nolans, from the town of which he was bishop; a devoted ecclesiastic; was b. at Bordeaux, 353; d. June 22, 431. He belonged to one of the noblest and richest families of the land, and inherited such vast wealth, that Augustine (De civit. Dei, i. 10) could speak of him as opulentissimus dices. His youth was spent in the pursuit of pleasure. In 379 he was consul, and might have occupied the most distinguished civil positions. But turning his thoughts seriously to religious concerns, and under the influence of Martin of Tours, and Ambrose, he determined upon a clerical life, and separated from his wife Theodisia, and with her full consent. In 393 or 394 he was made presbyter at Barcelona, and relinquished his wealth, but, retaining a certain control over it, dispensed it in charities,—building hospitals for monks and the poor, in constructing extensive water-works for Nola, etc. Martin of Tours, Augustine, and Jerome applauded his self-denial and devotion. He lived humbly, and maintained strict ascetic habits. In 394 Paulinus made Nola his home, and was subsequently (409, according to Tillemont) chosen its bishop. Of Paulinus' writings there are preserved fifty letters to friends (Augustine, etc.), and thirty poems. Some of his letters contain valuable notices of the church architecture of the day, and the celebration of the Agape. (See Augusti: Briefe zur christl. Kunstgeschichte, i. 147-170.)

PAULINUS OF YORK came to England to lead the Agapae. (See Augusti: Beitriigezur christl. Kunstgeschichte, i. 147-170.)

PAULINUS.


PAULISTS, a society whose proper designation is "The Congregation of the Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle;" founded by Isaac Thomas Hecker, in New York, in 1858. The original band were Redemptorists, who at their own request were released from their vows, and ordered to the new mission with which he wished to be better adapted to missionary work in America. The members and houses of the society are held together by voluntary agreement, under one superior general, and the rules are enacted in general chapter. The society founded The Catholicity, ii.

PAULUS, Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob, a leader of rationalism in the department of exegesis; b. Sept. 1, 1761, in Leonberg, Württemberg, in the same house with Schelling, whose colleague he afterwards became at Jena and Würzburg; d. Aug. 10, 1851, in Heidelberg. His father was Diakonus at Leonberg, was not only a rationalist, but at one time had doubts about the resurrection. In order, if possible, to satisfy those doubts, he asked his wife on her death-bed to appear to him in bodily form after her death. This she did, so that her husband saw, or thought he saw, her with her body. Paulus became such an ardent advocate of spiritualistic visions, that he was deposed, in 1771, from his office, "on account of his absurd and fanciful divine visions" (ob absurdas phantasmagoricas visiones divinas). Young Paulus was brought up with stern severity; entered the seminary at Tubingen, where he graduated in 1784, and then became teacher at Schorndorf. His intense application to study necessitated a prolonged vacation (1787, 1788), which he spent in travel through Germany, Holland, England, and France. In 1788 he was called to the chair of Oriental languages at Jena.

The period of rationalism can hardly produce a theologian who gave a more characteristic display of rationalistic tendencies than Paulus. The views he held as a young man he continued to hold in his old age. As a youth, he understood by righteousness intellectual probity, and by faith honesty of conviction; and just before his death, he said, "I am justified in the sight of God by my desire of that which is good." He conceived of religion as the intellectual knowledge of God. All definitions which associated it with the emotional nature, or regarded it as an act of immediate consciousness, he discarded, as savoring of pietism, mysticism, etc. Paulus did not succeed as professor of Oriental languages, and at Doderlein's death (1789) he was transferred to the chair of exegetical theology. He was, however, exceedingly busy as a student and author, and published, among other writings, the Philosophical Key to the Psalms (Philologische Clavis über die Psalmen), 1791 [2d ed., Heidelberg, 1815], and Philosophical Key to Isaiah, 1793; a critical commentary on the New Testament (Philolog.-Kritischer Com. über d. N. Test.), in three parts, 1800-04; and an edition of Spinoza's works (1802 sq, 2 vols.). His labors upon the Old Testament, in 639, created a decided sensation. The so-called natural explanation of the miracles of Christ is indubitably associated with his name. This method of interpretation stood in close connection with his philosophical principle, which measures facts by the conception of their possibility. It is impossible that one who was really dead should rise again: therefore Christ was only apparently dead when he lay in the sepulchre. Christ could not walk on the lake — that is an impossibility; and the Gospels mean that he walked on the shore of the lake. No rationalist of our day who lays claim to exegetical culture can read such interpretations without smiling. The remark is attributed to a well-known philologist, that "the theologians are creating exegetical miracles in order to do away with the biblical miracles." It was Lavater, and none of the sages of rationalism, who resented the ridiculous hypothesis that Christ walked on the shore, and not on the lake itself. "We dare not pronounce such interpretations of..."
the plainest statements foolish and insolent, for our very tolerant generation would declare that it concurred; but I would like, in all modesty, to ask these philosophical illuminators, whether a single philologist for the last seventeen hundred years can be found who stumbled upon the idea of translating the words "Jesus walked upon the sea" by "near the sea, on the shore," but whether, indeed, the three evangelists intended to teach that Jesus was entirely without sinking in deep devotion before him. No, he is not a mere man, as other men. He was not weary of repeating against me, "Believe me, I am justified in the sight of God by my desire of that which is good." Paulus wrote a sketch of his own life (1839); and full details will be found in the work of Reichlin-Meldegg, professor of philosophy at Heidelberg, to whose hands Paulus intrusted his manuscripts and many hundreds of letters: H. E. G. Paulus u. seine Zeit. Stuttgart, 1853, 2 vols. KARNIS.

PAUPÉRES DE LUGDUNO. See Waldenses.

PAVION, Bishop of Alet; one of the four bishops who refused unqualified assent to the papal condemnation of the five articles from Jansen's writings; was b. at Paris, Nov. 17, 1597; d. Dec. 8, 1677. He deserves a place here as a perfect type of a Jansenist bishop. He was acquainted in early life with St. Vincent de Paul, under whose direction he engaged in charitable work at Paris, and secured some fame as a preacher. Appointed to the bishopric of Alet, in the Pyrenees, by Richelieu, he was very reluctant to accept. Following the counsel of Vincent de Paul, he was consecrated in 1639. The diocese of Alet had been wretchedly administered. Pavillon effected a complete re-organization and reformation of the habits of his clergy, for whose education he established a seminary at Alet. Among the other customs of the day, which he denounced, was the duel. Neither Richelieu, Mazarin, nor Louis XIV. liked the bishop; and the Capuchins and other religious corporations of his diocese opposed his administration. The opposition was increased after his refusal to assent to the papal condemnation of Port Royal; but the purity of his life, and the esteem in which he was held, prevented his deposition. See Reuchlin: Gesch. von Port-Royal, Gottha, 1839-44, 2 vols. HERZOG.

PAYSON, Edward, by ratio of Rindge, Me., July 25, 1783; d. at Portland, Me., Oct. 22, 1827. He was a graduate of Harvard College; studied divinity with his father, Dr. Seth Payson; and was
settled over the Second Congregational Parish in Portland near the close of 1807. Here he continued to labor with extraordinary zeal and success, until his death, at the age of forty-four. Dr. Payson was a highly gifted man intellectually and spiritually, and left his mark upon American piety. His Life, which had a very wide circulation both in this country and in Great Britain, is usually ascribed to his name to the world. He was of a melancholy temperament, and not without morbid tendencies, which mar somewhat the influence of his example; but, notwithstanding this drawback, the records of his religious experience and pastoral labors are so full of impassioned love for Christ and love for the souls of men, so inspired by seraphic devotion and all holy sympathies, so illumined by light from heaven, that no one can easily read them without being stimulated to a better life. His fine natural traits—sportive humor, ready mother-wit, facetious pleasantry, and keen sense of the ridiculous—rendered him a delightful companion, in the centre of attraction alike in his home and in society. Just before his death he dictated a letter to his sister, which is one of the gems of religious literature. Here are the opening sentences:

"Were I to adopt the figurative language of Bunyan, I might date this letter from the land of Beulah, of which I have been for some weeks a happy inhabitant. The Celestial City is full in my view. Its glorious beam upon me, its breezes fan me, its odors are warmed to its rays, its sounds strike upon my ear, and, in the spirit, are breathed into my heart. Nothing separates me from it but the river of death, which now appears but as an insignificant rill, that may be crossed at a single step, whenever God shall give permission. The Sun of righteousness has been gradually drawing nearer and nearer, appearing larger and brighter as he approached, and now he fills the whole hemisphere, pouring forth a flood of glory, in which I seem to float like an insect in the beams of the sun, exulting, yet almost trembling, while I gaze on this excessive brightness."

Lit.—The Complete Works of Edward Payson in 3 vols. 8vo, Portland, 1846. This edition contains the Memoir by Dr. Asa Cummings, first published in 1829; Payson's Select Thoughts, edited by his eldest daughter, Mrs. Hopkins; and his Essays, by G. L. Prentiss.

PÁZMÁNY, Peter, the most distinguished Catholic prelate of Hungary; was b. Oct. 4, 1570, at Grosswardein; d. at Pressburg, March 19, 1637. His parents, who were Calvinists, sent him to the Jesuit college at Kolozsvár. At the age of seventeen he entered the order of the Jesuits, and was sent to Rome to complete his education. Returning in 1597, he became professor of philosophy at Graz.

As a Writer.—In the sixteenth century the press and the schools in Hungary were almost exclusively in the hands of the Protestants. Pazmany was a master of the Magyar language, and by his style won for himself the title of the "Hungarian Cicero."

As a Politician.—At the death of the primate Forgás, the author of the Kálausz was made archbishop. From the moment of his elevation, he made it his object to confirm the Hapsburg dynasty in power; and he succeeded in gaining a complete victory over Protestantism. Pazmany was the Hungarian Richelieu. He succeeded in making converts of many of the nobles, secured the election of Ferdinand II. to the throne, in spite of the herculean efforts of the Protestant nobles at the Parliament. In 1629 he was made cardinal.

As an Ecclesiastic.—At the appearance of Pazmany the Catholic Church was much demoralized in Hungary, both intellectually and financially. The clergy were dissolve. He had to build up from the foundation. His first care was to provide the church with well-trained ecclesiastics. In 1628 he founded the seminary called the "Pazmaneum," at Vienna, which is still in a flourishing condition. Theological and other schools were established in many places, and richly endowed. The Protestant clergy were driven from their parishes, and their goods confiscated. The Jesuits were everywhere in power. That Europe possesses one Protestant nation less than she has is due to the zeal and ability of Pazmany. See Frankl: Pázmány Péter és kora (P. Pazmany and his Times), Pest, 1868-72, 3 vols.; Kaukoffer: P. Pázmány, Cardinal, Vienna, 1866. FRANZ BALOCH.

PEABODY, George, an illustrious philanthropist, descended from New-England Puritans, was b. in the part of Danvers, Mass., which now bears the name of Peabody, Feb. 18, 1795; and d. in London, Nov. 4, 1869. He was employed as a boy in a country store; but he soon broke away from its limitations, and, before he became of age, had engaged in business at Georgetown, D.C., and in 1815 at Baltimore, in a commercial house which soon established branches at Philadelphia and New York. He visited England for the first time in 1827, and was of much service in protecting the financial interests of the State of Maryland. He made his permanent home in London in 1843.

As his fortune increased, he cherished the purpose of devoting a large part of it to the good of his fellow-men. His generosity first became conspicuous when he gave a large sum to enable exhibitors from the United States to make a suitable display in the Universal Exhibition of 1851; then he made a liberal contribution toward the expense of the Grinnell expedition, which went in search of the Arctic explorer, Sir John Franklin; and in 1852, when the centennial anniversary of the settlement of his native place was commemorated, he sent to the committee a letter, offering as a sentiment this maxim, "Education, a debt due from the present to succeeding generations," and giving a generous foundation for a local library. Next came his proposal to establish in Baltimore, where he had long resided, an institute for the encouragement of the sciences and the arts. This was followed, in 1862, by his gift to the poor of London, which has been employed in building good dwellings to be rented at low rates to moral, industrious, and needy persons. This was fol-
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Lowed, in 1866, by a noble endowment for the promotion of education in the Southern States of this Union.

The magnitude of these three last-mentioned endowments, in a certain sense, eclipses several other gifts, which, taken by themselves, would have made his name distinguished. He established a museum of archaeology at Harvard, of natural history at Yale, and endowed an academy of sciences at Salem.

He founded a second library in his native town, at North Danvers; built a church at Georgetown, Mass., as a memorial of his mother; and gave liberal sums to Kenyon College (Ohio), Washington and Lee University (Virginia), Phillips Academy (Andover), and to the Maryland and Massachusetts historical societies. He also founded a library in Georgetown, D.C.

He received during his lifetime innumerable tokens of the gratitude of those whose appreciation he valued. The queen, it is said, offered him a baronetcy, and, when it was declined, presented him with her portrait; citizens of London caused a statue by William W. Story to be placed in his honor near the Royal Exchange, Oxford conferred on him the honorary degree of J.C.D.; while his countrymen, by large assemblies in the places where he had lived, and by other innumerable tokens, manifested their admiration and respect; Harvard conferred on him the degree of L.L.D., and Congress caused a gold medal to be struck in his honor.

In all his good deeds George Peabody was as sagacious as he was generous. He gave in his lifetime for worthy objects, and he helped them on with a nice sense of their proportionate value. He gave for purposes in which he was personally interested, and which others had neglected, yet by methods which were likely to incite and call out the co-operation of others. His deeds of trust were prepared with remarkable skill, so as to secure in successive generations excellent managers, and so as to indicate clearly the main purpose of each foundation without cluttering it by too many trivial regulations. His endowments are free from narrow sectarian or sectional limitations, but are for the purpose of promoting education in the United States, and for the relief of the poor in England. His trustees were selected with great discrimination. Consequently all his gifts have been well administered, and most of them are of increasing value. They have also suggested other benefactions. It is certain, for example, that the bequest of Johns Hopkins for a university in Baltimore was quickened by the example of his former townsman; and the John F. Slater Fund, for the education of freedmen, was indirectly due to the success of the Peabody Fund. His interest in every place where he had resided—Danvers, Thetford, Georgetown, Baltimore, and London—was shown by some endowment.

Mr. Peabody was never married. He was hospitable and patriotic, and during his residence in London was instrumental in promoting a good understanding between England and the United States. His habits to the close of life were careful and thrifty; his demeanor was dignified, simple, and affable; he took great pleasure in his benefactions. When he died, his body, after funeral services in Westminster Abbey, was brought to his native land in a British man-of-war, and buried in his native town.

The eulogies by Hon. R. C. Winthrop (at the funeral) and by Hon. S. Teackle Wallis in Baltimore are among the best tributes to his memory.

Mr. Wallis closes his address with these words:

"Peabody has shown how the rich may keep above their riches by clinging to the treasure of their souls."

It is impossible to give a complete list of his benefactions, but those which are of the most general interest are indicated in the following list:—

Establishment of a trust for the London poor by a gift which has increased (1882) by investments to the sum of $4,000,000

Establishment of a Southern educational fund (besides, in Mississippi bonds, $1,000,000)...

Foundation of the Peabody Institute, Baltimore (including $1,000,000 in cash, $300,000 in Tennessee bonds, and $100,000 in Virginia bonds), total valued at...

1,400,000

Peabody Museum of Archeology, Cambridge, Mass. 150,000

Peabody Museum of Natural History, New Haven, Conn. 150,000

Peabody Academy of Sciences, Salem, Mass. 140,000

For a church at Georgetown, D.C. 100,000

Kenyon College 26,000

Phillips Academy, Andover 25,000

Maryland Historical Society 20,000

Massachusetts Historical Society 20,000

Newburyport, Mass., for a library 15,000

United States department in the World's Fair 15,000

Georgetown (D.C.) Public Library 14,000

Grinnell expedition to the Arctic Ocean 10,000

United States Sanitary Commission 10,000

Peabody Library, Thetford, Vt. 6,000

Washington and Lee University 5,000

Most of the institutions which bear the name of Peabody publish annual reports giving full particulars in respect to their operations. The proceedings of the trustees of the educational fund fill two octavo volumes of several hundred pages each.

D. C. GILMAN.

PEABODY, William Bourne Oliver, D.D., b. at Exeter, N.H., July 9, 1799; d. at Springfield, Mass., May 28, 1847; graduated at Harvard, 1817; studied divinity at Cambridge; and was from October, 1820, Unitarian pastor at Springfield.

"A man of rare accomplishments and consummate virtue," he was one of the most distinguished ornaments of his denomination. He wrote much for the North American Review, Christian Examiner, and Sparks's American Biography, and prepared for the Massachusetts Zoological Survey a Report on the Birds of the Commonwealth, 1839. He was familiar with landscape-gardening, and gave some lectures on scientific topics. His Sermons, with a memoir by his twin-brother, appeared, 1849, and his Literary Remains, edited by his son, 1850. He published in 1823 a Catechism in Verse, with ten lyrics on the seasons, etc., among them, Behold the Western Evening Light, and in 1825 The Springfield Collection of Hymns.

F. M. BIRD.

PEACE, Kiss of. See Kiss of Peace.

PEACE OFFERING. See Offerings, p. 1688.

PEARSON, Elipehlet, LL.D., b. in Byfield, a parish in Newbury, Mass., June 11, 1752; d. at Greenwich, N.H., Sept. 10, 1826. He entered Harvard College in 1769, and was graduated in 1773.

Soon after graduation he was called to teach a grammar-school at Andover, Mass., the home of

1 Owing to the loss, on the Arctic, of certain bonds, the recovery of which is still in litigation, the amount of this donation cannot be exactly stated.
his friend Samuel Phillips, afterwards lieutenant-governor of Massachusetts. In 1775 Gov. Phillips was commissioned by the General Court to manufacture gunpowder for the Revolutionary army. In this enterprise he relied very much on the scientific attainments of Pearson. He resided at the same time while he laid the foundation of Phillips Academy at Andover. Pearson became the first principal of the academy, and remained in office from 1778 to 1786. He was one of the twelve original trustees, and was the first president of the board who did not belong to the Phillips family.

In 1786 he was called to the professorship of the Hebrew and Oriental languages at Harvard College,— an office for which he was well qualified. He delivered to the students a valuable course of lectures on language. He was eminently successful as a teacher of rhetoric. Occasionally he spent the entire night in correcting the compositions of the students, in order that he might spend the day in the multiplied extra-official duties which were heaped upon him. He labored with rare zeal and tact for the financial as well as literary welfare of the college. He searched the documents which illustrated the claim of the university to certain disputed possessions; examined old deeds in the registry of probate, old notes pertaining to farms, ferries, and bridges, in which the university had, or was thought to have, an interest. For twenty years he was an uncommonly laborious professor in the college; for six years was a leading member of its Board of Visitors; and for a long time performed many of the duties belonging to the president. Among his pupils were some of the most eminent men of the day, such as John Quincy Adams, Judge Story, Presidents Kirkland and Quincy, Drs. William E. Channing and Edward Payson, John Pickering, Alexander H. Everett. It has been often said, that, if Gov. Phillips had lived, Pearson would have been elected president of Harvard College, as successor to Dr. Joseph Willard.

He resigned his office at Cambridge in 1806. He had rather repaired to Andover, where he gave the first impulse to the formation of the Andover Theological Seminary. He originated its remarkable constitution. He and Dr. Leonard Woods were the main instruments of effecting the union between the seminary planned at Andover and that which had been planned by Dr. Samuel Spring of Newburyport. He rode from Andover to Newburyport thirty-six times for the purpose of consummating that union. He was elected the first professor of sacred literature in the seminary. He was the first president of the Board of Trustees after the theological institution came under its care. He retained the presidency of that board nineteen years,— a longer period than any other one, either before or since his time, had held it. He continued a member of the board forty-eight years.

He was an adept in the fine arts; he possessed remarkable skill and taste in music; he had also an architect's eye and forecast. For many years he had been an industrious member, and also the secretary, of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He had associated mainly with men of letters, of science, and of political renown; he had not addicted himself to the niceties of theological study. Not feeling at home in his Andover professorship, he retained it only one year (1805–06).

His person was noble and commanding: his manners were dignified and courtly. As a teacher, he was zealous; as a disciplinarian, exact and severe. He published a Hebrew grammar and also five pamphlets. He edited two or three important volumes and numerous tracts. He originated the Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, and was the most conspicuous man in forming the American Education Society. His enterprising spirit made him a pioneer in many great and good works.

EDWARDS A. PARK.
PECKE, John Mason, D.D., Baptist; b. in Litchfield, Conn., Oct. 31, 1789; d. at Rock Spring, Ill., March 14, 1857. With early poverty, and no more than common-school advantages, he succeeded in acquiring considerable information, and in exerting a wide influence. His parents were Congregationalists, and he joined their church; but in 1812 he was licensed to preach by the Baptists, and subsequently was one of the pioneer preachers of this denomination. After regular pastoral labor for five years, in 1817 he was appointed by the Baptist Triennial Convention a missionary to Missouri Territory. In 1820 the mission was closed, but he continued his itinerating work there and in Illinois. In 1822 he was appointed to the same work by the Baptist Missionary Society. He also was agent (1823) of the American Bible Society, and active in the organization of Sunday-schools. By reason of his advocacy of the plan in 1826, he deserves the epithet of “father” of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, which was organized 1832. In 1827 he established the Rock Spring Seminary (now Shurtleff College); in April, 1829, The Pioneer, the first Baptist, perhaps the first religious, newspaper west of the Alleghanies. In 1833 he projected the American Baptist Historical Society. His life was that of a pioneer, and fruitful in good works. He wrote The Emigrant's Guide, Boston, 1831 (it induced large emigration); Gazetteer of Illinois, Jacksonville, Ill., 1834; Life of Daniel Boone, in Sparks's American Biography, Boston, 2d ser., xii.; Life of Father Clark N. Y., 1855. See R. Babcock: Forty Years of Pioneer Life: Memoir of John Mason Peck, D.D., edited from his Journals and Correspondence, Phila., 1894.

PEDERSEN, Christiern, b. at Svendborg, in the Danish Island of Funen, 1480; d. at Helsing, in the Island of Zealand, Jan. 16, 1554. He studied in Paris; became canon at the cathedral of Lund, but was implicated in the political vicissitudes of Christian II.; fled to Holland, and lived, after his return, in retirement, though active for the spread of the Reformation. He translated the New Testament into Danish, 1530.

PEDOBAPTISM, PEDOBAPTISTS. See PEOBAPTISM, PEDOBAPTISTS.

PELAGIUS AND THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSES. While the Eastern Church engaged all her energies in the elaboration of the doctrines of the Trinity and incarnation, and the demonstration of the supernatural character of Christianity as a fact in the objective world, it fell to the lot of the Western Church to take up the doctrines of sin and grace, and demonstrate the supernatural character of Christianity as an agency in the subjective world. Not that those ideas were altogether wanting in the Eastern Church, but they were only partially developed. The problem was then and there to burst the bounds of Pagan naturalism, and rise to the higher level of spiritual morality. Both in the contest between the Greek philosophy and the old mythological spirit, and in the contest between Christianity and Gnosticism, the issue at stake was the founders of Syracuse University, 1870, and the first president of its board of trustees. He wrote The Central Idea of Christianity (New York), The True Woman (New York, 1857), History of the Great Republic (New York, 1868).
Hence the constant and strong emphasis which all the Greek Fathers, from Origen to Chrysostom, lay on human freedom: hence the shyness they evince towards any thing which might make sin appear as a natural power. However grave the consequences of the fall may be,— the overpowering sensuality and death in its track; the weakness of the will; always open to the temptations of the world, the Devil, and the demons; the dulness and the errors of the intellect,— nevertheless, actual sin is always man's own deed, issuing from that point in him which cannot be obliterated without destroying him as a moral being,— the freedom of his will. The general state of sinfulness is recognized; but at the same time it is now and then hinted,— as, for instance, by Gregory of Nyssa— that there might exist human beings who were sinless. Quite otherwise in the Western Church. Tertullian, and, after him, Hilary and Ambrose, recognized in human nature a sin naturata, that is, a constitution which, from the moment of creation, placed man in such a position, that he fell into sin. They taught that Original Sin was a real and actual evil, which the first man, Adam, and his wife, Eve, had a momentary share, and that from that time it became the common property of the human race by generation, and they consequently define man as immortal, in the same state as Adam was in before the fall, and in the same year. At what time he came to Rome from Britain cannot be ascertained; but his stay there must have been of some duration, since he gave an almost complete literary exposition of those views which soon were to cause such vehement opposition before (in 411) he left for Africa. He was thoroughly conversant with the Greek language and theology, and shows a certain affinity to the doctrinal tendencics of the Eastern Church, which seems to indicate that the original connection between the British monasteries and the East, Augustine continued the journey to Palestine, while Coelestius remained at Carthage, where he hoped to obtain the office of presbyter. In 412, however, he was accused of heresy by Deacon Paulinus of Milan, before a synod at Carthage, over which Bishop Aurelius presided. The accusation referred to six different points of heresy, of which the most prominent seems to have been that concerning infant baptism. Adam, Coelestius was said to maintain, would have died, even if he had not sinned. Children are born in the same state as Adam was in before the fall, and consequently they have eternal life, even though they die unbaptized. Both before and after the Lord's appearance in the flesh, there have existed people who were without sin, etc. Coelestius tried to show that the question whether or not there existed a true tradux peccati was a theological problem, without any direct bearing on the general creed of the church. From the few fragments of the debate which have come down to us, it is evident that Coelestius thought much with Rufinus, the zealous propagator of Greek theology in the Latin Church, and the circle which gathered around Rufinus, Paulinus of Nola, Sulpicius Severus, and others. The odious stories told about him by Jerome and Orosius are completely refuted by the circumstance, that, even when the controversy was hottest, Augustine never ceased to pay an unstinted respect to his moral zeal and Christian conduct. The great work he wrote in Rome— his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans was to deprive the Pauline Epistles— exists only in the orthodox redaction of Cassiodorus; but even in that the change of the text is evident. In the Spanish presbyter Orosius to him with letters of recommendation. Orosius also brought a report of what had recently taken place in Africa; and Jerome consequently lost no time in writing his Dialogi contra Pelagianos. The book is full of the severest invectives, but without any deep understanding of the subject. Jerome confined himself to the question, whether, as asserted by Pelagius, a human being could be without sin; and that question became, indeed, the principal subject of the debate at the synod of Jerusalem, which Bishop
Peleaeius.

Johannes convened for the purpose of settling the controversy between Jerome and Pelagius. Orosius was invited to give an account of what had taken place in Africa, and laid great stress upon the circumstance that the views of Pelagius had been rejected by the authority of Augustine. But as Pelagius simply declared that the authority of Augustine had nothing to do with the subject in question, and as Johannes took the side of Pelagius, Orosius had to content himself with claiming that the final decision should be referred to the Bishop of Rome, since Pelagius was a member of the Latin Church. Johannes consented; but it soon appeared that the adversaries of Pelagius could not abide with patience the result of so slow a process. Before the year (416) came to an end, two deposed Western bishops who happened to be in Palestine (Heras of Arles and Lazarus of Aix) laid a formal accusation of heresy before the synod of Diospolis, convened by Bishop Eulogius of Cesarea. To the great chagrin, however, of Jerome, Pelagius succeeded also this time in satisfying his Oriental judges, and was recognized as an orthodox member of the orthodox church. Pelagius and Celestius were deposed. But since Pelagius acquiesced in that condemnation, Augustine was certainly right when he afterwards, in his De gestis Pelagii, protested that Pelagius could not give his assent to that condemnation without condemning himself.

In the West those decisions caused considerable uneasiness, and it was generally determined to employ more effective measures against the new heresy. At a provincial synod of Carthage, convened in 416 by Bishop Aurelius, Orosius read a report of what had taken place in Palestine, written by the two Gallican bishops; and the synod decided to anathematize Pelagius and Celestius, unless they retracted. A letter was also sent to Pope Innocent I., asking him to anathematize any one who should teach that man is able by himself to overcome sin, and fulfill the commandments of God, or who should deny that by baptism children are raised from a state of perdition. And made heirs to eternal life. The Nomidian bishops assembled at Mileve in the same year, and addressed the Pope in a similar strain; and so did five other African bishops, among whom was Augustine, in a private letter. The Pope was much flattered by these appeals, as he called them, to the authority of the Roman see, and declared himself in perfect accord with the African bishops. Pelagius now also presented a confession to the Pope, in which he expatiated at great length upon Christology, the Trinity, and other doctrines, but touched only vaguely the point in question, arguing against the views of the Manichæans, that man cannot escape sinning, and against those, who, like Jovinian, asserted that man, when regenerated, can sin no more. This confession did not reach Innocent before his death; but his successor, Zosimus, received it very kindly, and seemed to be more in favor of Pelagius and Celestius, who had become a presbyter in Ephe- sus, and afterwards had stayed for some time in Constantinople, came also to Rome about this time; and in the confession he submitted to Zosimus he tried to vindicate his old point of view, — that the whole question was, properly speaking, pretter fidei. The result of these movements was, that Zosimus, in two letters, openly blamed the African bishops because they had listened to the accusations of the Gallican bishops, two men of ill repute, and opened a controversy without properly investigating the matter.

The African bishops, however, would not brook the rebuke. A synod of Carthage immediately determined to adhere to the decision of Innocent as the only valid one; and, while Zosimus was trying to effect a decent retreat, the African bishops assembled in a general council (418), at which also delegates from Spain were present, and formally condemned the views of Pelagius. The propositions condemned were, that man was created mortal, and would have died, even though he had not sinned; that children were born without sin, and needed not baptism as an atonement; that grace works only forgiveness for sins committed, but does not help to avoid committing sins; that grace helps only by revealing the will of God, but not by communicating power to withstand sin, etc. The African bishops further succeeded in gaining the Emperor Honorius over to their side; and an edict of April 30, 418, banished all adherents of Pelagianism from the country. Zosimus now saw fit to break openly with Pelagianism, and by his Epistola Tractoria he solemnly confirmed the canons of the African council. All Western bishops were commanded to subscribe to the letter. A few Italian bishops refused. Among them was Julian of Eclanum in Apulia, the third great representative of Pelagianism, and a man both of talents and learning. He sacrificed his bishopric for his opinions, and in the literary contest which ensued he gave Pelagianism a broader and more consistent development. Meanwhile the Pelagians were everywhere hunted down. New and harder decrees were issued against them by Constantius. Pelagius himself disappears altogether after 420. Celestius is still seen wandering about for some years from place to place. In 424 he was in Rome, demanding a new investigation of the subject from Pope Coelestius; in 426 he was in Constantinople, trying to make an alliance with Nestorius, etc. See Celestius, Nestorianism, and Semi-Pelagianism.

Lit. — The sources are the works of Pelagius, Expositiones in epist. Pauli, Epistula ad Demetr., and Libellus fidei ad Innocentium (preserved among the works of Jerome, ed. Mart. V.: the Libellus fidei was for a long time considered an orthodox work, and is quoted as such in the Libri Carolini, i. 1); the pertinent works of Jerome, Augustine, Orosius, Julian, and Marius Mercator; the acts of the various councils (see in Mansi, i.); the pertinent works of Jerome, Augustine, Orosius, Julian, and Marius Mercator; the acts of the various councils (see in Mansi, i.); the pertinent works of Jerome, Augustine, Orosius, Julian, and Marius Mercator; the acts of the various councils (see in Mansi, i.); the pertinent works of Jerome, Augustine, Orosius, Julian, and Marius Mercator; the acts of the various councils (see in Mansi, i.); the pertinent works of Jerome, Augustine, Orosius, Julian, and Marius Mercator; the acts of the various councils (see in Mansi, i.); the pertinent works of Jerome, Augustine, Orosius, Julian, and Marius Mercator; the acts of the various councils (see in Mansi, i.); the pertinent works of Jerome, August
PELAGIUS.

Silvester, a foe of Monophysitism, and the elevation of Vigilius. He stood in favor with Vigilius, and in 553 signed the Constitution in favor of the Three Chapters (see Three-Chapter Controversy) which Vigilius had drawn up. Vigilius and Pelagius were both banished by the Byzantine emperor, but the latter pardoned, and commenced by the emperor for Pope Vigilius' part of Vigilius. Two Popes and one presbyter assisted at his consecration. He was accused of heresy, on account of his connection with the Three-Chapter Controversy, and took great pains to rid himself of the charge. He had much opposition in Italy. It was an act humiliating to the Papacy, when, in 557, he decided, at the wish of Childebert, to furnish a confession of faith as a proof of his orthodoxy. But that he understood how to vigorously defend the Church against the claims of the State is seen in his demand upon Childebert to make good his invasions into the rights of the papal vicar Sapandus. See Vida Pelagii I., in Muratori: Rer. Ital., iii.; JAFFÉ: Reg. Pontif. Rom., 2d ed., Leipzig, 1881. Pelagius' Letters are given in MIGNE: Patroli. Latina, vol. ixxi.—Pelagius II. (678-690), of Gothic extraction, the son of Winigild, was b. at Rome; elevated to the papal throne, July 30, 578; d. in Rome in January, 590. Pressed by the king of the Lombards, he sought aid from the Byzantine emperor, who, not being in a position to send an army, advised the Pope to free Rome from the army of besiegers by the payment of a sum of money. Pelagius, following the advice, secured temporary relief by the payment of three thousand pounds of gold to the Lombards. In order to secure permanent relief, he also solicited the aid of Childebert II., king of the Franks, who wrote to Laurentius, Archbishop of Milan, promising an army which should "destroy the cursed people that had armed its cruel hands with violence against the saints and for the murder of the faithful." The alliance between the Greeks and the Franks, for the purpose of breaking the power of the Lombards, was suddenly interrupted by the latter, who entered into a treaty of neutrality with the Lombards. The Greeks, in 584, concluded a three-years' truce, and a treaty of commerce with the Franks. It was utilized by Pelagius in an effort to heal the schism which the Three-Chapter Controversy had created in the Western Church. He communicated with the archbishop, Elias of Aquileja-Grado, and the other bishops of Istrius, using the words of 2 Tim. ii. 23, and trying to prove that the decree condemning the Three Chapters was not at variance with the first four ecumenical councils. They refused, however, to return to the Church till the condemnation was revoked, or to accept a proposition to meet papal commissioners. Pelagius also got into controversy with John the Faster, Patriarch of Constantinople, on his assumption of the title of ecumenical bishop. The papal document rebuking the patriarch for his presumption has not come down to us, the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals which profess to contain it being spurious. See Vida Pelagii II., in Liber Pontif.; also See Vida Pelagii I., in Migne: Patr., vol. lxxi.; JAFFÉ: Reg. Pontif. Rom., 2d ed., Leipzig, 1881, p. 137 sqq.; HINSCIUS: Decretates Pseudo-Isidori, Leipzig, 1863, p. 721. R. ZORPFFEL.

PELAGIUS, Alvarus, Spanish Franciscan, papil of Duns Scotus, and bishop of Silves in Algarve [Portugal], d. 1359; is famous for his immediate defence of the Papacy, in his work De planctu ecclesie (Ulm, 1574; Venice, 1580; Lyons, 1570); "The Pope is above everything, even eccen- trical councils. From him councils get their authority and the privilege of condemnation. The Pope may pronounce judgment upon all creatures, but be judged by none. As the Spirit was given to Christ without measure (John i. 34), so authority upon earth is given to the Pope without measure." He also wrote a Colloquium adv. heresies, which has never been printed. See BEILLER- MINE: De script. eccles.; RIEZLER: D. litter. Wurtes- sacher d. Päpste, 1874, pp. 283 sqq. HEKZOG.

PELLIKAN, Konrad, a distinguished Hebraist; b. Jan. 8, 1478, at Ruffach in Alsace; d. April 6, 1556, at Zurich. His German name, Kursner, was altered to Pellicanus by his uncle, who provided for his education at Heidelberg and Tubingen. In 1499 he began the study of Hebrew, which he pursued with intense avidity. His only help was the Stern messiah of Peter Negri (Esslingen, 1477). In 1501 he prepared the De modo legendi et intelligendi Hebraeum, which was the first Hebrew text-book ever written by a Christian. It was published in the Margarita philosophica, Strassburg, 1504. In 1501 Pellikan was consecrated priest in Ruffach, and, after filling various other academical positions, was, with Ecolampadius, made professor of theology at Basel, and in 1525 was, on Zwingli's invitation, induced to go to Zurich. His first lecture in Zurich, on Exod. xv., he began with the words, "Thanks be to my God, who, having snatched me from Egypt and from the Egyptian and papal captivity, has caused me to pass over the Red Sea." He threw aside the cowl, and married, although already arrived at the age of forty-eight. He died as professor of Greek and Hebrew, and librarian, at Zurich. Pellikan's text-book of the Hebrew was the first, but was soon displaced by Reuchlin's Rudimenta. He was also the first in the Reformation period to write a complete commentary of all the books of the Bible (Comment. biblischer, Zurich, 1539). His period was utilized by Pellikan in an effort to heal the schism which the Three-Chapter Controversy had created in the Western Church. He communicated with the archbishop, Elias of Aquileja-Grado, and the other bishops of Istrius, using the words of 2 Tim. ii. 23, and trying to prove that the decree condemning the Three Chapters was not at variance with the first four ecumenical councils. They refused, however, to return to the Church till the condemnation was revoked, or to accept a proposition to meet papal commissioners. Pelagius also got into controversy with John the Faster, Patriarch of Constantinople, on his assumption of the title of ecumenical bishop. The papal document rebuking the patriarch for his presumption has not come down to us, the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals which profess to contain it being spurious. See Vida Pelagii II., in Liber Pontif.; also See Vida Pelagii I., in Migne: Patr., vol. lxxi.; JAFFÉ: Reg. Pontif. Rom., 2d ed., Leipzig, 1881, p. 137 sqq.; HINSCIUS: Decretates Pseudo-Isidori, Leipzig, 1863, p. 721. R. ZORPFFEL.
PENANCE, the fourth of the seven sacraments of the Roman-Catholic Church, is a means of repairing a sin committed, and obtaining pardon for it, and consists, partly in the performance of expiatory rites, partly in voluntary submission to a punishment corresponding to the transgression. It is found in all religions. In the Old Testament it occurs under the form of purification, a punishment corresponding to the transgression; but in course of time they became a real opus operatum. In the middle ages it was generally agreed that the penance imposed upon one person could be paid by another, at least in part; and it was to be supposed that rules found in Mansi (Coll. Council., XVIII. p. 525) it is stated, that, by means of a sufficient number of co-fasters, a fast of seven years may be accomplished in six days. Penance was conceived of as a satisfaction; and consequently, as Thomas Aquinas has it, so long as the debt is paid, it does not matter who pays it. All these various features have been retained by the Council of Trent (Sess. XIV., c. 2 and 8) in its definition of the sacrament, though in a somewhat refined form. The conception of the Greek Church differs in no essential point from that of the Roman-Catholic. Penance is there considered a second baptism, the "baptism of tears" (Boissard : L'Eglise de Russie, i. p. 334). For further details and pertinent literature, see Confession, Penitentials, and Repentance.

PENITENTIALS (Libri Pcenitentiales) were collections of rules for the guidance of the confessor, prescribing the penalty he ought to impose; that is, the satisfaction he ought to demand before granting absolution. In the ancient church the Councils of Ancona (314), of Nicasia (325), and others, gave such rules. Of great influence on the reigning practice were also the two epistles on the subject by Basil of Cæsarea (d. 379). In his Synopsis, Ioannes Scholasticus (d. 578) gave sixty-eight canons, which were confirmed by the Trullan synod of 682; but the farther development of this literature in the Greek Church is of comparatively small interest. In the Latin Church the Letters of Basil formed the starting-point; though a work of similar kind, but of native growth, is mentioned in the middle of the third century. (Comp. Cyprian : Epist. 2, and De lapides, 31, 52.)

The monastic discipline exercised a special influence; and from it there grew up in the old British or Irish Church a number of penitentials, which, exactly in the fashion of a criminal code, prescribed certain penalties for certain transgressions. Fragments of the Canones Patricii (about 456), the Liber Davidis (about 544), a penitential by Vennianus, or Finnianus, another by Giladas (d. 688), are still extant. By Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury (d. 690), those works were collected and arranged for the Anglican Church. He was a Greek by birth; and his book, which from the eighth to the twelfth century was considered the highest authority on questions of penance, contains many Greek and Roman traditions.

It is doubtful, however, whether he ever wrote down his rules himself, or whether they were put in writing later on by others. The Penventiale Theodori, such as it is published in Ancient Laws and Institutes of England, 1840, cannot belong to him. The same is the case with the penitentials of Beda Venerable (d. 735) and Egerbert, Archbishop of York (d. 787). The Anglo-Saxon penitentials were brought by COLUMBAN into Gaul, and obtained great authority throughout the Frankish Empire. But works of the same kind poured into the country also from other sides; and a great confusion ensued, which a number of Frankish penitentials, which were simply considered as evidences of the sincerity of the repentance; but in course of time they
Haltigarius of Cambry wrote, about 829, his celebrated Liber Peneientialis, in six books. The sixth book (published in Canisius: Lectiones antiquae, tom. ii. part ii. p. 121) is designated as Peneientialis Romanus, quem de sermoio Romanice ecclesie adsumptim. Thus, it is certainly of Frankish origin. In the Roman Church, another Peneiential Romanum which is often mentioned, but which had no papal authority either. There exists, indeed, no penitential specially authorized by the Roman curia, though it often happened that a penitential writer ascribed his work to a pope in order to make it more authoritative. Thus there is a Peneientiale Gregorii III., but it belongs to a much later period. Prominent among the productions of the Frankish Church in this line during the ninth century is the Liber peneientiae, or Pamilentium, of Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mayence (d. 855). See Opera, ed. Colvenerius, Colographa, 1677, at vol. 1. None of these penitentials, however, succeeded in gaining authority throughout the whole Frankish Empire. The confusion continued. At last almost every diocese had its own penitential; and in many cases it would, no doubt, prove utterly impossible to disentangle the reciprocal relations of those books.


PENITENTIAL PSALMS, so called because of their expressions of repentance over sin, are seven in number; viz., vi., xxvi., xxviii., ii., cli., cxxv., cxiii. They are placed together in the Roman breviary, and indulgences have been promised to those who recited them. Pope Innocent III. ordered their recitation in Lent. The Fifty-first Psalm is the typical one of the seven.

PENN, William, son of Admiral Sir William Penn (of Margaret James, his wife; was b. in London, Oct. 14, 1644; and d. July 30, 1718. At the age of fifteen he was admitted as a gentleman commoner at Christ Church College, at Oxford, where he made large acquisitions as a scholar, and was distinguished for his excellence in field-sports and manly exercises. The instructions of Dr. John Owen, dean of Christ Church, gave him serious views of life; and he was deeply impressed by the preaching of the Quaker, Thomas Loe, an old Oxford student. Expelled from college for nonconformity, he was harshly treated by his father, who soon sent him to France with a party of young nobles and gentlemen. Presented to Louis XIV., he was a great favorite at court, and added to his former accomplishments all the social graces for which the French capital was famed, while at the same time he was kept pure from vice. At Saumur he attended with great interest the lectures of the Calvinistic theologian, Moses Amyrault. After a short stay in Northern Italy, he returned to London, after two years' absence, a good French scholar and a finished gentleman, and entered as a student of law at Lincoln's Inn. The great plague, which broke out a year afterwards, gave

his thoughts again a serious direction, and his father, to distract his mind, sent him to the gay and splendid vice-regal court of the Duke of Ormond, in Dublin. Forming a warm friendship for the duke's son, the Earl of Arran, he joined him in an expedition to put down a mutiny at Carrickfergus, and condemned with great courage. He wished to accept a commission now offered him in the army, but his father was unwilling. The only certainly authentic portrait of Penn is one taken at this time, representing him in a full suit of armor. Placed in charge of the family estates in Ireland, he showed great capacity for business. Being at Cork one day, he heard the preaching of his old friend, Thomas Loe, who began his discourse with these words: "There is a faith which overcomes the world, and there is a faith which is overcome by the world." Penn was so deeply moved, that he renounced the world at once and forever, and spent the rest of his life as a devoted servant of Christ. Attaching himself to the Society of Friends, he suffered much from persecution. Imprisoned in 1677, for attending a religious meeting of his fellow-worshippers in Cork, he wrote a letter to the Earl of Orrery, lord-president of Munster, in which he said, "Though to dissent from a national system imposed by authority renders men heretics, yet I dare believe your lordship is better read in reason and theology than to subscribe a maxim so vulgar and untrue." The Earl ordered his release; but his father, hearing that he had turned Quaker, sent for him, and he returned home. Observing that his son did not uncover his head when he came into his presence, the admiral demanded an explanation. William answered that he could uncover only to God, and not in homage to any man. "Not even to the king?" asked the father. The son asked an hour for consideration, and, after meditation and prayer, returned with the answer, "Not even to the king." Enraged, his father beat him and turned him out of doors.

However excessive his scruples may have been, the servility of that age made great profit for such a protest than our franker and more manly times. At all events, William Penn gave the fullest proof of his sincerity and Christian heroism. Never did a young man sacrifice more when he renounced the world. Enjoying the intimacy and favor of the king, admired at court, handsome in person, graceful in manners, adorned with every manly accomplishment, expectant heir of a title of nobility (that of Lord Weymouth), which the king was ready to confer upon his father, he was entering upon life with the most brilliant promise of distinction and success. All this he gave up, to meet persecution and scorn. Hardest of all, he was forced to disappoint the fond and ambitious hopes of his father. But he never wavered. His father, the admiral, was before his death (1670) reconciled to him, and advised him to keep his "plain way" of life and of preaching.

Penn holds a proud place as a champion of English liberty and of universal toleration. Imprisoned in the Tower, at the instance of the Bishop of London, (and this twenty-four years after the execution of Laud) for writing a tract entitled The Sandy Foundation Shaken, he sent
Ihe was again imprisoned for preaching. He cession of the Duke of York. ever was in the wrong, those who used force for king to endeavor to change his judgment, "who never could be in the right." After an imprisonment of nine months, he was released from the Tower by the king, through the intercession of the Duke of York.

In August, 1670, on going to the meeting at Grace-church Street, he found the house guarded by a band of soldiers. Not permitted to enter, the Friends gathered about the door in silence, and held their meeting in the street. Penn preached, but was soon arrested by the constables, together with William Mead. Penn's bold assertion of the liberties of an Englishman, and the noble constancy of his jury in acquitting him against all the threats of the court, have made this trial ever memorable. Within three months the was again imprisoned for preaching. He travelled in Holland and Germany, preaching fidelity to the light of Christ in the soul; and with his courtly breeding (speaking also Dutch, German, French, and Italian) he mingled with the highest orders of society as well as with the lowly. The princess-palatine of the Rhine, grand-daughter of James I., sought his society, and confided to him the story of her religious conflicts against Popery (1670); A Guide Mistaken (against J. Clapham's A Guide to True Religion, 1670); A Persuasion to Moderation (1675); The Continued Cry of the Oppressed for Honour to the Princes, and Safety to the Kingdom (1677); A Persuasion to Moderation (1675); The Continued Cry of the Oppressed for Justice (1673); A Letter to the Churches of Jesus Christendom (1677); A Persuasion to Moderation (1688); Good Advice to the Church of England, and Catholic and Protestant Dissenters, for the Abolition of the Penal Laws and Fasts (1687); A Key (elucidating the peculiar tenets and features of Quakerism); The New Athenians no Noble Bereans (1692); An Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe by the Establishment of a European Diet, Parliament, or Estates (1893); Fruits of Solitude (1693); Travels in Holland and Germany, anno 1677 (1694); Primitive Christianity revived (1695); The Quaker a Christian (1698).

From early years Penn had nourished dreams of a home for the oppressed in the wilds of America. Becoming connected with New Jersey, and one of the proprietors of East Jersey, he drew up liberal laws for the Province, and many Friends migrated thither. In 1681 he obtained from Charles II. a grant of the lands now constituting the States of Pennsylvania and Delaware, in satisfaction of a claim of his father's against the crown for sixteen thousand pounds, and became the greatest land-owner in the world. The king insisted on prefixing "Penn" to the name of the principality, against Penn's protest. Here he had opportunity for his "holy experiment." He granted perfect toleration, and the fullest liberty consistent with order, he treated the Indians with justice and generosity; and under his government the province grew rapidly, and flourished. He spent a great part of his large estates in England and Ireland for the aid of the settlers; — in fact, thirty thousand pounds more, he says, than he ever got from the Province; and yet, with an excess of liberality, he refused to accept an impost on exports and imports which the Assembly voted him. He found it difficult to collect the moderate annual quit-rents, which as feudal proprietor he was obliged to exact, and through the frauds of his steward he became for a time impoverished. He made two visits to his American possessions, but felt it his duty to live at the court of James II., interceding with the king for the release of all victims of religious or political persecution. This he did with great effect. The king, to whose especial care he had been intrusted by the dying admiral, was his faithful friend, and sometimes attended his meetings, and listened to his preaching. Penn did not conceal from him his liberal political views, but labored openly for the election to Parliament of the republican Algernon Sidney. On the accession of William of Orange, Penn was charged with being a Papist, and plotting for the return of the Stuarts, for which he was several times arrested, and once thrown into prison. He succeeded at length in establishing his innocence, and was made a welcome visitor at their courts by William, Mary, and afterwards Queen Anne, thus enjoying the personal friendship of five sovereigns of Great Britain. Six years before his death, he was attacked with an apoplectic disease, by which his mind was impaired, but not the sweetness of his temper, nor the joy of spiritual communion with his Lord. "Clouds lay upon his understanding," says Cope; "but the sun shone on his eternal prospects, and the long evening sky was clear, and full of light."

As an author, Penn appears as a defender of the views of Fox and Barclay, a writer of sententious ethical precepts, an opponent of judicial oaths, an advocate of a Congress of Nations for the settlement of international disputes, and a champion of complete and universal religious liberty. Many of his books and pamphlets were translated into German, French, Dutch, and Welsh. Among the more important of them are, Truth Exalted (a defence of Quakerism, 1685); No Cross, no Crown (1670); The People's Ancient and Just Liberties asserted (1670); A Caveat against Popery (1670); A Guide Mistaken (against J. Clapham's A Guide to True Religion, 1670); The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience briefly debated, etc. (1670); A Treatise on Oaths (1675); England's Present Interest discovered, with Honour to the Princes, and Safety to the Kingdom (1675); The Continued Cry of the Oppressed for Justice (1673); A Letter to the Churches of Jesus Christendom (1677); A Persuasion to Moderation (1688); Good Advice to the Church of England, and Popish and Protestant Dissenters, for the Abolition of the Penal Laws and Fasts (1687); A Key (elucidating the peculiar tenets and features of Quakerism); The New Athenians no Noble Bereans (1692); An Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe by the Establishment of a European Diet, Parliament, or Estates (1893); Fruits of Solitude (1693); Travels in Holland and Germany, anno 1677 (1694); Primitive Christianity revived (1695); The Quaker a Christian (1698).

Pennafort, Raymond de, b. at Barcelona towards the close of the twelfth century; d. Jan. 6, 1275. He studied in his native city and at Bologna; entered the Dominican Order; was made confessor to Gregory IX. in 1230, and general of his order in 1238; but resigned afterwards that office in order to devote himself to the conversion of the Moslems and Jews. He published a *Summa casuum panienticatiae* and *Decretalium Gregori* iX. compilatio.

Penny, John (or Ap Henry), Congregational martyr; b. at Cefnbrith, Llanearmach, Brecknockshire, Wales, 1559; hanged London, May 29, 1583. He was brought up in the Roman-Catholic Church; matriculated as a pensioner of Peterhouse, Cambridge, Dec. 3, 1580; became a Puritan; proceeded B.A., 1583, 1584; but took his M.A. at Oxford, July 11, 1586, where he was a commenor of St. Alban Hall. He took orders, but his heterodox opinions soon brought him into trouble with the bishops. In 1587 he published at Oxford a powerful plea for more gospel-preaching in Wales. In the next year he married Helen Godley of Northampton, and at Moulsley, Surrey, superintended the Puritan press of Waldegrave. It was about this time that several of his tracts and the first Martin Marprelate book (November, 1588) appeared. (See Martin Marprelate.) Later on he staid at Nottingham; but in March, 1589, he fled into Scotland. Queen Elizabeth demanded his banishment from that kingdom; and, being already suspected of the authorship of the Martin Marprelate books, he was arrested at Ratcliffe, March 22, 1589, and committed to the Poultry, March 24. His examination revealed nothing against him; but two indictments for having incited insurrection and rebellion in England were manufactured out of a scrap from his diary, and he was hanged at St. Thomas-a-Watering, Surrey, London. His last plea for mercy ended with these touching words: "Preparing myself, not so much for an unjust verdict and an undeserved doom in this life, as unto that blessed crown of glory which of the great mercy of my God is ready for me in heaven, I humbly betake your Lordship unto the hand of the just Lord and my Lord Jesus Christ." See DEXTER: *Congregationalism as seen in its Literature*, N.Y., 1880, pp. 246-252.

**PENTATEUCH.** The, is the name given to that portion of the Old Testament included in the five first books, — Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. It is divided into two great parts, — the first part consisting of Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus, and the second of Numbers and Deuteronomy. The Pentateuch is composed of five books. These five books were: (1) Genesis; (2) Exodus; (3) Leviticus; (4) Numbers; (5) Deuteronomy.

**I. NAMES AND DIVISION.** — The names which are beyond dispute given in the Old Testament to the whole Pentateuch are The *Book of the Law of Moses* (Neh. viii. 1), *The Law* (Thorah, Neh. viii. 2), *The Book of the Law* (Neh. viii. 3), *The Book of the Law of Jehovah* (Neh. ix. 3), *The Book of Moses* (Neh. xiii. 1), *The Nal-drud* and the rabbins often call the Pentateuch the Five-Fifths of the Law *תלמוד* when it was bound in book-form (e.g., *Babyl. Sanhedr.*, 44*). The Greek designations were & νόμος (The Law in the New Testament) and νόμος (The Pentateuch, Origen, In Joh., 26). The names of the five books were, as a rule, among the Jews their first words: (1) תּוֹרָה (B'reshith, "In the beginning"); (2) שֵׁם (Shemoth, "The names"), or גֵּるとְלֶה שֵׁם (Velek Shemoth, "These are the names"); (3) וְקֵרָא (Vikra, "And . . . called"); (4) בְּנִדָּק (B'nidakh, "In the wilderness"); (5) וְרָדָה (Vayddabah, "And . . . spake"); (6) וִיהי יִדָּר (D'barim, "Words"), or וְיָדָרר (D'barim, "Words"). These are the words אֹרְרֵם (Othrim, "Words"). The designations *Genesis* and *Etwym* are from the Greek, were used by Simon Magnus (Hippolytus, *Hares*, vol. 15, 16). Philo used the term *Genetn*, and *Etywym* for Exodus. The designation Deuteronomy occurs in the Epistle of Barnabas (chap. 10). The division into five books is older than the Septuagint, but the Septuagint, another point for fixing the date is the period of Nehemiah, when the Psalter was divided into five divisions with reference to the Pentateuchal books.

**II. CONTENTS.** — A summary of the contents of the Pentateuch may be stated as a history of the kingdom of God on earth and in Israel, from the creation to the death of Moses, and the laws of God's kingdom in Israel. The following are the contents of the main divisions: (1) Gen. i.-xi. The early history of the world and the human family, including the creation, the origin and development of sin, the Flood, the construction of the Tower of Babel, and Terah's removal from Ur. (2) Gen. xii.-xxxix. The history of the patriarchs, including Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. (3) Exod. i.-xxiv. The oppression of Israel in Egypt, and its emancipation; Moses being the central figure. (4) Exod. xxv.-xxxvi. The interruption of the divine legislation by the apostasy of the people and the renewal of the covenant. (5) Exod. xxxvii.-xix. The journeys from Sinai to Moab, and the inception of the covenants. (6) Exod. xxxviii.-xix. The events and legislation in Moab, including the prophecy of Balaam and the appointment of the city of refuge. (7) Deut. i.-xx. Moses' first exhortation. (8) Deut. iv.-xxiv. Moses' second exhortation, including the repetition of the Ten Commandments, and the Laws of Moses at one altar (Deut. xii.), the emancipation of Hebrew slaves, the rights of the priests and Levites, etc.
III. The Critical Problems. 1. The Traditional View and the Province of Criticism. — The synagogue, the church of the Fathers and the institution. (12) Deut. xxxi.—xxxiv. Conclusion of the life and activity of Moses, including the consecration of Joshua.

The external testimonies are not convincing. The Pentateuchal passages which speak of Moses as a writer (Exod. xvii. 14, xxiv. 4, 7, xxxiv. 27; Num. xxxiii. 2) refer either to isolated sections, as the victory over Amalek and the covenant code, or only to Deuteronomy (Deut. xxxi. 9–11, xxii. 24–26); that is to the body of this book I as the expression “Book of Joshua;” namely, that Moses is thereby simply declared to be the central figure.

Passing to the internal reasons (that is, those drawn from the history of Israel when compared with the contents of the Pentateuch, those contents themselves, etc.), many various considerations have been urged against the Mosaic authorship. Leaving aside others, there is one consideration which seems to me to be decisive; and starting from it, we are enabled to arrive more easily at a judgment concerning the others. Not only that portion which concerns the pre-Mosaic history, but throughout the whole of the Pentateuch, are not convincing. As regards the passages from the New Testament, we must protest against their use, for the twofold reason, that, if they prove the Mosaic authorship, all other proofs are superfluous, and are a derogation from the authority of our Lord; and that the use of such proofs removes the whole question from the historical and critical domain. We therefore do not regard the external proofs as binding, but hold it, for the nonce, possible that the terms “Five books of Moses” and “Law of Moses,” are to be understood in the same sense as the expression “Book of Joshua;” namely, that Moses is thereby simply declared to be the author of the entire Pentateuch. Astrue, starting, from the peculiar usage of the divine names in Genesis, a fact which had arrested the attention of others, affirmed in 1753 (in his Conjectures sur les mo- noires originaux dont il paroit que Moyse s’est servi pour composer le livre de la Genese), that the part of the Pentateuch treating of pre-Mosaic times (Genesis, Exod. i. ii.), leaving out nine documents which are acknowledged by the main records,—an Elohist and a Jehovistic document. Eichhorn simplified this thesis by arranging the first fifty-two chapters of the Pentateuch under two heads, and did especially good service by proving that a different style prevailed in the two records. De Wette (1805, 1806) called attention to the peculiarities of Deuteronomy. Ewald (Theol. Studien u. Kritiken, 1831, 602–604) pointed out that the differences of the Elohist and Jehovistic documents were traceable throughout the entire Pentateuch, and extended into Joshua. Ilgen (D. Urkunden d. Jerusalemisschen Tempel- archives in ihrer Urgestalt, Halle, 1798, 510), and, with more success, Hupfeld (D. Quellen d. Genesis, etc., Berlin, 1853, 224) occupied themselves in tracing the hand of a second Elohist writer.

The advocates of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, starting with the very just proposition that the names of God (Elohim and Jehovah) express different relations of God to the world, have explained the use of the two terms on the supposition that the writer used them intentionally. But, in spite of the critical skill and penetration which these scholars have shown, the circumstance is still left unexplained, that suddenly, from Exod. vi. 2, on to the close of the Pentateuch, the name of Jehovah is used almost exclusively; and it is to be remarked that even Keil admits the difference of style in the Elohistic and Jehovistic sections. Notwithstanding this confession, however, he not only does not distinguish these documents, but expressly refuses to acknowledge that the account of the Flood is made up of two distinct records,—a fact which is beyond doubt. The differences of opinion among the critics, upon which Keil lays stress, are, after all, not so great in certain fundamentals; all agreeing (Delitzsch, Wellhausen, etc.) upon the necessity of distinguishing the different sources, and agreeing, to a greater or less extent, in the classification of the sections. One example is sufficient. In the first nine chapters of Genesis, Nöeldeke, Dillmann, and Wellhausen agree in attributing to the first Elohist Gen. i.–ii. 3*, v. (except verse 29), vi. 9–22, vii. 11, 13–16*, 18–21, 24, viii. 1, 2*, 3–5, 13*, 14–19, ix. 1–17, 28, 29; differences only existing about five verses or parts of verses, as vii. 6 (which Nöeldeke and Dillmann add to this list), vii. 22 (which Nöeldeke adds), vii. 23* (which Dillmann adds, but hesitatingly), and viii. 3*, 19* (which Wellhausen adds).

2. History of Pentateuchal Criticism. — Of the many hypotheses suggested to account for the origin of the Pentateuch, three deserve prominent mention. (1) The Fragmentary Hypothesis. The Englishman Geddes, Vater, and Hartmann, upon the basis of breaks of composition, and repetitions, adopted the view that the Pentateuch is composed of a number of fragments. This view was proved untenable by the evident traces of
one arranging hand throughout the whole work. (2) The Supplemental Hypothesis. The identity of the sections and views in all the Elohist sections was the occasion of this hypothesis, according to which the Elohim (or original) document was supplemented by the Jehovist writer by the insertion of sections and remarks. Deuteronomy being incorporated at a later period. This view has been advocated by Tuch, Bleek, Lengerke (Konsel, 1807-1814), and Delitzsch (though no longer), but may be regarded as given up.

(3) The Documentary Hypothesis. According to this view the entire Pentateuch, or almost the whole of it, was compiled by two or more compilers from different documents. This view is held in forms differing very considerably: the differences concerning the order of succession and age of the documents, rather than their classification. Before taking up these views separately, we will classify the names and signatures given by different critics to the various Pentateuchal writers and compilers:

The first Elohist.—Tuch, etc., call his work "the original document" (Grundskrift); Ewald, "book of beginnings" (Buch der Ursprünge); Schrader calls him "the annalist" (Annalistischer Erzähler); Schultz, Dillmann, "A;" Wellhausen, etc., "P.C."

The second (or later) Elohist.—Ewald calls him "the third narrator;" Schrader, "the theocratic narrator;" Dillmann, "B;" or "the narrator from Northern Israel;" Schultz, "C;" Wellhausen, etc., "E."

The Deuteronomist.—Dillmann calls him "D."

We shall, in the following discussion, use Wellhausen's terminology, because it has been adopted by many writers, and does not prejudice the student in favor of the age or order of the documents, except that we will use "P" for "P.C."

3. The Most Important Views now held.—Schrader, in the eighth edition of De Wette's Introduction to the Old Testament (Berlin, 1869), combines the documentary and supplemental hypotheses. "P" is traceable to the close of Joshua, written early in David's reign, and was a priest. "E," who can be traced down to 1 Kings ix. 28, was probably from Northern Israel, and wrote soon after the division of the kingdom, or about 975-950 B.C. "J," also from Northern Israel, writing about 825-800 B.C., combined "P" and "E," adding a good deal which had come down by oral tradition. The radical part of Deuteronomy was written not long before the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, by a writer from Northern Israel, in "PEJ." The separation of the Pentateuch by oral tradition. The radical part of Deuteronomy was written, not long before the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, by a writer from Northern Israel, in "PEJ." The separation of the Pentateuch by oral tradition. The radical part of Deuteronomy was written, not long before the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, by a writer from Northern Israel, in "PEJ." The separation of the Pentateuch by oral tradition. The radical part of Deuteronomy was written, not long before the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, by a writer from Northern Israel, in "PEJ." The separation of the Pentateuch by oral tradition. The radical part of Deuteronomy was written, not long before the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, by a writer from Northern Israel, in "PEJ."

The Deuteronomist had, in any case, before him legal writings of essentially the same style, and often in the same language [as his own work], such as the Priestly Code.

Dillmann will give a connected and comprehensive statement of his views in the concluding volume of his revised edition of Knobel's Commentary on the Hexateuch. The following is a summary of his views as expressed up to this time. It is uncertain which of the two is the older,—"P," or "E." "E," who lived in the flourishing prophetical period of the central tribes, is certainly older than "J," who was dependent upon "E," and was nearer being a contemporary of the "D," who wrote not a long time before the reforms of Josiah. "P," "E," and "J" were wrought together into one volume by a compiler. Neh. viii.-x. refers to the entire Pentateuch. "P," "E," and "J" used very ancient authorities; "E," for example, incorporated the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx. 22-xxiii. 19).

Delitzsch wrote in his Commentary of Genesis (p. 21), as late as 1872, "Deuteronomy gives itself out as Mosaic, and the body of it must be declared Mosaic." He has, since 1876, modified his views, and now agrees very closely with the school of Graf in reference to the classification of the original documents and their order of succession, but differs with it essentially upon the date of composition, and pronounces emphatically against the conclusions it draws for the religious history of Israel. "J" and "D" he regards as having written after Solomon, but before Josiah; and "J" the latest, before Ezekiel. He brings into comparison the many records prior to the canonical Gospels, and adds that he "is now convinced that the process of composition and formation, out of which the law in its present form was derived, continued down into the post-exilic period, and perhaps not at an end till the period when the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint were made." He continues (p. 621): "All the more strongly do we insist upon the Mosaic origin and the divine revelation of the foundation [Fundament] of the Torah [Pentateuch]." Compare further, for Delitzsch's view, the translation from his lectures in The Hebrew Student for 1882 (i.-iv.), and Curtius, Delitzsch on the Origin and Composition of the Pentateuch, in The Presbyterian Review for July, 1882.

Wellhausen. The Decalogue likewise is not Mosaic. The Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx. 22-xxiii. 19) was given to "a people sedentary, and fully accustomed to agriculture." "J" belongs to "the golden period of Hebrew literature" just preceding the dissolution of the two kingdoms by the Assyrians. "E" betrays "a more advanced religious condition, with more regulations." Both these documents, partially, went through several editions and were probably united in one volume as they appeared in the third revision. "D" was composed shortly before Joshua]. I make the following summary of a communication of Noldeke to me, dated May 20, 1882. The final revision must not be identified with the Deuteronomist. The remainder of the Pentateuch, left after extracting "D" and "P," it is impossible for criticism to classify. He is not able to adopt the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. Ezekiel is dependent upon "P." "The Deuteronomist had, in any case, before him legal writings of essentially the same style, and often in the same language [as his own work], such as the Priestly Code."
the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, and contained at first only Deut. xii.--xxvi. It then went through two editions after the exile, which increased its bulk to thirty chapters (Deut. i.--xvi., xvii.--xxvi.), the latter incorporated with "J E." Lev. xvii.--xxvi. are a body of laws originating in the period of the exile between Ezekiel and the Priests' Code (which he designates "PC"), which was incorporated in "P." The remainder of the Hexateuch left after the extraction of "J E" and "D" is of post-exilic origin. The original nucleus was "Q," and the legislation of the middle books, standing in very close connection with it both by their contents and language (Exod. xxv.--xxxii., xxxiv.--xl.; Levit.; Num. i.--x., xvii.--x., xxxv.--xl., with a few exceptions), he calls the Priests' Code. The only sections belonging originally to "Q" are Exod. xxv.--xxxii.; Lev. ix., x., 1--5, 12--15, xvi.; Num. i., 1--16, 48--i., 9, 15--x., a part of xvi., xvii., xviii., xxv., 6--19, xxvi., xxvii., a part of xxxii., xxxiii. 50--xxxvi. The legal and historical document was incorporated in "J E D" in the year 444, and published by Ezra; for there can be no doubt that the law of Ezra was the entire Pentateuch (History, 425, 370 sqq., 421). Compare Henry P. Smith's art. in The Presbyterian Review for April, 1882: The Critical Theories of J. Wellhausen.

Graf, although he died July 16, 1889, deserves mention here on account of the great influence his main thesis has exerted. Upon the basis of his work upon the feasts, priesthood, and tabernacle, he declared that the legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch bear the "plainest marks of their post-exilic composition;" and shortly before his death he pronounced the so-called "original document" (Grundschrift) post-exilic. "J," wrote in the middle of the eighth century; "D," shortly before the eighteenth year of Josiah; and "P," after the exile, and his document was incorporated in "J D," soon after Ezra.

Reuss, who has taught, since 1833, substantially the same views as his predecessors in his Geschichte des Alten Testaments (§77), that the Decalogue is, "perhaps, the oldest of all the parts of the written law," but not Mosaic. The Book of the Covenant probably belongs to the time of Jehoshaphat, and "J," to the second half of the ninth century, which was later worked together in one volume with "E," so that it is almost impossible to separate the two. In the eighteenth year of Josiah, "D," consisting of Deut. v.--xxvi., xxviii., was unearthed, to give national authority to the legislation, and "purporting to be a discovery of the priests." After the first deportation, "D" was joined to "J E," but not by the author of "D." The section Lev. xvii.--xxvi. is not preserved in its original form; and the nucleus is of a later date than "D," and belongs after Ezekiel. The work promulgated by Ezra in 444 was not the entire Pentateuch. Its framework is "a gross fiction, dreams of an impoverished people," in this hand; but the contents are "a collection of laws of different origins." This code of Ezra was revised and enlarged in the period between Nehemiah and Alexander. "The prophets are to be regarded as older than the law, and the Psalms later than both "E" and "P." It is impossible for us in our limits to go into a minute criticism of all these views: we will content ourselves with making some general observations, and giving a limited explanation of some of the Pentateuchal problems now most agitated.

4. Preliminary and Explanatory Principles. — (1) Essentially the same methods are to be pursued in the criticism of the Old Testament as of other literary works. Miracles and prophecies, however, are not to be used as proofs of incredibility and unauthenticity. We hold to the religion of the Old Testament as a revelation: therefore we shall not expect the standard of a development according to natural laws to apply everywhere to the history of Israel. (2) Caution must be used in drawing arguments from the language and style of any portion of the Old Testament. Archaisms and obscurities were likely to be removed by copyists, an analogy being found in the editions of Luther's Bible. Again: difference of style points to a difference of authorship, rather than of date. (3) A written code of laws may exist for a long period without being known beyond a narrow circle. "J E," for example, was committed to writing at a comparatively late date, it does not necessarily follow that the essential part has not been accurately handed down. The credibility of the history and legislation of the Pentateuch is of more importance than the Mosaic authorship. (5) Many differences in the Pentateuchal laws are to be explained by the difference of time referred to. Notice must be taken whether a law refers to the time of sojourn in the wilderness, or looks forward to the sojourn in Canaan.

5. The Theory of Graf and Wellhausen. — The new school represented by Graf, Kayser, Reuss, Wellhausen, and others, has introduced a wide chasm between critics of the Pentateuch. Herebefore "P" has been regarded as the oldest document, and looked upon as credible, at least in the main points. The Pentateuch has been regarded at finished before the exile. The new school admits the antiquity of the Book of the Covenant alone. After it, came the historical works "E" and "J," then the first comprehensive code of laws, "D," then Ezek. xi.--xlviii., then the law of holiness, and finally "P." Wellhausen and others place the completion of the Pentateuch in 444 B.C. The significance of this new arrangement is at once visible in the revolution it necessitates in our views of Hebrew history. A few notices, based upon Wellhausen's able (geistvoll) History of Israel, will suffice. (1) The Place of Worship. — The historical and prophetic books know nothing of a central and only place of worship. The Jehovah ("J E") sanctions many altars. The fall of Samaria is favorable to centralization. "D" demands it, and "P" presupposes it, and associates the idea with the tabernacle in early times. (2) Offerings. — "J E" represents Sacrifice as a pre-Mosaic practice; "P" does not. According to "J E," with which the historical and prophetic books agree, the person to whom the sacrifices are made is prominent; according to "P," the ritual. "P" introduces the sin and guilt offerings, of which "there is no trace in the rest of the Old Testament before Ezekiel." (3) The feasts at first celebrated the beginning and close...
of the harvest, and the vintage. "P" adds to their number the day of atonement; and the sabbath and jubilee years were likewise later additions. (4) Priests and Levites.—In the earliest period of Israel's history, there was no distinction between clergy and laity. Everybody might sacrifice. Hence there is no mention of a priesthood in the oldest portions of "J E," no Aaron at the side of Moses. There was a tribe of Levi, but it perished in the time of the Judges. Later it became the title of a priestly caste. According to Ezek. xlv., only the Levites of Jerusalem were to officiate as priests in the golden period; and the other Levites were to be degraded. According to "P," the Levites never performed the functions of priests, but only the sons of Aaron. The capstone which "P" lays down is the high priest, a personage whose incomparable importance is foreign to the spirit of the remainder of the Old Testament.

We shall now proceed to lay down some criticisms of these positions of the new Pentateuchal school. The Egyptians had, at a very early date, a rich literature, and were accustomed to write much. Why should not the Jews, who were always open to foreign influences, have imitated them in this regard, and especially Moses, who had been brought up in all the wisdom of the Egyptians? From of old, Egypt had a large and influential priestly caste, divided into orders. Israel must also have had a priesthood at an early day, and not have remained a millennium without written priestly laws. It is to be assumed that the priest Moses (Exod. xxv. 8 sqq.; Deut. xxxii. 10; Ps. xcix. 6) established a ritual. There are not wanting testimonies to the early date of a priestly law (Deut. xxxiii. 10; Mic. iii. 11; Jer. xviii. 18; Ezek. vii. 26; Zeph. iii. 4; Hos. viii. 12). Especially is Deuteronomy, which was certainly in existence at least in the eighteenth year of Josiah, rich in proofs of this assertion. Compare Deut. xviii. 2 with Num. xviii. 20, 23 sqq., and Deut. xxiv. 8, where a priestly law concerning leprosy is referred to, such as is found in Lev. xiii. 14.

The new theory leaves the basal periods of Israel's history without a literature. Moses wrote no laws nor history; David, no psalms; Solomon, no proverbs.

The reason for the larger number of, and more exact references in the post-exilic books, to the Pentateuch, is that Ezra began an entirely new period,—that of the scribes.

The new theory not only excludes the divine factor from the history of Israel, but is obliged to resort, not infrequently, to the very precarious assumption of fictions,—a word which Wellhausen does not hesitate to use.

One of the principal arguments of the new school is, that the non-observance of a law proves its non-existence. This conclusion, however, is by no means conclusively drawn before the exiles. Jer. xvi. 6 with Deut. xiv. 1. When we remember the corruption of the priests, over which the prophets lament (Isa. xxviii. 7 sqq.; Mic. iii. 11; Zeph. iii. 4, etc.), it is easy to understand how the laws were lying neglected among the archives of the Temple.

The writings of the Old Testament are violently treated, both from a critical and an exegetical point of view, in order to serve the new theory of Hebrew history. The following may serve as examples. (1) The Pentateuch.—The Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx. 24, 25), according to Wellhausen (p. 30), "sanctuary" sacrifices at any locality. He explains the words, "in all places where I record my name," thus: "This means nothing more than that they did not want the place of communion between heaven and earth to be looked upon as having been chosen arbitrarily; but that they regarded it as chosen in some way (1) by God himself." In truth, the matter stands thus: the passage forbids an arbitrary choice of the place of sacrifice, and, while it does not exclude a plurality of such places, neither presupposes nor demands them. The command which the Book of Covenant also lays down, to appear three times a year before the Lord (Exod. xxiii. 17), decidedly points to a centralization of the worship. (2) The Historical Books—According to Wellhausen, these were subjected to many emendations and revisions, "so that the old tradition is covered up as with a Judaistic mould." The Chronicles are especially treated with particular sharpness. Leaving the refutation of such assertions, let me say that the picture of Ezra as given in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and by tradition, does not accord at all with the picture which the new theory draws. In order to overthrow a proof of the law of inheritance which prevailed among the priest of the line of Aaron, the false conclusion is drawn by Wellhausen from 1 Sam. ii. 27 sqq., that Zadok was the "first of an absolutely new line," and was neither a Levite, nor of the line of Aaron. The divine threat, however, is made only against Eli's house, and not against the entire house of his father. (3) The Prophets.—The treatment which this school gives to the prophetic books is, to say the least, of questionable value. Wellhausen says the word חֶבֶר ("create") was not originally in Amos iv. 13, 14. Joel is put after the exile. More violent and broader is done in the exegesis. The difference in the aim of the law and the prophets is ignored, as is the moral character of the ritual law. The prophets were not opposed to the observance of the sacrificial ritual, but only to practices of the people. Bredenkamp very justly insists upon the distinction of the prophets of the northern kingdom, who prophesy more against the introduction of heathen rites, and the southern kingdom, who prophesy more against an external service. (4) The Poetical Books.—Job is put after Jeremiah (Wellhausen, Bleek, R. W. Smith, etc.). Job i 5, however, does not fit in with the new theory of the history of offerings. Of the Psalms, Wellhausen says the question is, "not whether any of the Psalms were composed after the exile, but whether any were written before the exile." If the words "bent offering and sin offering hast thou not required," in Ps. xl. 6, were, for example, before the exile, then the mention of sin offerings occurs before Ezekiel. If they were written after the exile, a view I do not hold, then the analogous utterances of Amos v. and Jer. vii. do not exclude the existence of the law of offerings at an earlier period (Comp. Bredenkamp and W. H. Green, in The Presbyterian Review, for January, 1882, pp. 42 sq, and 1794).
without a motive, and could not be carried out after the exile, e.g., the Urim and Thummim (Exod. xxvii. 30; Lev. viii. 8; Num. xxvii. 21; the jubilee year, Lev. xxv. 8 sqq.; the Levitic cities, Num. xxxv. 1 sqq.; the law concerning spoils, Num. xxxvi. 25 sqq.). It gives only the sense of prophecy, though an equality in the wilderness, and no special legislation is made for the time of rest in Canaan. Such a fiction would be in the highest degree astounding. The relation of "P," especially as regards the law of holiness to Ezekiel, is now a subject of animated discussion. A careful comparison of the language shows that Ezekiel is dependent upon "P." Ezekiel (xlv. 18 sqq.) differs from "P" in the number of daily offerings and the method of making them. A prophet has liberty to change; but it is inconceivable, that, at a period when so much emphasis was put upon the written word, a document like "P," laying claim to divine authority, could be composed with changes in this regard. Ezekiel was not the first to make the distinction of priests and Levites, but it is inconceivable, that, at a period when so much emphasis was put upon the written word, a document like "P," laying claim to divine authority, could be composed with changes in this regard. Ezekiel was not the first to make the distinction of priests and Levites, but it is inconceivable, that, at a period when so much emphasis was put upon the written word, a document like "P," laying claim to divine authority, could be composed with changes in this regard.

It can be clearly shown of many laws of the Priests' Code, that they are older than Deuteronomy. To date the command to kill the sacrifices only at the tabernacle (Lev. xvii. 1 sqq.) after Deuteronomy, or after the exile, is Dillmann, is "simple nonsense." It must have come into existence during the wanderings in the wilderness. A comparison of Deut. xiv. 9-20 and Lev. xi. 2-23 shows that Deuteronomy either draws directly from Leviticus, — the better opinion (Ewald, Knobel, Riehm), — or from the document which was used for the account in Leviticus (Dillmann). The language of "P" also deserves attention as an evidence for its antiquity. Ryssel, in his careful treatise on the language of P (De Eloquentia Pentateuchici sermone, Leipzig, 1878), reaches results inconsistent with the suppression of post-exilic origin.

According to Graf and many other critics, Deuteronomy was written a short time before Josiah's reforms. There are serious objections to this theory. The account of the discovery — "I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord" (2 Kings xxii. 8) — indicates that its contents were known, not only to Hilkiah, but to others; and it was found in the temple, its proper place (Deut. xxxi. 29). This book contained, at any rate, the body of Deuteronomy; for the words of chap. xxviiiii explain Huldah's utterances, and the contents of the book as a whole explain Josiah's reforms. And how does it occur that the book received such rapid and universal recognition? There must have been some external veneration. Did Hilkiah attest it? But, according to the new theory of Hebrew history, the injunction of Deut. xviii. 6-8 must have been very unwelcome to the priests at Jerusalem; yet they and Hilkiah co-operate to spread the authority of the book. This fact is a convincing proof that it already enjoyed irresistible authority at the time of its discovery. Dr. Green aptly says (Presbyterian Review for January, 1882, p. 114), "If Mr. Gladstone could but find some law-book in Dublin which had never been heard of before, how easily and amicably the whole Irish question might be settled!" From the words of Isa. xix. 19, "—In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar (mazeboth) at the border thereof," — W. Robertson Smith (Old Testament, etc., p. 354) draws the conclusion that Deuteronomy could not have been written before Isaiah. But Deut. xxxii. 21-22 speaks in the same way of Edom (Deut. xxi. 18-19) and the Amalekites (xxv. 18-19) and in favor of conquests and war (xx. 10-20) — and how could the legislation for the throne (xxvii.) have originated so late?

Was Moses the Author of the Pentateuch?

The survey given by Professor Strack in the preceding article, of the bewildering maze of critical opinions respecting the origin of the Pentateuch, sufficiently shows that no certain conclusion as to its date and authorship is to be reached by that process. Can any thing more reliable be ascertained by appealing to historical testimony? Let us inquire what account the Pentateuch gives of itself, what account succeeding ages give of it, and whether there are sufficient reasons for setting this testimony aside.

We read (Deut. xxxi. 9), "Moses wrote this law," and (ver. 24), "When Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished." This has very generally been understood to affirm that the entire volume of the Pentateuch, known in later times as "the law of Moses," was now completed by the addition of what Moses commanded; and the commands of Moses were written in "The Book of the Law," which stands in so obvious and intimate a relation to Deuteronomy. That this is what these words really meant is warranted by the context 
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The feast of tabernacles (Neh. viii., where verses 14 ff. show that Ezra understood Lev. xxiii. 40-42 to be included), and to be laid up beside the ark, and preserved in the sanctuary (2 Kings xxii. 8), and inscribed monoliths have meanwhile become part of the entire Pentateuch. Accordingly, not a few of those who deny that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, nevertheless admit that the words in question were intended to assert that he did.

But, if we give these words the most restricted sense that can possibly be put upon them, they cannot mean less than that Moses wrote the laws contained in Deut. xii.-xxvi. Exod. xxiv. 4, in like manner, affirms that Moses wrote chaps. xx.-xxiii., which is styled (ver 7) "The Book of the Covenant." In Exod. xxxiv. 27 he is commanded to write vers. 10-28. All the laws scattered through Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, are expressly declared in detail to have been given by God to Moses, and by him delivered to the people. The occasion upon which these statutes were severally enacted, the circumstances which called them forth, and facts connected with their actual observance in the time of Moses, are in many cases recorded in detail. Moreover, these laws bear the impress of the age and the region to which they are referred. The law of the passover (Exod. xii.) was given when each father of a family was priest in his own house; and atonement could be made by sprinkling the doorposts of the tabernacle and its vessels (Exod. xxv.-xxxii.), and respecting their transportation through the wilderness (Num. iv.), sufficiently vouch for their authenticity. The laws respecting offerings (Lev. i.-vii.) contemplate Aaron and his sons as the officiating priests. The law of leprosy (Lev. xiii., xiv.) has to do with a camp and with tents. The law of the day of atonement (Lev. xvi.) was given after the death of Nadab and Abihu, and contemplates Aaron as the celebrant, and the wilderness as the place of observance. The law of the red heifer (Num. xix.) is directed to Eleazar the priest, and respects the camp of Israel, and dwellers in tents. The terms in which the laws are drawn up make it evident that they were not only enacted in the wilderness, and so might have been written by Moses, but that they must have been committed to writing at that time. Had they been preserved orally, changes would insensibly have been made in their language, to adapt them to the altered situation of the people in a later age, when settled in Canaan, and occupying fixed abodes, and when Aaron and Eleazar were no longer the priests.

The laws of the Pentateuch thus claim to have been all given by Moses; those of Exod. xx.-xxiii., Lev. xi.-xxxiii., Deut. xii.-xxvi., can only be supposed to have been recorded by him; and a large proportion of the remainder evidence by their very structure that their present written form dates from the abode of Israel in the wilderness. To this general line of reasoning the following two principal objections have been advanced:

1. Alleged diversities in the laws themselves.
2. Alleged counter-testimony from post-Mosaic history and writings.

The Pentateuchal legislation, it is urged, is not digested into one self-consistent code, as might be expected if it all belonged to one period, and sprang from a common source, but consists of several distinct bodies of law, which both differ in the matters to which they severally relate, and contain divergent regulations concerning the same matter. But this finds its adequate explanation in the different occasions upon which they were prepared, and the ends which they were respectively designed to answer. "The Book of the Covenant" (Exod. xx.-xxiii.) was the basis of the relation about to be established between Jehovah and Israel. After the sin of the golden calf, Exod. xxxiv. 10-26 remains as these same ordinances, so far as related to the service of God and the promise of Canaan. The other laws in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, mostly concern the cultus, and give detailed directions from time to time, as occasion demanded, respecting the sanctuary, the priesthood, and the ritual. Deuteronomy is a solemn inculcation of the law upon the people by Moses, in public addresses at the close of his life, immediately prior to their entrance into Canaan.

The contents of these several bodies of law are determined by their respective purpose. That detailed regulations are given in Leviticus respecting matters not alluded to at all in Deuteronomy, or only summarily referred to there, is not because the former is a subsequent development from the latter, or because it belongs to a period when a new class of subjects engaged public attention. It belonged to the priests to conduct the ceremonial. While it was important for the people to be instructed how to distinguish clean and unclean meats (Deut. xiv. 3 ff., comp. Lev. xi.), since this entered into their daily life, it was sufficient, in respect to leprosy, for instance, "to admonish them, in the general (Deut. xxii. 8) to heed the injunctions already given to the priests (Lev. xiii., xiv.) It was enough for them to be told where to bring their various offerings (Deut. xii. 6), and that the animal must be without blemish (xvii. 1). The specifications respecting them (Lev. xxii. 19-23), and the ritual to be observed (Lev. i.-vii.), were intrusted to the priests.

It was quite natural that some modifications of pre-existing laws should be made in Deuteronomy after the lapse of nearly forty years, whether with the view of rendering them more explicit (Exod. xxii. 2 ff., comp. Deut. xv. 12, 17; Exod. xxii. 25, comp. Deut. xxiii. 19, 20; Exod. xxii. 26, comp. Deut. xxiv. 10-13; Exod. xxii. 31, comp. Deut. xiv. 21), or for the sake of a further extension of the same principle (Exod. xxiii. 10 ff., comp. Deut. xv. 1 ff.), or because rendered necessary by the transition from the wilderness to Canaan (Lev. xvii. 3, 4, (at the very least), Exod. xv. 15; Exod. xxii. 30, comp. Deut. xv. 19, 20; the omission of Lev. xi. 21, 22 from Deut. xiv.). No objection of any moment can be drawn from the fact that many of the laws are framed with reference to the condition of the people after they should be settled.
in Canaan (Exod. xxii. 5, 29, xxiii. 10 ff.); for in most cases their very terms imply that this was prospective (Lev. xiv. 34, xxv. 1; Deut. xii. 1, xix. 14). Some laws have been represented as mutually inconsistent, which really relate to distinct matters, and supplement, instead of contradicting, each other. Thus the tithe of Deut. xii. 17 begins to be paid from the third year; and those of Num. xviii. 24; Deut. xviii. 3 is distinct from Lev. vii. 34; Num. iv. 3 belongs to the transportation of the tabernacle; viii. 24, to its ordinary ministrations. And in general it may be said, that all alleged discrepancies admit of satisfactory explanation.

There is no divergence in the laws of the Pentateuch in respect to the altar. Exod. xx. 24, as Professor Strack correctly observes in the preceding article, gives no sanction to a simultaneous plurality of altars. In Leviticus, priestly duties are assigned by name to Aaron and his sons as the officiating priest of the sanctuary, which mainly respects the future, describes the priests by the tribe to which they belonged, as Levitical priests; but it neither asserts nor implies, as has sometimes been maintained, that every Levite was entitled to discharge priestly functions. Leviticus has, of course, fuller details in respect to the feasts and the ritual than Deuteronomy; but there is no disagreement between them.

There is, accordingly, no such diversity in the laws as conflicts with their having been given by Moses, and recorded by him. And the objection from the post-Mosaic history and writings is equally unfounded. It is said that the history affords no evidence of a law restricting sacrifice to one altar, or priestly functions to the family of Aaron, until long after the time of Moses, and that the contrary practice of good men makes the existence of such a law insupportable and impossible.

It should be observed here, that history cannot be expected to record the regular observance of established institutions. This is taken for granted, and rarely referred to, except incidentally, or for the sake of mentioning infractions of them. That, however, the Book of Joshua implies the existence and observance of the entire Mosaic law, is universally confessed. Judges speaks of but one house of Jehovah (xix. 18), and this located at Shiloh (xviii. 31); of the annual feast there (xxi. 19); of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, as priest (xx. 28). Though the idolater Micah consecrated one of his own sons as priest (xxvii. 5), he was overjoyed to have a Levite instead (vers. 12, 13), who deserted his service to become priest of a tribe (xvii. 19, 20).

Plainly it would have been more tempting still to have been a priest of all Israel in Shiloh, if that had been permissible. In Samuel's childhood, the house of Jehovah was the tabernacle of the congregation (1 Sam. ii. 22), called indifferently "the house of the Lord" (i. 24) and "the temple of the Lord" (ver. 9) was still in Shiloh, and was the one commanded place of sacrifice for Israel (ii. 29). Eli and his sons officiated there (i. 3) as descendants of Aaron, whose body could be the tribes to be his priest (ii. 28). There was the ark and the lamp of God (iii. 5); and annual pilgrimages were made thither for worship (i. 3, 7, 11, 14, 19).

While thus the regular course of the history establishes the existence of the Mosaic law of sacrifice and of the priesthood, all apparent anomalies are readily explicable. Sacrifices in the presence of the ark (Judg. xx. 26, 27, xxi. 4; 1 Sam. vi. 15) were not irregular. The phrase "before God" (Josh. xxiv. 1), or "before the Lord" (Judg. xi. 11, xx. 1), contains no implication of a place of stated worship. "The sanctuary of the Lord" at Shechem (Josh. xxiv. 26) was not a building erected for sacrifice, — for the oak was "in it," not "by it" (as the Authorized Version has it), — but a spot hallowed by its associations (Gen. xi. 7, xxiii. 18, 20, xxiv. 4). The sacrifices at Bochim (Judg. i. 18), by Gideon (vi. 20-26) and by Manoah (xiii. 19, 20), were occasioned by the appearances of the angel of Jehovah. These extraordinary manifestations occurred elsewhere than at the tabernacle, since they were called forth by emergencies not adequately met by the ordinary means of divine communication. From the capture of the ark by the Philistines, until its transportation to Zion by David, there was no longer a sanctuary, which was the habitation of him who dwelt between the cherubim (1 Sam. ii. 32-36; Ps. lxxviii. 60, 68; Jer. vii. 12, 14, xxvi. 6, 9). The law of the sanctuary was, therefore, necessarily in abeyance; and Samuel, as God's immediate representative, both assumed the functions of the degenerate priesthood, and offered sacrifice in various parts of the land. Until this provisional period was finally terminated by the erection of the temple, the people worshipped in high places (1 Kings iii. 2). The high places in Judah, after the temple was built, are censured by the sacred historian, and rebuked by the prophets, though even pious kings did not always succeed in suppressing them. Elijah's sacrifice on Carmel (1 Kings xvii. 22 ff.) was offered by divine command (ver. 36); and the unrebuked altars in the northern kingdom (1 Kings xvii. 30, xix. 10, 14) were erected by those who were debarred from going up to the temple at Jerusalem.

To the psalmists, from David onward, God's sole dwelling-place is Zion; and they make frequent mention of the law, which is described as "written in the volume of the book" (Ps. xi. 7). The older prophets make frequent allusions to the ceremonial and other laws, and denounced the sanctuaries of the northern kingdom. Hos. viii. 12 refers to an extensive written law.

There are, accordingly, abundant traces of the Mosaic legislation, from the days of Moses downward, and there is no reason to discredit its claim to have been delivered and written by Moses himself. If the laws are from the pen of Moses, so is the entire Pentateuch. For 1. These laws are an integral portion of the Pentateuch, and have been so ever since the time of Ezra, when it is confessed that "The Book of the Law of Moses" (Neh. viii. 1) was the name given to the Pentateuch in its present form, which was thus attributed to Moses as its author, chosen out of all men; and it is spoken of on the first return of the exiles (Ez. iii. 2), as existing in the reign of Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 8, xxiii. 24, 25), of Amaziah (xiv. 6), of David and Solomon (xxi. 8; 1 Kings ii. 3), in the
time of the judges (Judg. iii. 4) and of Joshua (1 7, 8). Unless decisive reasons can be adduced to the contrary, this must be held to be the same book.

2. There is no historical evidence or intimation that the pentateuchal laws ever existed separate from the rest of the Pentateuch, with which they are closely interwoven; the whole forming a unitary whole, and their absence from the laws of Moses, which would be expected if the laws were written by another, shows that the entire Pentateuch, as traditionally ascribed to Moses, must likewise be conceded to be his, unless there are valid reasons to the contrary. The Book of Deuteronomy consists of three addresses by Moses to the people (i. 1-iv. 40, v. xxvii., xxviii.-xxxiv.) and an historical appendix (xxxv.-xxxviii.). These addresses are intimately related to one another and to the laws which are included in the second address; the aim of the whole being to urge Israel to obey these laws. The style and language are identical; one spirit reigns throughout; and like recurring phrases frequently recur. The objections to the unity of the major body of the book (i.-xxxv.), and to Moses as its author, are of the most trivial description. In the appendix, Moses is expressly said to have written the song (xxxiii.1.), and to have spoken the blessing (xxxiii. 2.). That he did not write chap. xxxiv. is plain from its contents. Whether he wrote any portion of chap. xxx, if so, at what precise point he laid down the pen, and it was taken up by his successor, it might be difficult to determine; and fortunately this is wholly immaterial.

The laws in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, are so intimately blended with the history as to be inseparable. Whoever wrote the one must of necessity have written the other likewise. And Genesis is plainly conceived and written as introductory to the Mosaic history and legislation. In fact, one consistent topic and method of treatment is pursued throughout the Pentateuch; the genealogies are continuous, and mutually supplementary: a consistent chronology is maintained; there are implications and allusions in one portion to what is found in other portions by way of anticipation or reminiscence, which bind all together. And in the alleged gaps in the history during the sojourn in Egypt, and the greater portion of the wanderings in the wilderness, only make more manifest how rigorously the plan of the entire work is adhered to.

3. Moses is expressly said, not only to have written laws, but in some instances at least, historical incidents as well (Exod. xvii. 14; Num. xxxiii. 2); which shows both that matters designed for permanent preservation were committed to writing, and that Moses was the proper person to do it. The statement respecting Amalek was to be written for a memorial in the heart of Israel, which suggests a continuous work that Moses was preparing, or had in contemplation, and which would better insure its preservation than a separate fugitive record. That the explicit mention of writing in these instances does not justify the inference that he wrote nothing further, is seen from the analogy of xxx. 8; Jer. xxx. 2; Ezek. xliii. 11; Hab. ii. 2.

4. The alleged inconsistencies and statements, implying a later date than that of Moses, are capable of a ready solution. There are only a very few isolated passages, which it is necessary to assume have been added or modified at a subsequent time; e.g., Gen. xxxvi. 31 ff.

5. There are frequent allusions to the pentateuchal history in post-Mosaic writings, which not only confirm its truth, but by their evident verbal allusions, in some instances at least, imply its existence in written form. Joshua is throughout based on the entire antecedent narrative (Judg. i. 10, 20, comp. Num. xiii. 23, xxv. 15-26, comp. Num. xx. 14 ff., xxxii. 2 ff.). See also Judg. ii. 1-3, 7, iv. 11 (Num. x. 29), v. 4, 5, vi. 8-10, 13; Ruth iv. 11, 12, 18 ff.; Sam. ii. 27, 28, xii. 6, 8, xx. 2, 6, 29 (Num. xxii. 19); 2 Sam. vii. 22-24; in the Davidic Psalms, such allusions as Ps. viii. to Gen. i.; xi. 6 to Gen. xxxix. 24; xxix. 10, cx. 4. In the prophets it will be sufficient to refer to the following passages in Hosea: i. 10 (comp. Gen. xxii. 17, xxxii. 12), xi. 8 (comp. Deut. xxix. 23; Gen. xiv. 2), xiii. 8, 4, 12, xi. 1, xii. 9, xiii. 4-6 (Deut. viii. 12-14), xvi. 13, ix. 3 (comp. Deut. xxvi. 8), ix. 10, xii. 3 (comp. Exod. iii. 16), 15, 16 (iv. 10 (comp. xxxvi. 26).

6. The language of the Pentateuch is throughout the Hebrew of the purest period, with no trace of later words, or forms, or constructions, or of the Chaldaisms of the exile. The archaisms are peculiar to the Pentateuch. It always uses ֶלֶא ("she"), ֶלֶא for ֶלֶא ("girl"), and which would better insure its preservation than a separate fugitive record. That the explicit mention of writing in these instances does not justify the inference that he wrote nothing further, is seen from the analogy of xxx. 8; Jer. xxx. 2; Ezek. xliii. 11; Hab. ii. 2.

7. The familiarly with Egyptian objects and institutions shown by the writer, and presupposed in the people, as this has been exhibited in detail, particularly by Hengstenberg and by Ebers, is most readily explicable in the Mosaic period.

8. The doctrinal contents of the Pentateuch show that it belongs to the earliest period of the Old Testament. Its teachings respecting the Messiah, divine retribution, the spirit of the Old Testament. Its teachings respecting the Messiah, divine retribution, the spirit of the Old Testament, and the future state, are of the most elementary nature. In respect to all these points, a great advance is made in the Psalms and other poetical books, and in the prophets. Its account of the creation, the fall, and the deluge, while uncontaminated by any Pagan or polytheistic conceptions, has, nevertheless, such points of contact with old Assyrian myths as establish its very high antiquity. Some of the Mosaic laws had already been expanded by usage at an early period of the history; as that of levirate marriage in Ruth, the Nazarite in Samson, and the consecration of the first-born in Samuel. The service of the sanctuary was enlarged by music and by courses of priests under David, and its vessels multiplied under Solomon; and the prophetic order, of which the Pentateuch speaks as still future, superseded the priestly responses, for which it made provision. The Pentateuch orients rites, but suggests no explanation: this was a matter of later development, as respecting sacrifice (Ps. xl.; Isa. liii.), purification (Ps. xxvi. 6, li. 7), incense (Ps. exii. 2), the privileges of God's house (Ps. xxvii. 4),
The comparative value of ritual and spiritual worship (Ps. i. 8 ff., li. 16, 17, Isa. i. 11 ff.).

9. An argument has sometimes been drawn from the Samaritan Pentateuch, under the impression that it must have been derived from copies existing in Israel prior to the schism of Jeroboam; since the Samaritans would not have adopted it from the Jews, on account of the bitter feud between them. Nor would the northern kingdom, from which the Samaritans were drawn, have been susceptible of a different interpretation, but, inasmuch as the grievance of the Samaritans lay in the refusal of the Jews to recognize them as their brethren (Ex. iv. 1–3), the former coveted whatever would lend support to their claim. Hence their temple, modelled after that at Jerusalem. Hence their doctrines and traditions, borrowed from the Jews. And their Pentateuch was drawn from the same source and in the same spirit.

But the existence and authority of the Pentateuch in the kingdom of Israel, from the time of the schism, can be established by a different line of argument. The prophets of the ten tribes, Hosea and Amos, make frequent appeals to "the law," which was a written law of ten thousand precepts (Hos. vii. 12), and a covenant (viii. 1) formed when Israel came out of Egypt (xii. 9, xiii. 4); and the people are charged with gross criminality for disobeying it. The ceremonial which they describe, the statutes to which they refer, and the events to which they allude, are precisely those which are found in the Pentateuch. And no valid reason can be given for supposing the volume of which they speak to be any other than the Pentateuch itself, which is thus shown to have been possessed of incontrovertible divine authority among those who had the strongest reasons for denying its binding obligation if they could.

10. The testimony of our Lord, and of the inspired writers of the New Testament, is in various passages unequivocally given to the Mosaic origin and authority of the law that bears his name, and which is indifferently denominated "the Law of Moses," "The Book of Moses," and "Moses." It thus peremptorily waives aside any theory which makes the statutes of the Pentateuch, in whole or in part, the product of a later age. The Pentateuch is further, by fair implication, attributed to the pen of Moses. Jesus says to the Jews, concerning Moses (John v. 46, 47), "He wrote of me," and, without further explanation, refers them to "his writings," as something well known, and in their possession, and which they should have believed. We read in the same Gospel (i. 46), "Moses in the law," as well as the prophets, wrote concerning Jesus. The contrast with the prophets shows that it is the entire Pentateuch, and not its legal sections merely, which is here referred to. The same is the case in Luke xxiv. 27, where our Lord, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself:" (comp. Acts xxvii. 28). There is New Testament authority, and a strong and unanswerable sense in the protevangelium (Rom. xvi. 20), the promises to the patriarchs (John viii. 56; Gal. iii. 18), the blessing of Judah (Heb. vii. 14), the account of Melchisedec (Heb. vii.), the ladder of Jacob (John i. 51), the paschal lamb (John xix. 36), the daily sacrifice (John i. 29), the sin-offering (Heb. xii. 11, 12), the day of atonement (Heb. ix. 7), the whole system of sacrifices and lustrations (Heb. ix. 13, x.), the high priest (Heb. viii. 1), the water from the rock (1 Cor. x. 4), the prophet like unto Moses (Acts iii. 22). These, and other things of like nature, are written "in the law," or "in Moses," concerning Christ, and are designated by our Lord as written by Moses himself. It is not to be supposed that he makes here the special revelation of a fact known by his omniscience,— that Moses wrote the Messianic passages, and nothing more. But Christ affirms that Moses wrote them, because he was the well-known author of the Pentateuch, which contained them. This explicit assertion of Mosaic authorship gives the key to the proper understanding of other passages, which, taken singly, might have been susceptible of a different interpretation, but, viewed in this light, afford it abundant corroborating force.

There is, accordingly, nothing to contradict, but much to confirm, the idea, which has come down from the earliest times, that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch; unless a fatal objection is to be found in the modern critical hypothesis, that it is composed of a diversity of documents. There is no space here for an examination of that hypothesis, or of the grounds on which it rests. Some things are plausibly said in its favor, but there are serious objections to it which have never yet been removed. I cannot regard it as certainly established, even in the Book of Genesis, much less in the remainder of the Pentateuch, where even Bleek confessed he could no longer surrender the Elohist from the Jehovist: the second Elohist could not find anywhere. Thus much, at least, may be safely said: the criteria of this proposed analysis are so subtle, not to say mechanical, in their nature, so many purely conjectural assumptions are involved, and there is such an entire absence of external corroborative testimony, that no reliance can be placed in its conclusions, where these conflict with statements of the history itself. Genesis may be made up of various documents, and yet have been compiled by Moses. And the same thing is possible, even in the later books of the Pentateuch. If these could be successfully partitioned among different writers, on the score of variety in the literary execution, why may not these have been engaged, jointly with Moses himself, in preparing each his appointed portion, and the whole have been finally reduced by Moses to its present form, and issued with his sanction and authority? Even the allegation that the pentateuchal documents can still be traced in the Book of Joshua creates no serious difficulty. It is the entire Pentateuch, and not its legal sections merely, which is here referred to. The same is the case in Luke xxiv. 27, where our Lord, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself:" (comp. Acts xxvii. 28). There is New Testament authority, and a strong and unanswerable sense in the protevangelium (Rom. xvi. 20), the promises to the patriarchs (John viii. 56; Gal. iii. 18),
the whole course of the subsequent history; but it
no more follows that the same pen recorded the
whole than that one leader both conducted Israel
out of Egypt, and brought them into the posses-
sion of Canaan. The coincidences in thought
and expression between Joshua and the Penta-
tuch arise simply from the circumstance that
the former records the execution of commands and
the fulfilment of promises given in the latter, and
these are naturally repeated in exact language.
It simply shows that the actors in these events,
and the writer of the book, had the Pentateuch
before them, and carefully followed it.

It simply shows that the actors in these events,
and the writer of the book, had the Pentateuch
before them, and carefully followed it.

PENTECOST. (a) The Jewish (pentecostia, rab-
—Among the ancient Israelites it was the
second of their three pilgrimage festivals, and
marked the conclusion of the harvest commenced
with the passover, fifty days before. For reasons
assigned in Lev. xxiii. 15 sq., it is usually called
the “Feast of Weeks.” Cf. Deut. xvi. 10. The
description is found in Lev. xxiii. 15-21,
and Num. xxviii. 26-31, according to which, the
chief offering made by the whole people shall
consist in “two wave loaves” salted, brought
out of all the other offerings.” Concerning the
appearance of these, cf. Exod. xxxiv. 22; Joseph.,
Antiq., III. 10, 6. According to Mishna, Menachoth, 11, 4,
the length of this bread was to be seven hand-
breadths; its breadth, four; and its “horns”
(ענורי), the breadth of seven fingers. An anal-
ogy is found in the δόρα αἰωνίων of the Greek
sacrifice. In addition to this bread, Lev. xxviii.
18 sqq. prescribes further offerings. Cf. also Num. xxviii.
27 sqq. and, on the later practice, Joseph., Antiq.
3, 10, 6. In addition to the public offerings,
there were also some of a private character.
Cf. Num. xxviii. 26; Deut. xvi. 10-12. The manner
of bringing these to Jerusalem is described in
Mishna, Bekorot, 3, 2 sqq. The law restricted the
Pentecost festival to one day, to be kept holy
(Lev. xxiii. 21, xxvii. 26). Joseph., Antiq., III.
10, 6, says it was called אספורה (אספור), in He-
brew, and it is really called thus in the Mishna;
The Pentateuch, however, preferring other desig-
nations. Cf. Lev. xxiii. 36, and Deut. xvi. 8.
The word פְּרֵי, used in this last passage, does
not signify the “close of the Eastercycle,” and
thus has nothing to do with the εἴδωλον of the
LXX., nor with the θρήν ψυγίς of rabbinical
literature. This festival, mentioned but once in
the historical books (2 Chron. viii. 18), was purely
of an agrarian nature,—thanksgiving for the grain
harvest, as the Feast of Tabernacles is for the
fruit harvest. Only in post-biblical times did it
receive an historical basis and connection. Philo,
Josephus, and the older portions of the Talmud,
know nothing of it. Since Maimonides (More
Nebuchim, 3, 43), Pentecost is regarded as the
memorial festival of the giving of the law on
Sinai. This is based in Exod. xlv. 1. Cf. HAM-
burger: Real-Encyk. des Judenthums, i. 1057 sq.;
SCHRÜBER: Satzungen u. Gebrechte d. talmudisch-
rabbinischen Judenthums, pp. 216 sqq., and, for the
literature, the art. PASSOVER. VON ORELLI.

(b) The Christian.—Among the Christians, Pen-
tecost is the third of the chief festivals, closing
the cycle of the festivals referring to the Lord,
and thus separating the Semestre Domini and the
Semestre Ecclesiae. It is connected with its Jewish
predecessor, not only historically, through the
events recorded in Acts vii., but also internally,
being early regarded as a festival of thanksgiving
for the first-fruits of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 23; cf.
Augustine, Ep. 54 ad Januar.). Originally the
term “Pentecost” designated the whole period of
fifty days, from Easter to the outpouring of the
Holy Spirit. It is thus used by Tertullian, De
Idolatr., c. 12; or Origen, Contra Cels., viii. 22;
and by the Antioch Synod of 341, in canon 20; by
V. 20, and the Ordo Romanus. In contrast to
Lent, there was no fasting during this season,
and prayers were spoken while in a standing
posture. In addition, this joyful period was
marked by a cessation of theatre and circus exhi-
bitions, and by increased ceremonials and liturgy
in the church services.

In a narrower sense, as designating the last
day of this quinquagesimal period, the word “Pen-
tecost” is first found in a canon of the Council of
Elvira, 305; cf. Labbeii, Concill. I. 975. On the
importance of this σημείο τοπορ c. Euseb., De Vita
Const., IV. 64. Gregory of Naz., Ortal. XLIV. de
Pentec., honors it as ἡμέρα τοῦ πνείματος; and
Chrysostom, Hom. II. de Pentec., as μνήμην τῶν
τοπορ. Cf. also Augustine, Ep. 54 ad Januar. c
Faust, I. xxxii.; Leo the Great, Serm. 75-77 de
Pentec.; Concill. Apath. a. 506, c. 31 sqq.
At an early period already the days around Pen-
tecost were also regarded with especial honor;
but, from the eighth century down, these festivals
began to be curtailed, and the Protestant Church
of to-day celebrates only two Pentecost days.

Because it was customary to wear white gar-
mants on Pentecost, this day is called Whit-
sunday, and the whole period Whitun tide. The
older literature is found in AUGUSTI: Denkwür-
gkeiten, ii. 384 sq; GUERKE: Lehrbuch der
christ.-kirchl. Archäologie, pp. 190-196. For later,
cf. NILES (S. J.): Kalendarium manoscritti
Ecclesiae, etc. (1870), tom. ii. pp. 270 sq sq.
ZÖCKLER. (O. H. SCHODDE.)

PERATÉ. See Gnosticism, p. 881.

PERCY, Thomas, D.D., Bishop of Dromore,
County Down, Ireland; b. at Bridgnorth, Shrop-
shire, England, April 13, 1728; d. at Dromore,
Sept. 30, 1811. His fame rests mainly on his History
of Ancient English Poetry (1783); for which work he
was edited by him from an old manuscript. He
was, in consequence of this publication, advanced in
the Church, being made chaplain-in-ordinary to
the king, 1769, Dean of Carlisle, 1778, and Bishop
of Dromore, 1782. His religious publications embrace *The Song of Solomon* (newly translated from the original Hebrew) with a Commentary and Annotations, which came out anonymously in 1784; and *Key to the New Testament*, 1785, 3d ed., 1779.

**PEREIRA,** the lower part of Eastern Palestine.

**PEREIRA, Antonio de Figueiredo,** b. at Macao, Feb. 14, 1725; d. in Lisbon, Aug. 14, 1797. He was educated by the Jesuits at Villa-Viçosa, but refused to become a member of the order; entered the society of the Fathers of the Oratory; devoted himself to art and literature, and attracted much attention by his *Exercicios da lingua latina e portugueza* (1751) and his *Novo Metodo da gramatica latina* (1752). In the contest between Don José I. and the Ultramontanist party, he threw himself with violence on the royal side; wrote *Doctrina veteris ecclesia*, etc. (1765), *Tentativa theologica* (1769), both translated into French; obtained a high position in the government; and became a member, afterwards president, of the Academy of Sciences. The list of his works numbers a hundred and sixty-nine. It is his translation of the Bible into Portuguese, originally published in Lisbon (1778-90, 23 vols.), which the British and Foreign Bible Society circulates.

**PERFECTIONISM.** Calvinists and Lutherans deny any perfection in this life; but there are three theories in the other branches of the Christian Church upon this subject, advocated by Roman and Greek Catholics, Wesleyan Arminians, and Friends respectively. There is also the theory of the Oberlin school of theology. (1) Roman Catholics teach that the observance of God's law. Yet his venial sins compel him to use the petition, "Forgive us our debts." In some cases, by a special privilege of God, he may avoid all sins. Cf. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, sess. vi. chap. xi. and can. 23, 25; Schaff, *Creeds*, ii. pp. 100-102, 115. (2) Wesleyan Arminians teach a perfection which is not angelic, Adamic, nor absolute, but one that is relative; i.e., according to the special economy introduced by the atonement, in which the heart, being sanctified, fulfills the law by love." "The highest perfection," says Wesley, "which man can attain while the soul dwells in the body does not exclude ignorance and error and a thousand infirmities." This is what is styled Christian perfection. Its source is the grace of God; its fruit, freedom "from all un holy tempers, self-will, pride, anger, sinful thoughts." (3) The Friends teach, in the case of the justified, "The body of death and sin comes to be crucified and removed, and their hearts united, and subjected unto the truth, so as not to obey any suggestion or temptation of the flesh, but to be free from actual sinning, and transgressing of the law of God, and in that respect perfect. Yet doth this perfection still admit of a growth; and there remaineth a possibility of sinning where the mind doth not most diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord." — Eighth prop. Confession of the Society of Friends. Cf. Schaff, *Creeds*, iii. pp. 974, 975. (4) The Oberlin school of theology teaches, that "as virtue and sin belong only to voluntary action, and are contradictory in their nature, they cannot co-exist in the soul. The beginning of the Christian life is entire obedience. Every lapse into sin involves, for the time, the entire interruption of obedience. The promises of God and the provisions of the gospel are such that, that, when fully and continuously embraced, they enable the believer to live a life of uninterrupted obedience,—an attainment which may be properly encouraged and expected in the present life." Cf. art. NEW-ENGLAND THEOLOGY, 5, p. 1687.

**PERGAMOS,** properly *PERGAMUM* (Rev. i. 11, ii. 12-17), the seat of one of the seven churches of Asia, a celebrated city of Teuthrania, Great Mysia, on the north side of the Caicus, about three miles from the Ægean Sea. The city began as a fortress upon the acropolis, and early obtained a sacred character. There Lyaimachus, a general of Alexander the Great, stored his stolen treasure, which amounted to nine thousand talents. But Philaterus of Tium, a eunuch, whom he implicitly trusted, faithlessly appropriated the money, in revenge for ill-treatment by Lyaimachus' wife, declared himself independent, and thus laid the foundation for a long-continued prosperity, B.C. 283. Under the house of Attalus, the city was beautified, and its territory extended. Pergamum was also a literary centre, and boasted of a library of two hundred thousand rolls, which was finally moved to Alexandria, as a gift of Antony to Cleopatra, and thus destroyed. The word "parchment" is derived from the Latin carta pergamenta ("paper of Pergamum"). The city was renowned for its Æsculapian worship, as the birthplace of celebrated physicians (chief of whom was Galen), as the seat of a famous medical school, indeed, of a university, as a bathing-place, and also for its idolatry and gladiatorial shows. The heart, being sanctified, fulfilled, fullfills the law by love." The highest perfection," says Wesley, "which man can attain while the soul dwells in the body does not exclude ignorance and error and a thousand infirmities." This is what is styled Christian perfection. Its source is the grace of God; its fruit, freedom "from all un holy tempers, self-will, pride, anger, sinful thoughts." (3) The Friends teach, in the case of the justified, "The body of death and sin comes to be crucified and removed, and their hearts united, and subjected unto the truth, so as not to obey any suggestion or temptation of the flesh, but to be free from actual sinning, and transgressing of the law of God, and in that respect perfect. Yet doth this perfection still admit of a growth; and there remaineth a possibility of sinning where the mind doth not most diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord." — Eighth prop. Confession of the Society of Friends. Cf. Schaff, *Creeds*, iii. pp. 974, 975. (4) The Oberlin school of theology teaches, that "as virtue and sin belong only to voluntary action, and are contradictory in their nature, they cannot co-exist in the soul. The beginning of the Christian life is entire obedience. Every lapse into sin involves, for the time, the entire interruption of obedience. The promises of God and the provisions of the gospel are such that, that, when fully and continuously embraced, they enable the believer to live a life of uninterrupted obedience,—an attainment which may be properly encouraged and expected in the present life." Cf. art. NEW-ENGLAND THEOLOGY, 5, p. 1687.
1. The employment of pericopes in the church originated in the forms of worship in the synagogue. The Scriptures themselves command that the law shall be publicly read (Deut. xxxi. 10–13) for the instruction of the people. Cf. also Josephus, c. Ap., ii. 17. When synagogues were built, this public reading formed a portion of the regular sabbath services. Cf. Acts xvi. 21. With the reading of the law, was already, in Christ's day, associated the reading of the prophets. Cf. Luke iv. 16, 17; Acts xiii. 11. Both have been retained to the present day. The sections of the law to be read on the sabbath at the present time can be seen by a reference to the Hebrew text. They are called Parashas (פרשיות, from פרש, separati). Genesis contains twelve, Exodus eleven, Leviticus and Numbers each ten, Deuteronomy eleven. — fifty-four in all. This number is arranged for the Jewish leap-year, which contains fifty-four sabbaths. In ordinary years, several of the shorter sections are sometimes read on the same day; so that each year the whole law is completed. With the above are connected the sections in the prophetic books. Luke, for example, called them dimissio, or missa, because, after reading these, the people were dismissed, a list of which is found appended to the Hebrew Bible. Rabbinical tradition assigns a high antiquity, not only to the public reading of the prophetic books in general, but also to the present selection of sections, and a still earlier date to the Parashas. Elias Levita (cf. Bodenach: Die kirchl. Verfassung d. heutigen Juden, ii. p. 24) relates, that, when Antiochus forbade the reading of the law, the people began to read sections of the prophets corresponding in contents to the legal Parashas. Thus, e.g., if on the first sabbath an account of creation was to be read, a prophetic section would be chosen, such as Isa. xlii. 5–xliii. 20, in which God was praised as Creator of heaven and earth. This tradition, however, is improbable. Cf. Joseph., Antiq., XII. 5, 4. Vitringa's idea (Archiv. gnost., p. 294) that the Jews were chiefly induced by their antipathy to their enemies, the Samaritans, who read only the law, to introduce the reading of the prophets, is more probable. Besides, the cessation of prophecy undoubtedly had much to do with it. Lately Zunz (in his Gottsdienst, Vorträge der Juden, Berlin, 1832) has proved from Talmudic and other sources, that at a very early date the Pentateuch in Palestine was arranged for a cyclus of three years or three years and a half, so that it was read twice every seven years in accordance with the one hundred and seventy-five sections found in the Jerusalem Talmud; which division antedates that into fifty-four Parashas made in Babylonia. According to the same authority, the Haphtaras were not yet fixed in the third Christian century. Cf. i. c., pp. 3, 193.

2. What is the relation of the Parashas and Haphtaras to the sections of Scripture read in the churches during the Passion Week? A general connection, but no closer relationship, exists, as the Christian cultus is a child of that in the synagogue. Justin Martyr (Apol., i. 67) relates, that, at the regular meetings of the Christians, “the memoirs of the apostles, the letters of the disciples, and the writings of the prophets,” were read. Tertullian (De praescriptione, 30) lauds the church for “mixing” (mucet) the writings of both Testaments. The author of the Commentary on Job found in Origen (tom. ii. 581) mentions that Job was regularly read in the churches during the Passion Week; and Origen himself testifies to the use of the Old Testament in the worship of the church. Cf. also Apost. Constit., i. 39, 57. This is corroborated by later testimony.

3. In many different ways the public reading of the Scriptures was developed in the different sections of the church. Little of this process has been recorded: it belongs to what Basil calls the ἄγωσις της ἐκκλησίας μνημής.

4. The method of reading the Scriptures in the Greek Church is, in this connection, of the highest importance. Concerning her we possess the oldest documents: she is the mother of all the Oriental churches, and thus the source, not only of their liturgies, but also of their lectionaries. The sources at the disposal of the modern student have lately been greatly multiplied by the productions of the Greek Phoenix press in Venice, especially established to spread the books of the Greek Church in the western portion of the territory of the Constantinopolitan patriarch. An examination of these shows the remarkable wealth of the Greek Church in this respect; for not only do the Sundays, the prominent days of Christ's history, and the many saints' days, have their regular gospel and epistolar lessons, but such are also assigned to every day in the week. In these lessons, aside from those for the regular festival days, a lectio continua, which is generally supposed to exist there, is not so apparent. Some system, however, has been followed out. Thus, for the period between Easter and Pentecost, as Chrysostom already states, the Acts and the Gospel of John were read continuously. For the rest of the church year, three separate and independent series of lessons are employed,—one series for the Sundays, beginning with the second after Pentecost; one series for the sabbaths, beginning in the Pentecost Week; and one series for the five week days between the Sunday and sabbath. All three series select both from Gospels and Epistles, following the order of the books and chapters in the New Testament.

History explains this strange phenomenon. It is very evident that the Greek Church at first introduced lessons for the Sundays, later for the sabbaths, and still later for the week-days. Documentary evidences to this effect are at hand, especially for the lectionaries for the week-days, which are found only in later and poorer manuscripts. The Sunday and sabbath lessons are already referred to by Chrysostom. The Old Testament was read chiefly during the season of Lent. The peculiar character of the Greek Church, however, makes it probable that the present system of lessons known as the Antiochian-Byzantine was not the only one used in early days. And in the churches during the Passion Week, the reading in this direction in some very old manuscripts.

5. Next in importance is the Armenian system. Professor Petermann of Berlin first translated it from the Armenian Church Almanac, published in Venice, 1782; which translation appeared in Dr. Alt's instructive work (Kirchenjahr, ed. ii., pp. 136, 225). Scripture-reading is a most important part of Armenian
church service,— more so than in the Greek Church. During the time from Easter to Pentecost the Armenian Church does not only have services daily, but has them thrice every day, and for every service has prescribed lessons from the Old and New Testaments. During the rest of the year, this church not only celebrates every Sunday and saint's day, but also regularly every Wednesday and Saturday. In this way it is made possible that between Easter and Pentecost, during the principal services, the whole Psalter, the Acts, the whole Pauline Epistles, the whole Catholic Epistles, the Gospel of St. John (chapters 1-17), and the Gospel of Matthew are read; in the matins, the first half of the Gospel of Luke, and, in the vespers, the Gospel of Matthew to chapter xvi. 1, and Mark to chapter xii. 37, are read. From Pentecost on, both the Pauline Epistles and the Gospels are read; for ten weeks, Matthew; for eleven weeks, Mark; for thirteen weeks, Luke; and from Epiphany, after John i.-vii., these latter chapters thus being read twice every year. In addition to these, selections from the Old Testament are also read. The Armenian system in its kernel is very ancient. It shows enough of connection with the Greek system to prove that the latter is its source, and is thus older than the separation of these churches, in 405 A.D. But even a higher antiquity can be shown; since this system exhibits the two chief peculiarities of the Cappadocian plan, which, as early as the sixth century, presented lessons for Wednesdays and Saturdays, and also from the Old Testament for the whole year. Basil (Ep. 289, Ad Caesarem) says, "Four times do we assemble every week,—on Sunday, Wednesday, Friday, and the sabbath, and also on the days commemorating the martyrs." Cf. also Hom. 8. De bapt. Accordingly we can see in the kernel of the Armenian system the outflow of the Cappadocian, or rather in it a reflex of the old form of the Greco-Cappadocian system.

The once grand Church of Syria, owing both to the dogmatic contentions of the fifth and sixth centuries, and to the conquests of Islam, has been represented at present only in such sects as the Nestorians, the Jacobites, the Maronites, and the Melchites.

The latter, called "the royal party," have retained the cultus of the Greek Church in general, as also the Greek reading-system. Very ancient documents written in Syriac testify to this point. We have an almost complete record of the Melchite lectionary of the first half of the eleventh century.

Of about the same age are the documentary evidences concerning the Nestorian system of Bible lessons. The Missale Chaldæicum of the United Nestorians, published in Rome repeatedly, does, indeed, give no account of the age of the manuscript upon which the edition, which contains both the Gospel and the Epistolary lessons, is based; but this can be supplied from other sources. It is here a series of lectiones selectae that are of such a character as to deserve in some respects to be placed at the side of the Romish pericope-system. For certain portions of the church-year, certain New-Testament books are used. Thus, for the first half of the Epiphany period, the Gospel of St. John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, are chiefly employed. In place of the latter, the Epistle to the Romans is used from the Monday of the first week in Lent to Palm Sunday; and, side by side with this, sections of the Gospel on the Mount are read. Once in the middle of Lent, sections of St. John's Gospel are again employed, however, with some interruptions. From Pentecost on, selections from Matthew, then from Luke, follow, accompanied by portions of Corinthians, Thessalonians, and Galatians. It is possible that the Nestorians adopted this arrangement to mark their contrast with the Greek Church, either originating it themselves, or taking it from existing practices. The date would then be the fifth century. The system is certainly very peculiar, and in marked contrast with the Byzantine, as is especially seen by the Old-Testament selections. But the Nestorians had more than one system: at least there is a second series of epistolary lessons recorded in a Vatican manuscript of 1801.

The "Nestorian" lessons recorded by Dr. Alt (Der Christl. Cultus, ii. p. 485), as found prescribed in the New Testament for the Christians of Malabar, have some marked peculiarities, but are of doubtful authenticity.

The documents with reference to the reading-system of the Jacobite Christians are quite ample, but have not yet been satisfactorily examined. The very first volume of the Syriac New Testament, published by Widmanstadius, Vienna, 1805, contains a list of the New-Testament pericopes of the Jacobites; and, besides, a Jacobite Liturgy, found in the second volume of Renaudot's collection, contains relevant matter. This latter volume prescribes a twofold liturgical arrangement,—the first called Ordo communis secundum ritum Syrorum Jacobitarum (pp. 1 sq.) and the second, Alius Ordo generalis liturgiae (pp. 12 sq.). And, according to the investigations of Birchell, only the latter is a Jacobite, while the former is a Maronite, plan; which explains the discrepancies between them. The Alius Ordo also agrees with Widmanstadius' list. That the latter is that of the Jacobite Church is plain from the fact that Moses of Marden, from whose hand this Syriac text was derived, was a Jacobite. But this list itself lacks inner harmony, the epistolary lessons not agreeing with those of the Gospel. The British Bible Society, in retaining the liturgical readings of the Widmanstadius' edition, seems to have published its edition only for the Jacobite Christians. Widmanstadius' list is thus not satisfactory. But other evidences, chiefly ample and good manuscript authorities, as to the Jacobite system, are at our command. Their common peculiarity, like that of the Nestorian system, consists in the selection of particular portions of Scripture for certain prominent days. Thus Christmas is marked by selections that treat of the incarnation of Christ historically; the Epiphany period by extracts from the early work of Christ; and the Easter week by a systematic plan carried out in the selection of passages.

For the extra-Gospel lessons the Widmanstadius' list is, strange to say, the only available source; and this list shows a predilection for a lectio continua. It appoints the Acts for Lent, First Corinthians after Pentecost, James and First Peter after Epiphany.

The plan of Scripture reading pursued by the
The peculiar plan in the public reading of Scriptures, a phenomenon similar to that observed in the Church of the East. As here the Byzantine system was the one most extensively spread, thus, in the West, the Roman system gradually supplanted all the rest. A difference between the two consists in this, that the non-Byzantine systems of the East were mostly followed by bodies that stood opposed to the Byzantine Church, while the non-Roman systems found a home in bodies on doctrinal and fraternal footing with the Roman Church.

11. Of the existence of a south-Italian system employed at Capua, we have ample proof in the Cod. Fuldensis, corrected in the year 545 by Bishop Victor himself of Capua.

12. That the Christians of Gaul pursued a peculiar plan in the public reading of Scriptures is already manifest from a letter of the missionary Augustinus to Gregory the Great. Besides, there are other scattered evidences from Hilary (354), Sidonius (472), Salvianus (440), Cf. Mabill., De liturg. Gallic., pp. 29 sqq. Then we have a Capitular of Charlemagne, abolishing the Gallic Liturgy in favor of the Roman.

13. The very ancient Liturgy and reading-system of the Milan Church has been more fortunate. It is still preserved under the title Missa Ambrosiana. Its original form cannot be definitely determined, as the different printed texts do not agree among themselves.

14. On the very peculiar Mozarabic system, consult the special article. It seems to be older than the Gallic system, or they form two branches from one stem.

15. The Roman system of scriptural reading, like the whole Roman Liturgy, has passed through three stages,—that of its origin and development down to the time of the Carolingians, that of its supremacy in the middle ages, and that of fixed and formal codification by the Council of Trent.

The oldest traces of it are found in the fifth century, about the time of Jerome, to whom Berno and later writers ascribe its origin. It consists of a double list,—one of Epistle, and the other of Gospel selections,—partly chosen freely, and partly with partiality for certain books.

In the second period, this system made its greatest conquests; in France supplanting the Gallic, in Germany entering with Christianity. It also experienced some internal changes during this time, especially on account of the many saints' days and the introduction of the Corpus Christi Festival in 1264.

Finally the Council at Trent declared the papal system the only legitimate one for the Roman Church, only allowing those churches the use of any other which could prove that the latter had been in constant use there for the past two hundred years.

18. With the Reformation effected by Luther and his German Bible, the traditional character of church services necessarily had to change also. The Bible was read, studied, and explained. The most complete system of Bible lessons was introduced in England, to some extent, also, in Germany and Switzerland. This whole subject is treated in extenso by Ranke: Fortbestand des herkömmlichen Perikopenkreises, Gotha, 1859.

17. The old pericope system has a peculiar history within the section of the Protestant Church that has retained it. In England, Cranmer, in writing the Prayer-Book, simply took the Epistles and Gospels as found in the Missale of the English bishoprics, omitting only those intended for days not celebrated by the Protestants. This latter was also done in Germany; but some other changes were made here, especially at the close of the Epiphany and Trinity Sundays. In the pre-reformatory system there were no lessons for the sixth Sunday after Epiphany, nor for the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh Sundays after Trinity. This defect was remedied successfully during the sixteenth century by an unknown master in liturgics; and the present arrangement is the result.

18. The subordinate services, such as the matins, vespers, and also services during the week, prayer-meetings, and the like, found great favor in the eyes of the Reformers. Luther in 1528, the Zurich order of worship for 1638, and the Geneva Liturgy, gave directions for the use of lessons in such services.

The Church of England pursued its own plan in arranging the daily lessons. Not content, as the Continental Reformers were, with selecting only certain sections of Scripture to be read, Cranmer arranged for morning and evening services such a course of lessons, that in every year the entire Old Testament, with the exception of the Psalter and the purely ritual sections of the Pentateuch, was read through once, the New Testament three times, and the Psalter twelve times, i.e., was to be chanted through once a month.

In Germany the services during the week in the course of time became almost extinct.
19. The public scriptural reading, thus reduced to the regular Gospel and Epistolary lessons for the different Sundays, could not long satisfy the church. Already Spener advocated an enlarged pericope system; and since 1769, when the movement was started by the Elector George of Hanover, the evangelical authorities in the various provinces of Germany have sought to remedy this defect, especially by the adoption of the three series of pericopes. Cf. Ranke in the original of this art. (Hertzog, II. vol. xi. 460-492), and Nebe on the Pericopes. ERNST RANKE. (G. H. SCHODDE.)

PERIKAU, Synods of. — I. (1551). The consolidation of the Roman-Catholic party in Poland, and the drawing-up of the Confessio catholica fidelis by Stanislaus Hosius, Bishop of Culm and Ermeland, as a counterbalance to the Confessio Augustana. — II. (1555). The consolidation of the Protestant party in Poland, and the sending of a royal embassy to Paul IV., demanding the celebration of mass in the vernacular tongue, the administration of the Lord’s Supper in both forms, the abolition of annata, the abrogation of ecclesiastical celibacy, etc. — III. (1556). The wild outburst of dissension with the Protestant camp, between Lutherans, Calvinists, and Antitrinitarians. — IV. (1564). Religious disputation (Aug. 6-14) between the Antitrinitarians, Grigor Pauli and Georg Schoemann, and the Reformed, Stanislaus Saruzki, Discorda, and others. The Lutherans took no part in the discussion. The Antitrinitarians were excluded from any community with the Reformed Church. See Poland.

PERIZZITES. See CANAAN, p. 380.

PERKINS, Justin, D.D. American missionary in Persia; b. at West Springfield, Mass., March 12, 1805; d. at Chicopee, Mass., Dec. 31, 1869. He was graduated at Amherst, 1829; studied at Andover Theological Seminary, and in 1833 was sent by the American Board to the Nestorians in Persia. He established himself at Oroomiah (November, 1854), and for thirty-six years conducted the mission. He translated the Bible into the Nestorian dialect, and also other books. In 1842 he made a tour through the United States, accompanied by Mar Yohanan, an early convert, who had been a Nestorian bishop. In 1843, at Teheran, the capital of Persia, he successfully defended the Protestants against misrepresentation and persecution. He wrote, A Residence of Eight Years in Persia among the Nestorian Christians (Andover, 1843), Missionary Life in Persia (Boston, 1861).

PERKINS, William, b. at Marston Jabet in Warwickshire, Eng., in 1558; entered Christ’s College, Cambridge, 1577; was chosen fellow of the same in 1582; entered the ministry, and was appointed lecturer at Great St. Andrews, Cambridge. He married in 1590. He was called before the High Commission for inquiry as to his papal communion with Catholics in the Puritan movement. He seems, however, to have taken little interest in ecclesiastical affairs, but was a High Calvinist and scholastic. He was a powerful preacher. Fuller says, “He would pronounce the word ‘damn’ with such an emphasis as left a doleful echo in his auditors’ears a good while after.” He was an extreme Calvinist in doctrine. His Armilla auresc, published in 1600 at Cambridge, stirred up Arminius to reply in 1602, and had a great deal to do in bringing on the Arminian controversy, on the Continent, as in England. He gathered round him a circle of disciples who published the Minutes of an Assembly for the Examination of Mr. William Perkins (1602). He died in 1621. He was a member of the general Colloquy at Douay (1618). His sermons and treatises were printed at Antwerp, and translated into French, Latin, Italian, and German.

PERONE, Giovanni, D.D., Roman-Catholic theologian; b. at Chieri, Piedmont, 1794; d. in Rome, Aug. 29, 1873. He received his doctorate at Turin (1815); went to Rome, and entered the Society of Jesus; was sent the next year (1816) to Orvieto as professor of dogmatic and moral theology. Recalled to Rome (1828), he became professor of theology in the Roman college, and held the position until 1873, except when rector of the colleges at Ferrara (1830-33) and Rome (1858-56). He took refuge for two years with some pupils at Stonyhurst, Eng. (1848-50). In 1854 he played a prominent part on the affirmative side in the discussions preceding the bull Ineffabilis Deus, which proclaimed the Immaculate Conception dogma. In 1859 he figured similarly upon the Ultramontane side in the Vatican Council. He was a member, and chosen councillor, of nearly all the papal congregations on doctrine, discipline, and liturgy, and thus wielded great influence. It is, however, as emphatically the theological teacher of the present Roman Church that he deserves most attention. His system of dogmatics is now that which is most widely used in his church, and comes up most fully to its standard of orthodoxy. His method is scholastic and traditional, but divested of the wearisome and repulsive features of old scholasticism, and adapted to the modern state of controversy. His system appears in two forms,—unabridged and abridged,—under the titles Praelectiones theologicae quas in Collegio Romano Societatis Jesu dabo (Rome, 1835 sqq., 9 vols. 8vo, republished and reprinted in many editions at Turin, 1845 sqq., 9 vols. 8vo), Paris (1870, 4 vols.), Brussels, Ratisbon, and elsewhere, translated into French and German; and Praelectiones theologicae in Compendium redactae (abridged), Rome, 1845, 4 vols., 36th ed., 1881, 2 vols., translated into several languages. Besides this great work, he wrote Il Heresianismo, a good thing, Rome and Lyons, 1840; Synopsis historiae theologiae cum philosophia comparata, Rome, 1845; De immaculato B. V. Mariae conceptus: an dogmatico decreto
PERSECUtion OF THE CHRISTIANS IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE. It was formerly usual to distinguish between ten general persecutions; but the distinction was very arbitrary, and gave an entirely wrong idea of the real state of affairs. The fact is, that persecution, when once started, never ceased until stopped by law. Frightful at some periods, and insignificant at others, it was always permitted, and by the edict of Trajan it became legal. Thus the history of persecution naturally falls into three great periods. The first, from the beginning of Christianity to the reign of Trajan. Persecution is permitted, but not legal. The second, from the reign of Trajan to the accession of Decius. Persecution is legal, and increases both in extension and intensity, but remains local, and depending on the individual view of the governor. The third, from the accession of Decius to the promulgation of the first edict of toleration in 311. Persecution is legal and general. Its reason is political. To the empire the speedy suppression of Christianity has become a question of life and death.

I. — The first persecutor was Nero. But his reason was merely incidental. Two-thirds of Rome had been consumed by a huge conflagration. The populace was on the very verge of revolt, forecasts of a price of a governor. Some one whispered the name of the emperor. It became absolutely necessary to bring forward the guilty; and Nero fastened the charge on the Christians. But the circumstance that he could do so is characteristic of their position in Roman society. Their religion was not illegal. No edict had as yet been issued against them, nor did Nero issue any. Nevertheless, their social position began to become critical. Though religious, more especially doctrinal, intolerance was something so entirely unknown to antiquity that the strangest forms of worship were tolerated in Rome beside the official one. Rome was a city in which politics it was prohibited. The Druids were not tolerated in Gaul. Now, it cannot be maintained for one moment that the Christians mixed up politics with their religion; but it is nevertheless easy to understand how they could rouse such a suspicion. They could not be identified with the base passions of an ignorant mob. And in the main this state of affairs continued during the reigns of Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, and Nero. A great general persecution is spoken of under Domitian; but see that article.

II. — At the beginning of the second century the number of Christians throughout the empire had increased so much, that they could not be overlooked any more, nor be identified with the Jews. But, the more the Christians came to the front, the more striking the difference became between the spirit which ruled them and the spirit incultated by the official religion. Serious men could not fail to see that Christianity acted as a powerful element of dissolution in the Roman state; and it was consequently the good emperors of the period — Trajan, Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius — who persecuted the Christians; while the fools— Commodus, Caracalla, Heliogabalus — saw fit to take no notice of them. Of paramount interest and importance are the letter from Pliny the Younger, governor of Bithynia, to Trajan, and Trajan’s answer. This last document has been completely misunderstood by Mestizo and Sardis, Tertullian, and other Christian writers, who considered it an edict of toleration, while in reality it is the legalization of persecution. True, he orders that no action shall be taken against the Christians, unless upon denunciation; but he adds, that, “when they are formally accused and convicted, they shall be punished.” And what the effect of such a decree must have been is easily imagined in a time when it became common for the crowds in the amphitheatre to cry out, “To the lions with the Christians!” The edict of Hadrian (which art. see) has also been misunderstood. It is simply a confirmation of the edict of Trajan. But these two edicts formed, up to the accession of Decius, the legal foundation of the social position of the Christians; that is, the special right of a people, the right of being considered a religious body, at any moment institute persecution against them without any interference of the law in their behalf.

III. — Hitherto the worst enemy of the Christians had been the mob. Stirred up by accusations of monstrous stupidity, and prompted by unborn envy and hatred, it was the mob which instituted the persecutions. But now the situation was changed. The government itself became persecutor, and from principle. What in Marcus Aurelius had been a mere instinct became in Decius conscious action. He considered the Christians in the cities as worse enemies of the state than the barbarians on the frontiers. To suppress Christianity seemed to him a political necessity, a duty of patriotism; and persecution was carried out as a regular government measure. The same policy was renewed by Diocletian, and failed. (See the article on the public festival; numerous acts and ceremonies of political and military life they could not perform; their religion separated them from their co-citizens, and threw a veil of secrecy over their life. More was not necessary to stir up the Roman imagination, so easily touched by the idea of plots, conspiracies, attentates, etc. The persecution, however, was only short and local; though in the provinces some official may have seen fit to imitate his master, and may have been aided by the base passions of an ignorant mob. And in the main this state of affairs continued during the reigns of Constantine, Titus, Domitian, and Nero. A great general persecution is spoken of under Domitian; but see that article.
PERSEVERANCE OF SAINTS. This doctrine, the fifth of the so-called "Five Points of Calvinism," is thus clearly set forth in the Canons of Dort, Fifth Head of Doctrine:—

"Whom God calls, according to his purpose, to the community of his Son, Jesus Christ, and regenerates by the Holy Spirit, he delivers also from the dominion and slavery of sin in this life, though not altogether from the body of sin and from the infirmities of the flesh, so long as they continue in this world." (Art. I.)

"By reason of these remains of indwelling sin, and the temptations of sin and of the world, those who are converted could not persevere in a state of grace if left to their own strength. But God is faithful, who, having conferred grace, mercifully confirms, and powerfully preserves them therein, even to the end." (Art. III.)

"Of this preservation of the elect to salvation, and of their perseverance in the faith, true believers for themselves may and do obtain assurance according to the measure of their faith, whereby they arrive at that assurance that they ever will continue true and living members of the Church; and that they experience forgiveness of sins, and will at last inherit eternal life." (Art. XV.)

"This certainty of perseverance, however, is so far from exciting in believers a spirit of pride, or of rending them carnally secure, that, on the contrary, it is the real source of humility, filial reverence, true piety, patience in every tribulation, fervent prayers, constancy in suffering and in confessing the truth, and of solid rejoicing in God; so that the consideration of this benefit should serve as an incentive to the serious and constant practice of gratitude and good works, as appears from the testimonies of Scripture and the examples of saints." (Art. XII.)

"The carnal mind is unable to comprehend this doctrine of the perseverance of saints and the certainty thereof, which God hath most abundantly revealed in His Word, for the glory of His name and the consolation of pious souls, and which he impresses upon the hearts of the faithful. Satan abhors it; the world ridicules it; the ignorant and hypocrite abuse, and heretics oppose it. But the spouse of Christ hath always most tenderly loved and constantly defended it as an inseparable treasure." (Art. XV.)

This doctrine was first clearly set forth by Augustine in the Pelagian controversy (De Dono Perseverantiae), renewed by the Reformers, and is held by all Calvinistic churches, as a logical consequence of the doctrine of election. See Westminster Confession, chap. xvii.

Arminius at first hesitated about it, and then left it an open question. The later Arminians took strong ground against it, and affirmed the possibility of a total and final fall from grace. This is the position of the Wesleyan Arminians to-day in Europe and America. The Lutheran Confessions hold a middle position. The Church of England leaves room for both theories. See Arminianism, Five Articles of; Arminianism, Wesleyan.

Persia was one of the great world-powers of Daniel, the rival of Rome in its palmy days, the rival of the Ottoman Empire when Europe trembled before it, and, even in the last century, a conquering power, the extent of whose dominions was by no means inconsiderable. In extent of dominion, and continuance of power, it is worthy of comparison with Rome, and as a civilizing, fertilizing power, as the western islands and shores represent civilization and barbarism. It was a nation of philosophers and poets, as was recognized by Mohammed, in the saying, that, "if science were suspended from the height of heaven, there are among the Persians those who would possess themselves of it." Mohammedanism, on its intellectual side, was largely Persian. Arabian philosophy was Arabian only in name and language. The brilliancy of the Bagdad caliphate, the Augustan age of Mohammedanism, was largely due to Persian influence. Language and literature are rich and copious, and characterized by a union of profound thought with brilliancy of expression—true "apple of gold in pictures of silver." This brilliancy is not that of high art, but of life. Persian, like other Oriental literature, preserves the characteristics of spoken language, which give it a perennial freshness, and make it independent of the changing fashions of time and place. It is nearer to practical life than Hindu thought,—not thought merely, but thought in action. This brings out the most characteristic feature of the Persian mind, which is not so much its absolute originality as its giving currency and influence to the thoughts and institutions of other Oriental lands. It maintained this supremacy under all circumstances. Conquering or conquered, it makes a deep impression upon all the Oriental peoples with whom it comes in contact. Hindu, Arab, Tartar, and Turk, all feel its influence. In this respect it bears a striking resemblance to Greece. In religion it occupied a still higher position. Of all non-Christian religions, it was the one most free from idolatry, most pure from moral taint, and characterized by moral earnestness, and depth of sense of sin. Life a warfare; man, soldier of the Prince of light, in conflict with the Power of darkness. The Persians were the people most in sympathy with the people of God under the old dispensation, sustaining to them a peculiar relation, delivering them from Babylon, and aiding and assisting them after their return.

Turning now to the Persia of to-day, we find that it still occupies an important central position with reference to Russia on the north, India on the east, Arabia on the south and south-west, and Turkey on the west. In political power, influence, and glory, it is but the mere shadow of what it once was. Its territory, it is true, extending nine hundred miles from east to west, and seven hundred from north to south, and embracing an area of about six hundred and forty-eight thousand square miles, is still large. But of this territory three-quarters is desert; and much of the remainder—even of those parts which, like the country along the shore of the Caspian and on the western border, is exceedingly fertile—is but a bare waste, sparsely inhabited. In the more thickly settled districts even, signs of decay meet one, in uncultivated fields, deserted villages, and cities whose...
population, in some cases, is but a tithe of what it has been. Making due allowance for exaggerated estimates, the probability is, that the population of Persia to-day is not more than a fourth of what it was two centuries ago, and that its wealth has diminished much more. The same causes which have brought about the present state of things are at work to-day. The extortion of the government, dissension among rival princes, and the jealousy of the two leading nations,—the Tartars and Persians, between whom the land is divided,—are rapidly paving the way for the dismemberment of the empire. The Kurd, in his mountain fastnesses, watches for the opportunity to swoop down, and take possession of the fertile lowlands; and Russia, who already within the present century has twice enriched herself at the expense of Persia, waits the time when the whole of Northern Persia shall become part of her possession. True, losses on the north may in part be compensated by extension on the southwest; Bagdad and the region round, rich in historical and religious memories to Persia, falling to her as her share of the possessions of "the sick man of Europe," and Persia; of that she will even again be a great political power. As regards literature, it was the opinion of Lord Beaconsfield, that the time is at hand when Oriental literature shall take the place occupied by that of Greece and Rome. Within the last few months Max Muller has borne very emphatic testimony to the importance of this literature; and it is a noticeable fact that this conviction is a growing one among those who have given attention to the subject. The question, however, of Oriental literature, is but part of a larger question. The distinctive characteristic of that literature is the religious element which pervades and dominates it; and it is just here, that, at the present time, the position of Persia is of special significance. Persia is a distinctively Mohammedan country. In a population of five or six millions there are only about forty thousand Armenians, thirty thousand Nestorians, fifteen to twenty thousand Jews, and eight thousand Fire-worshippers, or about a hundred thousand in all. But the Mohammedanism of Persia is a peculiar Mohammedanism. In the ordinary sense of the term, the Persians are, and always have been, bad Mohammedans. They are the Broad Churchmen of that religion, and Mohammedanism in its Arabian dress has always been too narrow for them. Hence has arisen a type of Mohammedanism which may be called the Persian mystical, dervish, or monkish, Mohammedanism, the leading representative of which is Jelalu-d-Din, author of Mesnevi, not so well known in the West as Saadi and Hafiz, but of immensely greater significance from the religious standpoint.

The work is an old one. Meviana Jelalu-d-Din ("Our Lord, the Majesty of the Religion of Islam"), son of an eminent mystic, was born at Balkh, Sept. 29, 1207 A.D. The time of his birth is significant; as it is the period richest in Persian history in its record of the life of distinguished poets and philosophers, thus preparing the way for the coming of him who was to bring together and unite all the separate streams of thought in one mighty river. About 1227 we find him settled at Conya, the ancient Iconium, where in 1249 he instituted the order of Mevlevi,—dancing or whirling dervishes; and here, in 1278, he died. A truly extraordinary man, of marvellous insight and susceptibility for spiritual truth, not only a profound thinker, but a man of affairs as well, a combination of philosopher and statesman. For our judgment of him we are not dependent upon the statements of credulous disciples; the six books of Mesnevi being an imperishable monument of his genius, fully entitling him to the name of "Prince of Persian Mystics."

But what is mysticism? We may sum it up in one pregnant sentence from the Gospel of John (iv. 24), read in the order of the Greek text,—"Spirit the God;" not merely higher than matter, but that from which matter derives all its significance. God is Spirit, God is truth, Elohim, fulness of might, the unlimited, inexhaustible source of life and light; matter, the opposite pole, without form, without substance, without even a shadow; that which is, but has not; existence without attributes; a purely negative conception, characterized by emptiness and necessity, as Spirit is by fulness and liberty. Relation of God and matter, that of giver and receiver; of the two will ever again be a great political power. As regards literature, it was the opinion of Lord Beaconsfield, that the time is at hand when Oriental literature shall take the place occupied by that of Greece and Rome. Within the last few months Max Muller has borne very emphatic testimony to the importance of this literature; and it is a noticeable fact that this conviction is a growing one among those who have given attention to the subject. The question, however, of Oriental literature, is but part of a larger question. The distinctive characteristic of that literature is the religious element which pervades and dominates it; and it is just here, that, at the present time, the position of Persia is of special significance. Persia is a distinctively Mohammedan country. In a population of five or six millions there are only about forty thousand Armenians, thirty thousand Nestorians, fifteen to twenty thousand Jews, and eight thousand Fire-worshippers, or about a hundred thousand in all. But the Mohammedanism of Persia is a peculiar Mohammedanism. In the ordinary sense of the term, the Persians are, and always have been, bad Mohammedans. They are the Broad Churchmen of that religion, and Mohammedanism in its Arabian dress has always been too narrow for them. Hence has arisen a type of Mohammedanism which may be called the Persian mystical, dervish, or monkish, Mohammedanism, the leading representative of which is Jelalu-d-Din, author of Mesnevi, not so well known in the West as Saadi and Hafiz, but of immensely greater significance from the religious standpoint.

The work is an old one. Meviana Jelalu-d-Din ("Our Lord, the Majesty of the Religion of Islam"), son of an eminent mystic, was born at Balkh, Sept. 29, 1207 A.D. The time of his birth is significant; as it is the period richest in Persian history in its record of the life of distinguished poets and philosophers, thus preparing the way for the coming of him who was to bring together and unite all the separate streams of thought in one mighty river. About 1227 we find him settled at Conya, the ancient Iconium, where in 1249 he instituted the order of Mevlevi,—dancing or whirling dervishes; and here, in 1278, he died. A truly extraordinary man, of marvellous insight and susceptibility for spiritual truth, not only a profound thinker, but a man of affairs as well, a combination of philosopher and statesman. For our judgment of him we are not dependent upon the statements of credulous disciples; the six books of Mesnevi being an imperishable monument of his genius, fully entitling him to the name of "Prince of Persian Mystics."

But what is mysticism? We may sum it up in one pregnant sentence from the Gospel of John (iv. 24), read in the order of the Greek text,—"Spirit the God;" not merely higher than matter, but that from which matter derives all its significance. God is Spirit, God is truth, Elohim, fulness of might, the unlimited, inexhaustible source of life and light; matter, the opposite pole, without form, without substance, without even a shadow; that which is, but has not; existence without attributes; a purely negative conception, characterized by emptiness and necessity, as Spirit is by fulness and liberty. Relation of God and matter, that of giver and receiver; of the two will ever again be a great political power. As regards literature, it was the opinion of Lord Beaconsfield, that the time is at hand when Oriental literature shall take the place occupied by that of Greece and Rome. Within the last few months Max Muller has borne very emphatic testimony to the importance of this literature; and it is a noticeable fact that this conviction is a growing one among those who have given attention to the subject. The question, however, of Oriental literature, is but part of a larger question. The distinctive characteristic of that literature is the religious element which pervades and dominates it; and it is just here, that, at the present time, the position of Persia is of special significance. Persia is a distinctively Mohammedan country. In a population of five or six millions there are only about forty thousand Armenians, thirty thousand Nestorians, fifteen to twenty thousand Jews, and eight thousand Fire-worshippers, or about a hundred thousand in all. But the Mohammedanism of Persia is a peculiar Mohammedanism. In the ordinary sense of the term, the Persians are, and always have been, bad Mohammedans. They are the Broad Churchmen of that religion, and Mohammedanism in its Arabian dress has always been too narrow for them. Hence has arisen a type of Mohammedanism which may be called the Persian mystical, dervish, or monkish, Mohammedanism, the leading representative of which is Jelalu-d-Din, author of Mesnevi, not so well known in the West as Saadi and Hafiz, but of immensely great
ideas in this work, as it were, a very seed-bed, where there is oftentimes more of meaning in a single sentence than in learned tomes; comprehensiveness as well as richness, the truth of Mohammedanism supplemented by the truths of all other religions; a doctrine of incarnation, of atonement, of regeneration; practice of morality based entirely on love; claims to be the absolute religion, — the ocean, of which all forms of religion are but the streams: hence the reconciling character of the system. Not only does it furnish a centre for the multitudinous sects of Islam, but it presents a platform on which theistic Hindu and Mohammedan meet, and on which the followers of Darwin, Carlyle, and all non-Christian philosophies and sects, may unite. Another important characteristic is, that we find Jelalu addressing all classes of men, unfolding the highest themes to the lowest as well as to the highest intelligence. No man so low or so ignorant for whom he has not something fit and appropriate. To make a learned man a philosopher were nothing. The soldier, the muleteer, the lowest ranks of men, them would he teach the doctrines of divinity. An important practical feature of this system is, that it is not a mere philosophy: it is an institution, a great force and power. It teach the lesson of divine wisdom. A still more marvellous doctrine is, that it is not a mere philosophy: it is an institution, a great force and power. It teaches the lesson of divine wisdom. A still more marvellous feature is, that it is not a mere philosophy: it is an institution, a great force and power. It teaches the lesson of divine wisdom. A still more marvellous feature is, that it is not a mere philosophy: it is an institution, a great force and power. It teaches the lesson of divine wisdom.

The history of these monks of Islam is full of significance in its bearing on the history of to-day. Originating in Arabia, at the very beginning of Mohammedanism, the dervish movement did not become prominent till it was taken up in Persia. From that country it received a twofold impulse. The Hindu doctrine of successive incarnations, or, as it is termed in dervish phrase, of the constant presence of the living God upon earth in the person of the Imam, was made its foundation. Two ideas of tremendous power were thus brought together, — that of absolute subjection to the will of God, and that of a direct commission proceeding from the very mouth of God; and the result was seen in a series of revolutionary movements which, from the eighth to the thirteenth centuries, convulsed the Mohammedan world, finally culminating in that sect of the Assassins, who, for nearly two centuries, kept up a reign of terror, compared with whom, as Von Hammer says, “All earlier and later secret combinations and predatory states are crude attempts, or unsuccessful imitations.” Persia, however, did something more than provide dynamite for the ascetic tendencies of the age. It was at the very time when that movement seemed to have exhausted itself, that Jelalu-d-Din appeared, and stamped upon it a universal character, thus giving it a new lease of life.

From Persia the movement goes into all surrounding lands, and, in spite of opposition, everywhere it prospers. In Persia itself it takes possession of the throne, placing upon it a dynasty which yields the sceptre for nearly two hundred and twenty-five years, — from 1499 to 1722. Its history in the Ottoman Empire is still more marvellous. Distressed and hated because of its Persian origin, it wins its way despite all obstacles; and to-day its power is greater than ever. Not only are many of the principal men of the nation Mevlevis, not only has the order stood high in the favor of sovereigns; the Sultan is never regarded as fully invested with imperial power till girded with the sword of Osman by the successor of Jelalu-d-Din. There remains but one position to be attained, — the caliphate itself; and that, at the present time, seems to be within its grasp. The whole trend of the Mohammedan world, may, we may say, of the Oriental world, is in the direction of this pantheistic dervish system. The pressure of the European powers, of Christianity, and the reaction against the secularization of the official heads of Mohammedanism, all contribute greatly to strengthen dervish Mohammedanism. New orders have sprung up: old orders have been strengthened. The present Sultan might almost be called a dervish, surrounded by dervish counselors, having, as his aim, to propagate dervish principles. The doctrine of the Mahdi, or guide, is a dervish doctrine. The impending change in the seat of the caliphate cannot fail to help the movement; and if, as seems not unlikely, Bagdad is to be the new centre, that is the great dervish world, its “City of Saints.” Already there have been, within the present century, three marked manifestations of this religious system, — Muridism or Shamylism in the Caucasus, the Brahmo Somaj in India, and Babism in Persia. The first has been put down, but only after a war of thirty-five years, which taxed the resources of the Russian Empire. The other two have but begun to manifest themselves; and it is a significant fact, that they are not merely defensive, but offensive, movements. Chunder Sen has lately given out that he is about to visit Europe as the bearer of a divine command to it to abandon its sectarianism, and receive the universal religion. If we are inclined to laugh at the idea, we should do well to remember that many of the leading minds in Europe and America are more in sympathy with this Oriental Pantheism than with Christianity; that Emerson was but a Persian Sufi in a Yankee dress; and that at the very time these lines are being penned (May, 1883), five thousand American citizens, members of the order of Bektashi dervishes, are commemorating with Oriental rites the death of Abd-el-Kader. We should do well also to remember, that, whatever decay of faith there may be in Europe and America, there is none in Asia. There it is but latent, and is already beginning to manifest itself with the same power as in the days of old. Mohammedanism is not passing away in any other sense than that it is being perfected in a universal religion, which sustains the same relation to Mohammedanism that Christianity does to Judaism; and this bastard Christianity, this false logos, as we may call it in view of the fact that it holds the cardinal truths of Christianity while at the same time it makes them void by its tradi-tion, is a far more dangerous dervish Mohammedanism pure and simple ever was or could be. Now, if ever, Christianity is called upon to justify its claims to be the universal religion.

Persia is an old mission-field. In the New Testament (Acts ii. 9; 1 Pet. v. 13) there are indications, to be sure, of its early mission activity; but the gospel message was not unknown. We may divide the work into four periods, — early Christian mis-
missions down to the fifth century, from the fifth century onward, Nestorian missions, Roman-Catholic missions, commencing with the thirteenth, and evangilizing among the Mohammedans with the nineteenth century. For the first two, see Nestorians.

John de Monte Corvino, the first Roman missionary, began his work at Tabreez, near the end of the thirteenth century; and since that time Rome has made a number of efforts to gain a permanent influence over the Mohammedans. In the seventeenth century, in Chardin's time, there occupied a number of important centres. Neither the Nestorian nor the Roman mission has exercised any permanent influence upon the nation. The Nestorians to-day are a small body in one corner of the country, speaking a different language from that of the surrounding peoples; and the Romanians are mainly those who have been gained during the present century.

About the middle of the last century the Moravians made an attempt to establish a mission in Persia, which was unsuccessful. Martyr's stay, 1811-12 (see Martyrs), was brief, but memorable for the boldness with which he grappled with the Mohammedan problem. For three years and a half (1829-33) Groves labored at Bagdad; Basel missionaries (1833-37), at Tabreez; and James L. Merrick (1834-45), at various points in Persia, principally at Tabreez. These different attempts had to do largely with work for Mohammedans. Dr. Perkieres commenced the Nestorian mission in 1834 (Nestorians, Grant, Perkins); in 1870 it became the mission to Persia, or, more properly, Northern Persia. In 1872 Teheran was occupied by James Bassett; Tabreez, by P. Z. Easton, in 1873; and Hamadan, by James Hawkes, in 1881. In 1889 Isphahan was occupied by Robert Bruce of the English Church Missionary Society; and in 1888 Bagdad, by missionaries of the same body. Connected with the five stations above referred to (Bagdad not included) there are 17 male missionaries (14 connected with the Presbyterian Board, 2 with the English Church Missionary Society, and 1 independent), and, inclusive of wives of missionaries, 20 female missionaries, between 80 and 90 native helpers, about 1,850 native communicants, one college, several high schools, and a large number of village schools. Summing up the work of the evangelical missionaries, we may say, that, thus far, much has been done for the Nestorians, something for the Armenians, and something also for the Mohammedans, but that, taking a broad view of the field, we have made but a commencement; and, while we have no reason to doubt the final victory, we have no reason to expect an easy triumph.


See literature under Cyrus, Derush, Grant, Magi, Manicheism, Martyrs, Missions, Mohammed, Nestorians, Parseeism, and Perkins.

PERSONS, Robert (or Parsons), Jesuit emissary and agitator; b. at Nether Stowey, Somersetshire, June 24, 1548; d. at Rome, April 16, 1610. He was graduated M. A. at Oxford, 1572; but, having been converted to Romanism, he quitted England, 1574, and entered the Society of Jesus at Rome, July 4, 1575. Five years later he and Campian (see art.) were sent to England. They were the first Jesuits to visit that country. The arrest of Campian caused his return to Rome, 1588; whence, however, he continued to manage the English mission, of which he became prefect in 1592. In 1595 he was the first rector of the English seminary in Rome, and in 1588 was sent to Spain to look after Jesuit interests in England, in case the Armada should make its expected successful attack upon that country. He founded schools for the training of English priests at Valladolid (1589), Lucar (1591), Sevilla and Lisbon (1592), and St. Omer (1593), besides lending his efficient aid to the colleges of the secular clergy at Douay. He was an indefatigable, wily, and learned man. Of his numerous writings may be mentioned, A brief discoverie containing certaine reasons why catholickes refuse to goe to Church, Doway, 1580; A Christian directorie guiding men to their salvation, Lond., 1583-91, 2 parts, reprinted, modernized, and Protestantized by Dean Stanhope, 1700, 8th ed., 1782; A conference about the next succession to the crowne of Ingland, 1584 (the printer of it was hanged for sedition: it supported the claim of the Infanta); Treasie of the three conversions of England from paganisme to Christian religion, 1603-04, 3 parts (an answer to Fox's Acts and Monuments). For his biography, see E. GEE: The Jesuit's memorial for the intended reformation of England under their first Popish prince, London, 1680; Hallam: Lit. hist. Eng.; Green: Hist. Eng. People.

PERU, a republic of South America, established in 1821; numbered 2,699,945 inhabitants in 1876, besides some tribes of wild Indians, estimated at 350,000 souls. Most of the inhabitants are of Indian descent, and the overwhelming majority of the people belong to the Roman-Catholic Church. In 1874 there were 5,087 Protestants, 498 Jews, and 27,073 persons belonging to other denominations; but, according to the constitution of Aug. 31, 1867, only Roman Catholics have the right of public worship. The ecclesiastical division of the country is: History of the Archdiocese of Lima, founded in 1539, and the bishoprics of Arequipa (1600), Chachapoyas (1805), Cuzco (1535), Guamanga (1809), Huancu (1863), Puno (1862), and Trujillo (1757). In 1880 there were only 634 parishes, but 1,000 secular priests, and 7,600 regular clergy. Under the Papal bull the Church of Peru was exceedingly rich; and in spite of repeated confiscations of estates, and seizures of revenues which have come over her
since the establishment of the republic, she is still very wealthy. But her bishops are appointed by the secular government, and treated as government officers. See D'URSEL: L'Amérique du sud, Paris, 1857.

HAUCK.

PESS., See Bible Versions, p. 298.

PESSONIER, See Optimi M., Schopenhauer.

PESTALOZZI, Johann Heinrich, b. at Zürich, Jan. 12, 1746; d. at Yverdon, Feb. 17, 1827. He studied theology, but soon felt that the ministry would not give him the opportunities he wanted. He then tried jurisprudence, but felt still more disappointed. Finally, in 1769, he bought at Neuhof a tract of waste land, and became a farmer, not from any business speculation, but from sheer philanthropy, hoping to do something to better the conditions of the human race by making unproductive soil productive. But his capital proved insufficient; and in 1775 he turned his farm into a kind of poor-school, in which the children maintained themselves by manual labor between the hours of instruction. In one respect, so far as education was concerned, the experiment turned out a great success. But, as the school could not financially support itself, Pestalozzi was compelled to discontinue it; and from 1780 to 1798 he devoted himself to literature. Some of his books — Lienhard und Gertrud (1781) and Nachforschungen über den Gang der Natur in der Entwickelung des Menschen (1798) — attracted much attention, and made a great name for him; and in 1788 he once more found an opportunity of employing his great educational powers. He obtained the use of an old, dilapidated nunnery at Stanz, opened an orphan-asylnum, and gathered together eighty children, who, after the lapse of a few months, looked, physically, intellectually, and morally, as if they had gone through a transformation-mill. But the following year the French took the nunnery for a hospital, and Pestalozzi's work was destroyed. He had determined, however, to become a schoolmaster, and in 1799 he accepted such a position at Burgdorf. The novelty of his methods, and the enthusiasm and other causes, brought on hard times; and in 1825 it was necessary to close the school on account of debt. The last years of Pestalozzi's life were full of hardships and bitter strife. He died at Yverdon, Jan. 5, 1827. The reader is referred to the works of Pestalozziana, the numerous treatises and essays which bear his name, and to the books of his friends. In English there are biographies by BIBER (London, 1861) and KRÜER (Cincinnati, 1870).

PETAVIUS, Dionysius (Denys Petau), b. at Orléans, Aug. 21, 1683; d. in Paris, Dec. 11, 1632; one of the most celebrated Roman-Catholic theologians of the post-Tridentine age, — the Aquila Jesuitorum. He studied philosophy at Orleans and Paris, in which latter place he held a position in order to enter the order of the Jesuits. He made his novitiate at Nancy, studied theology at Pont-à-Mousson, and was in 1621 appointed professor of theologica positiva in the university of Paris; which position he held for twenty-two years. In 1644 he retired into private life, and devoted himself exclusively to literature. His works, numbering forty-nine (of which ten are in folio), comprise philology, chronology, and theology. Among his philological works are editions of Senecius (1611, with translation; 2d ed., 1631; 3d ed., 1633, with valuable notes), Thomistius (1619), Justinian (1614), Viarenus (1616), and Epiphanius (Opera omnia, 1622, with translation and notes). Of his chronological works, the Opus de doctrina temporum (Paris, 1627, 2 vols. fol.; new edition by Hardouin, Antwerp, 1703, Verona, 1734–36, Venice, 1767) contains a new system of chronology, which was further developed in his Uranologia (1830), defended against the attacks of La Peyre in La pierre de touche chronologique (1636), and practically applied in his Tabulae chronologicae (1628) and Itinera rum temporum in X111 libris (Paris, 1633–34), an outline of the world's history, which became very famous, and continued down to our time (last edition, Venice, 1849); not to speak of the eight thousand mistakes he corrected in Barouius' Annates. Of his theological works, some are polemical, of a rather harsh description, against Salmasius, Maturin Simon, Grotius, etc.; but his principal work is his De theologica dogmatibus, Paris, 1644–50, 5 vols. fol., but unfinished. It is a "history of doctrines," planned under the influence of that aversion to scholasticism which was the universal result of the Reformations, and executed with enormous learning and great literary skill. It defends the doctrine of development. At first is
made no great impression; but, when the Reformed theologians began to praise the book, it at once flew into unparalleled celebrity, and edition followed edition, the last by J. B. Thomas, Barle Duc, 1804 sqq., 8 vols. See his biography by Franz Stanonik, Grz., 1876. Wagnermann.

PETER, The Apostle.—I. His Life. I. From his Call to Christ's Ascension. — His original name was Simon, or Symeon. His father’s name was John (John i. 42), or Jonah (Matt. xxi. 17). He was born in Bethsaida, but after his marriage lived at Capernaum, and, with his younger brother Andrew, carried on the trade of fisherman. He was an adherent of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always henceforth inseparable companion and apostle. Once described him as Cephas, and the apostle, as is proved by the fact he was not primate, nor was it possible for him to transmit this position to any other, any more than he could transmit his apostleship, or his eyewitness of Jesus, one of the necessary conditions of apostleship. But it cannot be supposed that no earthly hopes mingled with Peter’s faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, nor that he at once understood how the sufferings of Jesus could lead to the glory that should follow. Indeed, when he first heard of sufferings, he exclaimed, "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall never be unto thee." For which speech he was very sharply rebuked (Matt. xvi. 22, 23). As the hour came on, the play of lights and shadows upon his moral life was more rapid. He declares how joyfully he had left all, and followed Jesus (Matt. xix. 27). But the question "What, then, shall we have?" showed that the thought of reward was a little too prominent. He vehemently refused to have his feet washed by Jesus, and, on receiving a warning, as vehemently desired it, but in the affair showed, along with humility and devotion, not a little wilfulness, and a certain dulness of apprehension respecting the meaning of Jesus’ deed. When the supper was ended, Jesus said, "All ye shall be offended in me this night." To which Peter replied characteristically, "If all shall be offended in thee, I will never be offended." Our Lord knew better (Matt. xxvi. 31-35). Peter was honest in his intention, but he lacked strength of purpose. He gave one blow in his Lord’s behalf, saw how vain was any attempt at resistance, and retired, like the rest, into his heart, and only from him was brought out the three answers fullof humility and love, the tender commands, "Feed my sheep," "Tend my lambs," proved that his restitution was complete. To the erring Peter, not repentant, but repentant without confession, was given the leadership of the entire church and the honor of martyrdom.

2. From the Ascension of Christ to his Own Death. — The Gospels constitute our only historical source for the life of Peter up to the ascension of
Jesus. After this event we have the Acts of the Apostles, a few notices in the Pauline Epistles and in the Apostolic Fathers. In the Acts, Paul receives greatest attention; but in their earlier portion Peter is the principal figure. Luke derived his account from Mark (Col. iv. 10, 14; cf. Acts xii. 12), Philip the evangelist (Acts xxii. 6), and other members of the primitive church, and from certain documents; e.g., in the speeches of Peter. The result is a reliable and full history.

From it we learn that Peter, undisturbed by the threatenings and persecutions of the Sanhedrins, prosecuted with great energy his apostolic calling; that he went down into Samaria (Acts viii. 14 sqq.), and, after Paul’s conversion, to the Syro-Phoenician coast, and visited Lydda, Joppa, and Cesarea (ix. 32–x. 48). On his return to Jerusalem, he was arrested by Herod Agrippa, released miraculously, and left the city (xii. 1–17), nor again appears in the history until the Council of Jerusalem, in which he held not a prominent part (xv.). In the latter part of his life he is spoken of by Paul as making great missionary journeys, accompanied by his wife (1 Cor. ix. 5; Gal. ii. 11). His position among the primitive disciples is in thorough accord with the declaration of Jesus (Matt. xxvii. 53; Mark xvi. 18). He was their leader. On his advice an apostle is chosen (Acts i. 22); by his preaching the first great increase in the church was occasioned (ii. 14), by him the disciples were defended against the Jewish hierarchy (iv. 8, 19, v. 29), the church cleansed of unworthy members (v. 3 sqq.), the union of the outside communities with it guarded (viii. 14, ix. 32), and the first heathens received into the church (x.). But Peter’s position was so far from giving him exclusive jurisdiction, that the ordination — the first ecclesiastical officers, the seven deacons — was shared by all the apostles (vi. 6); the Samaritan tour of inspection was made with John, on terms of entire equality, and on the commission of the apostolate (vii. 14); his conduct in Cesarea was sharply criticised by the strict party, and elaborately defended (x. 1–18); and finally, in the Council of Jerusalem, the presiding officer was not James, but Peter (vii. 15), because he shows, that, while at first Peter’s authority was paramount (Gal. i. 18), later he was one of the three pillar-apostles, along with James and John, and next to James (Gal. ii. 9).

Peter’s Theology. — The speeches of Peter present the gospel in its original doctrinal statement. They assume, as we should expect, an apologetic and practical form. Their central theme is the death of Jesus. But this is shown not to be a hindrance to the acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah, because it was not the result of any fault of his: rather, it was an iniquitous deed of the Jews, long ago foretold (iii. 13 sqq., iv. 10, v. 30, x. 30). Jesus had proved himself by deed and sign and miracle to be holy and righteous, to be anointed with the Holy Spirit, to be, in short, the very Messiah whom the prophets had foretold (ii. 22, iii. 14, xi. 33, x. 35). He was the faith of prophecy and of God’s decree (ii. 23, iii. 18, iv. 25), and had, as its designed result, that first blessing of the Messianic kingdom, — the forgiveness of sins. It was a further proof of Jesus’ Messiahship, that God raised him from the dead on the third day (ii. 32, iii. 15, iv. 10, x. 40), showed him unto chosen witnesses (x. 41), and raised him to his own right hand (iii. 30 sqq.). By this resurrection God set Jesus forth as the Messianic King (ii. 36, v. 31), made him the corner-stone of the kingdom (iv. 11), and Lord over all (x. 36, cf. ii. 36). This kingdom is that long ago foretold (ii. 13, 24), and is attended by the graces of forgiveness (ii. 28, iii. 18, 19, v. 31, x. 43), peace (x. 36), the gift of the Holy Spirit (ii. 38, xi. 17), deliverance from ungodly men (iv. 40), bodily healing (iii. 16), salvation (iv. 12), and the blessing of God (iii. 26). In order to share in these blessings it was necessary sincerely to repent, and honestly to believe in Jesus as the Christ (ii. 38, iii. 19, v. 32, vii. 21, 22). In expression of this repentance and belief, and as pledge of the blessings promised, baptism into the name of Jesus followed. Not yet, however, was the Messianic kingdom fully set up. This would not be true until all Israel had turned unto the Lord, according to the prophetic announcement. But that this was near was evident; for Joel connects it with the outpouring of the Spirit, which had taken place at Pentecost. Then would God send Jesus to be the judge of quick and dead, and believers would be finally free from persecution (ii. 20, x. 42).

Peter’s Relation to the Gentiles. — Peter believed that the Gentiles would ultimately receive the gospel (iii. 29 sqq.), but he and the other apostles believed that the conversion of the Jews as a nation would come first. Hence he did not feel himself called to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, and it was only after special preparation and direction that he went. But what he then witnessed in the house of Cornelius convinced him that God put Gentiles on the same footing with Jews in the matter of salvation (x. 34, 44–45). Yet, as far as he personally was concerned, he felt no call to become an apostle to the uncircumcision. He shared, however, in the interest the mother-church took in the spread of Christianity among the Gentiles, very cordially received Paul, and defended the latter’s position, that the yoke of the law must not be laid upon the necks of the Gentile converts (xv. 10). Peter showed the sincerity of his convictions, and also his independence by mingling freely for a time with such converts at Antioch. But when certain came down there “from James,” he gave up his association with the Gentiles at table. For this he was publicly rebuked by Paul (Gal. ii. 11 sqq.), who told him plainly that his objectionable conduct was not due to any change in his opinions, but to dissimulation. At heart Peter and Paul were exactly agreed, and all attempts to make out conflict between them are futile. For so far was Paul’s bold speech from the heathen walls of Jerusalem (Acts xx. 16 sqq.) to the Jews that, Paul subsequently alludes to Peter in the friendliest way (1 Cor. ix. 5, xv. 5).

Peter’s Death at Rome. — Of the last days of Peter, nothing is known from the New Testament. The few scattered allusions in the Fathers and in the early church with the title of Peter in connection, however, make it in the highest degree probable that Peter died in Rome as a martyr, under Nero. The proof of this statement may be thus presented. John xx. 18 prophesied the martyrdom of Peter. Clement of Rome, in his
first letter to the Corinthians (e. v.), says, "Let us set before our eyes the good apostles, Peter, Iohn, and Thaddeus, and Andrew, who through unjust envy endured not one or two, but numerous, labors, and, after he had at length suffered martyrdom, went to the place of glory appointed to him." Inasmuch as tradition invariably makes Rome the place of Peter's martyrdom, and Clement speaks of Paul's martyrdom immediately after the allusion, it is at least most probable that he means Rome was the scene of Peter's death. Papia would seem also to be a witness to the Roman residence of Peter. He relates, on the testimony of a presbyter, that the Gospel of Mark, whom he calls "the interpreter of Peter," was composed in Rome. More unmis-
takable is the testimony to this residence of the apocryphal Acts of Peter and Paul, (second century?) of Dionysius of Corinth (Euseb., Ch. Hist., II. 25), of Irenæus (Adv. Haer., III. 1), of Ter-
bullian (De Jure, 36; cf. Adv. Marc., IV. 5), of Clement of Alexandria (Euseb., Ch. Hist., IV. 14), and of the Roman presbyter Caius (Euseb., Ch. Hist., II. 25), who speaks of Peter's grave in the Vatican, and Paul's on the Via Ostia. To break the force of this concurrent testimony, recourse is had to the theory that the tradition is merely an exten-
sion in fact or likelihood. Of the remaining patristic notices, the only one which is re-
liable is, to this residence of the Roman bishopric of Peter, there is no foundation. The New Testament is surely against it. Peter does the Epistle presuppose any more acquaint-
ance with the Old Testament than would have been expected among Gentile converts.

II. His Epistles. 1. First Peter. — It is ad-
dressed to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia (including Pam-
phylia, Pisidia, and a part of Lycaonia), Cappadocia, Asia (including Caria, Lydia, Mysia, and perhaps Phrygia), and Bithynia. These "elect" were heathen Christians, for the most part, belong-
ing to the mixed congregations which resulted from Paul's missionary efforts. Any other inter-
pretation leads to forced exegesis; since these readers had formerly lived in the lusts of the flesh in their ignorance (i. 14), and had been brought through Christ to faith in God (i. 21), in times past were no people, but now as Chris-
tians were the people of God (ii. 10). These expressions could not be applied to Jews, any more than the declaration that they had formerly wrought the desires of the Gentiles (iv. 3). The use of the word "dispersion" (i. 1) is to be ex-
plained by Paul's idea of the essential unity of all Gentile Christians with the believing Jews as the true Israel. Nor does the expression, "Ye have become daughters of Sarah" (iii. 6) mili-
tate against the Gentile origin of the addressed; because, if they had been Jews, they would have been, not have become, daughters of Sarah. Nor does the Epistle presuppose any more acquaintance with the Old Testament than would have been expected among Gentile converts.

The Epistle refers to the sufferings of these Christians, and the false charges brought against them, and warns them against giving any just offence (iv. 4, 12, 14, 15). It counsels them how
to act in their respective relations (ii.–v.), and how to avoid that impending danger of purchasing the friendship of the world by compliance with its passions (ii. 1-2). The allusion of Peter to the condition of the Christians do not point to any persecution solely on the ground that they bore the name of Christ, since Peter expresses the hope that their good manner of life will silence their traducers (iii. 13, 10), but rather on the ground of the vague reports which were circulated among and believed by the heathen concerning the Christians’ hatred of the human race and shameful secret practices. It was the object of the Epistle to cheer these Christians in their trying circumstances, and to prevent their return to heathenism by showing that they stood in the true grace of God (v. 12). Peter exhorts them to bear patiently their ills, conscious of their rectitude and possession of the truth. He points them to the near future when their sufferings shall cease, and shows them how those very sufferings were divinely appointed for their salvation. There is no hint that his readers have heard of them. His object is not to concern them with their ills. This is proved by an analysis of the Epistle, which is not, however, systematically arranged. After alluding, by way of preface (i. 1–12), to the glorious end of their faith, even the salvation of their souls, as a source of comfort under their sufferings, Peter passes on to give general exhortations to a holy walk (i. 13–21), to brotherly love (i. 22–25), and the upbuilding of a spiritual house in the Lord (ii. 1–10). He then exhorts them respecting those special dangers incident to the pilgrim condition of the Christian (ii. 11, 12), further respecting their several relations, as subjects, husbands, wives (i. 3–iii. 7), telling them not to render evil for evil (iii. 8–12), not to desist the strokes they may receive (iii. 13–17), to imitate Christ in their sufferings (iii. 18–22), not turning back to the heathen vices and sins, but maintaining at all hazards their Christian character (iv. 1–10). Peter then exhorts the elder to a faithful performance of their duties (v. 1–4), the younger to be subject unto the elder, and all to be on the watch (v. 5–9). He closes with a benediction and salutations (v. 10–14).

The Epistle, in some respects, occupies a unique position in the New Testament. Although it bears evidence of the author’s acquaintance with the Epistles of James, Romans (especially with xii. and xiii.), and Ephesians, the treatment of the existing material is by no means slavish. It has originality in point of style. It is not so highly dialectic as Romans, nor so orderly as Ephesians, not, like James, full of gnomic sentences: it is rather loose and free, yet not confused. The style is fresh: thought follows thought with a general connection between them. Grammatical peculiarities are as such insertions between article and noun, the use of the participle with the imperative mood, and its the participial. In its trinitarian position, it shows the influence of Paul (cf. Rom. vi. 7, 1 Pet. iv. 1, 2; Rom. vi. 18, 1 Pet. ii. 24; Rom. xiii. 34, 1 Pet. iii. 22), yet in general presents the same theology which characterizes the speeches of Peter. So in the Epistle we have Peter the sensitive teacher of the New Testament revelation (which is emphasized, as it is not by Paul), and very clearly and strikingly the risen Christ as the source of present spiritual blessings and eternal salvation. Faith is set forth as a trust upon God, which grounds itself upon Jesus as the glorified Messiah, instead of, as with Paul, the reception of the forgiveness which has been wrought for us by the death of Jesus.

The time of composition of First Peter must have been the latter part of Nero’s reign; and, since the writer uses the Epistles of Paul and James, it may be more definitely stated as 65–66. Additional evidence for this date is, that Peter would scarcely address Paul’s congregations before the latter’s demise, which took place 64. The place of composition is given as “Babylon” (v. 13). There is good reason for taking this as the symbolic name for Rome, as at a somewhat later date (69 or 70) it is used in Revelation. The historic Babylon, when Peter wrote, was almost entirely a heap of ruins. There was, to be sure, a colony of Jews there; but there is no tradition in the New Testament of the first five centuries regarding a Christian community there. Again: figurative expressions occur in the Epistle; such as “strangers,” “dispersion,” the “elect,” “my son;” and this lessens the strangeness of a symbolic name for Rome. Moreover, if there had been any difficulty in understanding the name “Babylon,” it would have been removed by Silvanus, who bore the Epistle (v. 12). In regard to the genuineness of the Epistle there is no question. It is quoted in the Second Epistle, by Hermas, Iapias (Euseb., Ch. Hist., III. 30), Polycarp (Iapias., IV. 14), Basilides (Clem. Alex., Strom. IV. 12), Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clemens Alex., Origen; reckoned by Eusebius among the iiomologoumena, translated in the Peshito (second century). Its genuineness was first questioned by Chidius (Uranischen d. Chr., 1808), but upon insufficient grounds. There was call for such an Epistle. It in every respect is worthy of, and agrees with, the character of Peter; and that he could write Greek is every way probable. The only ground for rejecting it which the Baur school can give is the baseless assumption of an antagonism between Peter and Paul.

2. Second Peter.—The objections to its genuineness are solid. Its occasion is the entrance of false teachers of two classes,—the libertines, practical and theoretical, and the mockers of Christ’s second coming. After an introduction, which reminds the readers of their possession in Christ, and exhorts them to fidelity (i. 1–10), the Epistle divides itself into three parts: 1st, The certainty of the second coming (i. 11–21); 2d, The character of libertinism and its the character of libertinism and its future punishment, with biblical illustrations (ii. 22); 3d, The coming destruction of the world by fire asserted against the mockers, the delay explained by God’s long-suffering, with exhortations to constancy (iii. 1–13). The Epistle ends with a reference to Paul’s Epistles, with warning, exhortation, and praise to God (iii. 14–18).

The similarity between Second Peter (in chap.
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ii. and also, in part, in i. and iii.) and Jude is most striking; and that the latter was the basis is apparently proven by the greater simplicity, naturalness, and spontaneity of those expressions in Jude which are all Second Peter's; and, if Jude borrowed from Second Peter, it is hard to see why he copied the description of libertinism, and not also the refutation of the mockers, in chap. iii. How comes it, also, that the marked linguistic peculiarities in Second Peter are limited to that portion to which Jude presents a parallel? Comparing Second and First Peter, the Second is in point of style less Hebraic, less varied, more periodic, contains less allusion to the Old Testament and to the sayings of Christ, brings out prominently new ideas concerning "knowledge" (ἐγνώμονα), "godliness" (τειχισμόν), and the destruction of the world, and says nothing about the "hope" which characterizes the First Epistle. It describes Christ as the Saviour (σωτήρ), which the First never does, but does not mention his death and resurrection.

These facts tell strongly against the genuineness of the Epistle, and cannot be removed by any theory of a ten-years' interval between the Epistles, or of their different audiences,—the First, Jewish; the Second, Gentile Christians. Nor, in support of the genuineness, is there early tradition. First in the third century, by Firmilian of Caesarea (d. 268), was it unmistakably quoted. According to Origen, only the First was recognized as canonical; and Eusebius puts the Second among the Antilegomena. Jerome, however, defended it, and principally effected its recognition. In the Reformation era it was doubted by Erasmus and Calvin, and is now pretty generally rejected. Yet the moral earnestness of the Epistle; the difficulty of assigning it to a place in the post-Petrine period, or to any other author; the declaration that the writer was Symeon Peter (i. 1), and had been with Jesus in the holy mount (i. 18); and the commendation of Paul's Epistles (iii. 15, 16)—all point to its Petrine origin. Quite recently, Dr. E. A. Abbott (in the Expositor, 2d series, vol. iii.), followed by Farrar (Early Days of Christianity, vol. i. pp. 190 sqq.), has maintained that the author of Second Peter must have read Josephus. For a satisfactory criticism of such a theory, see Professor B. B. Warfield: Dr. Edwin A. Abbott on the Genuineness of Second Peter, in the Southern Presbyterian Review, April, 1883. The Epistle was declared canonical by the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 366; and, as the writers who we know had previously used it are spread over a wide territory, it may well be that the council had more evidence of its genuineness than we now possess. And the fact that it ventured to give canonical authority to an Epistle previously doubted may be cited in proof that such was the case.

LIT.—Besides the Bible Dictionaries of Winer, Schenkel, Reim, [Kitto and Smith], the New Testament Introductory, of Harnack (1894), Cremer (1830), Hug (1847), De Wette (3d ed., 1860), Reuss (4th ed., 1864), Bleek-Mangold (1873), and the New Testament Biblical Theologies of Schmid (1853), Van Ostapke (1867), Immer (1877), Weiss (1880), see the Commentaries of this period by Wetzel (3d ed., 1865), Weisgarber, in Olshausen (1850), Huth, in Meyer (4th ed., 1877, [Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1881]), Fronmüller, in Lange (Eng. trans. by Montbret, New York, 1867), Hohnhausen (1873-75); on Second Peter, Diehl (1861), Th. Schott (1802); on First Peter, C. A. Witz (1861); [in English, the Cambridge Bible for Schools. The best English Commentaries upon First Peter separately are by Leighton (very famous, first published York and London, 1893-94, 2 vols., repeatedly since: it has been styled "a truly heavenly work—a favorite with all spiritual men") and Brown (Edinburgh, 1869, 3 vols.); upon Second Peter separately, T. Adams (London, 1833, new ed., 1862), T. Smith (London, 1881); upon both together, Lillie (New York, 1869). For the question whether Peter ever was in Rome, and on his asserted episcopate, see especially Lipsius: Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe (Brunswick, 1869), Quellen der römisch. Petrusage (1872); Johann Schmid: Peters in Rom, Luzern, 1879 (literature very fully given). [See also F. Leon: De l'authenticité de la seconde épître de Saint Pierre, Lausanne, 1877; Martin: Les Saints Pierre et Paul dans l'église syro-myzriennne, Atta, 1878; Howson: Hora Petrina, London, 1883.]

F. SIEFFERT.

PETER, Festivals of St.—I. D epositio Petri in catacombus et Pauli in via Ostiensi. The Catalogus Liberianus (354) first mentions the entombment of the bones of Peter and Paul as having taken place in the year of the consuls Tuscius and Iulius (258), and gives the date as III. Cal. Julii.; that is, June 29. A festival in commemoration of that day is first mentioned in the Latin Church by Prudentius in the fourth century; by Augustine (Serm., 293-290), Maximus of Turin (Serm., 66-69), and Leo the Great (Serm., 82-84) in the fifth; after the sixth, it is mentioned in all martyr chronicles. In the Greek Church neither the Apostolical Constitutions, nor the two Cappadocian Gregories, nor Chrysostom, know anything of it. It is first mentioned by Theodorus Lector in his church history (i. 10) having been celebrated in Constantinople towards the close of the reign of Anastasius I. (518): after the seventh century it is mentioned in all calendars, also those of Copts, Ethiopians, and Armenians. In 1743 Benedict XIV. decreed a celebration of eight days for the city of Rome; and in 1867, the eighteenth centenary, it was renewed with great magnificence by Pius IX. II. Festum cathedrae Petri Antiochenae. The Calendarium Liberianum mentions that a festival was celebrated on Feb. 22 in commemoration of the accession of the apostle Peter to the episcopal chair. But it uses the words VIII. Kal. Mart. Natale Petri de Calchrea, and thus leaves the locality of the chair in uncertainty. The same is the case with the Calendarium of Polumius Silvius (448). In the Ambrosian Liturgy and in the Sacramentarium of Gelasius I. the festival is omitted altogether; but it is found again in the Sacramentarium of Gregory, and after his time always. III. Festum cathedrae Petri Roman. Jan. 18, was generally confounded with the preceding, up to the eighth century, but became independently established, and formally fixed during the Carolingian age, to which time, also, belongs the final recognition of the double episcopacy of St. Peter.
Peter of Alcantara. 1818

Peter Martyr Vermigli.

...tioned until the ninth century in Wandelbert's Martyrologium and Pseudo-Beda's Hymil de vini-culato. It is celebrated by the Church of Rome on Aug. 1; by the Greek Church, on Jan. 16; and by the Armenian Church, on Feb. 22. The Armenian Church has also a festival of "the finger of the Apostle Peter;" but nobody knows anything of the origin or signification of this festival.

Peter of Alcantara, b. in 1499; d. Oct. 18, 1562. He entered the Franciscan order in 1515; became guardian of a newly erected monastery at Badasar in 1519; was appointed superior-general of the province of Estremadura in 1538; and induced the chapter of his order to sanction his reforms at a meeting in Placentia, 1540. He also aided Ste. Theresa in her reforms of the Carmelites. Not content, however, with the role of a reformer, he founded, with the consent of John III., a new congregation, the severity of whose rules far surpassed that of the Franciscans. He was canonized by Clement IX. in 1669. See Acta Sanctorum, Oct. VIII. Two works are ascribed to him, of which the De oratione et meditatione is genuine, while the De animi pace hardly belongs to him.

Peter of Alexandria became bishop of that city in 300, and was decapitated, on the order of Maximinus, without any preceding trial, in 311. In his time fell the schism of Meletius and the persecution of Diocletian: according to legend, he was himself the last victim of that persecution in Alexandria. He left a De oratione et meditatione, a treatise on the subject of the tapsi, the degree of their crime, and of the penance demanded for reconciliation. See Galland: Bibli., iv. pp. 108 and 112; and Routh: Reliquiae sacrae, iv. p. 21. Gass.

Peter of Blois (Petrus Blesensis), d. about 1200. He studied canon law at Bologna, and theology in Paris, and became chancellor to the archbishop of Canterbury, in whose service he made several voyages to Rome. Of his works — treatises on theology, philosophy, canon law, medicine, and mathematics, more or less influenced by John of Salisbury — the most interesting are his hundred and eighty-three letters to Henry II., various popes, and higher ecclesiastics. They are full of characteristic traits of political and ecclesiastical life in his time, and give also some positive information of importance. The best edition of his works is that by Pierre de Gossainville, Paris, 1607.

Peter of Bruys and the Petrobrusians. Peter of Bruys is known to us only through the book of Peter the Venerable (Adversus Petrobrusianos hereticos), and from a passage in Abelard's Introductio ad theologiam. What later writers tell of him is only guess-work. He was a pupil of Abelard, and his general aim may be described as a restoration of Christianity to its original purity and simplicity. But his criticism was as ill judged as his reforms were violent. He accepted the Gospels; but he ascribed only a derivative authority to the Epistles, and rejected all the canons of the Church. He, therefore, held that the Church buildings were an abomination to him; for the church is the community of the faithful, and the place where they gather, whether a stable or a palace, is of no consequence. Church officials, bishops, and priests, he represented as mere frauds; and generally he demanded the abrogation of all external forms and ceremonies. In Southern France, where the Cathari were numerous, he found many adherents; and in the dioceses of Arles, Embrun, Die, and Gap, he caused much disturbance. Churches were destroyed, images and crucifixes burned, priests and monks maltreated, etc. At last the bishops were able, by the aid of the secular power, to put down the movement, and expel the leaders. But soon after, Peter of Bruys appeared in the dioceses of Narbonne and Toulouse, where he preached for nearly twenty years, and with still greater success. In 1126 he was seized, however, and burnt at St. Gilles; but his party, the Petrobrusians, did not immediately disappear. Peter Venerabilis visited them, preached to them, and wrote the above-mentioned book against them, but without any result. They joined Henry of Lausanne, and finally disappeared among the Henricians.

Peter of Cellensis, abbot of Moutier-la-Celle, near Troyes, in 1150; abbot of St. Remi, near Rheims, in 1162; bishop of Chartres in 1181; d. in 1183. Of his works, edited by Janvier, Paris, 1671, and consisting of mystical expositions of scriptural passages, treatises on conscience, discipline, etc., the most important are his letters to Alexander III., various princes, bishops, abbots, etc. They are not only of historical, but sometimes also of theological interest. They were edited by Sirmon, Paris, 1613.

Peter Lombard. See Lombard.

Peter Martyr, or Peter of Verona, a Dominican monk, who in the middle of the thirteenth century was appointed inquisitor in Lombardy. The severity with which he exercised his power produced much hatred against him, and in 1252 he was assassinated. In the very next year he was canonized by Innocent IV. See Act. Sanct. Boll. Apr. III.

Peter Martyr Vermigli, b. in Florence, Sept. 8, 1530; d. at Zurich, Nov. 12, 1562. In 1536 he entered, against his father's wish, the order of the regular canons of St. Augustine, at Fiesole; studied Greek, Hebrew, and theology at Padua, and was made abbot of Spoletta, and afterwards prior of St. Petri ad aram, near Naples. He there came in contact with the circle of Juan Valdes, and was, especially by the influence of Ochino, completely won for the Reformation. Though suspicion was raised against him, he was appointed visitor-general of his order; but his severity in enforcing the rules made him hated by the monks, and he was sent to Lucca as prior of San Frediano. But soon the Inquisition became aware of a decidedly evangelical movement set on foot by him among the clergy of Lucca, and he had to flee for his life. In 1542 he reached Zurich, and went thence to Strassburg, where he was most kindly received by Bucer, and finally
appointed professor of the Old Testament. In 1547 he came to England, on the invitation of Cranmer, and became dean of St. Paul's. — 1. On the First Epistle to the Corinthians, in 1548; on the Epistle to the Romans, in 1549, etc. He took, also, a prominent part in the disputations concerning the Lord's Supper, in the negotiations concerning the new Liturgy, etc. After the accession of Mary, he fled to the Continent, and went back to Strasburg. There, however, the state of affairs had changed, a strict Lutheranism prevailing; and he was appointed only after subscribing to the Confession Augusta. But two years later on (1553), when the controversy of the Lord's Supper broke out, he left Strasburg, and accepted a call to Zürich, where he spent the rest of his life in very lively communication with the Reformed party in England (Defenso doctrina veteris et apostolicae de Eucharistia sacramento, 1559, against Gardiner, and Defenso ad R. Smythiei duos libelli de calibatus aecrdoton et voit monasticis, in Poland (two letters concerning the Holy Trinity and the two natures in Christ), in Italy, and in France. He was present at the disputa1. 1561; but the formula (concerning the Lord's Supper) which the assembly finally agreed upon was rejected by the Sorbonne. His Commentaries were published after his death; also his Loci communes, edited by Robert Masson, London, 1575, and one of the principal sources for the study of the Reformed theology of the sixteenth century. See Simler : Oraio de vita et obitu P. M., Zürich, 1562; Schlosser : Leben des Theodor Beza und P. M. Vermigl, Heidelberg, 1807; C. Schmidt : P. M. Vermigl, Elberfeld, 1838. C. Schmidt.

PETER THE VENERABLE. Pierre Maurice de Montboisier, called "the Venerable," was b. in Auvergne, France, 1092 (94), and d. Christmas Day, 1156 (58), at Cluny. He was the seventh son of Maurice, Lord of Montboisier, and of Ringarde his wife. Four of his brothers became ecclesiastics also; and one, Armannus, was prior of Cluny. At seventeen years of age Peter was sustained in his rule. His name of "the Venerable," was derived from his largeness of body and mind, his benevolent face, and his Christian charity. Bernard of Cluny was probably his prior. Peter was the first to acknowledge Innocent II. as pope, against Anacletus, his rival claimant, who had in fact been a Cluniac monk. This just and pious action, is in strong contrast to that of Innocent and of St. Bernard, who seem equally to have disregarded Peter and his motives. To meet their insinuations against laxity of discipline, he called a general chapter of his order (Benedictines), at which "two hundred priors and a thousand ecclesiastics" were present, who supported him in a stringent rule. Peter's writings embrace Epistles (lib. 6. 22, to Heloise, being notably fine), and Tracts against the Petrobrusians, Jews, and Mohammedans, together with a few Hymns and Sequences. His principal claims to modern honor lie (1) in his having secured a Latin translation of the Koran through his own labors and those of some of his monks; (2) in his kind treatment of Abelard, whom he received after his defeat by Bernard, and tenderly cared for until he died, and whose body he delivered to Heloise; and (3) in his hymn "Mortis, portis, fractis, fortis," on the resurrection. This is the conjectured original of Bishop Heber's "God is gone up with a merry noise." Peter was decidedly broader and more genial than his age and surroundings, but his writings are of slight value. Fl. Illyricus quotes him, however, as one of his "witnesses." He was but a poor Latinist; yet, in his sermon on the transfiguration, he displays real rhetorical power. His burial was beside his comrade, Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester, within the church at Cluny.

Lit. — His works were published Paris, 1614, and several times afterwards: Migne (Patrologia, vol. 189, pp. 9 sqq.) contains them all. His life can be found in Histoire Littéraire de la France, xiii. p. 241, and in Migne, as above. For the best view of his character, see Morison : Life and Times of St. Bernard, London, 1863, 2d ed., 1877. SAMUEL W. DUFFIELD.

PETERBOROUGH, a city in Northamptonshire, Eng., situated on the left bank of the Nene, seventy-six miles, north by west, from London. It is the seat of the bishopric of the same name. The episcopal stipend is forty-five hundred pounds. The see was founded by Henry VIII., in 1541. Peterborough Cathedral is a beautiful specimen of Norman and Early English architecture. It was commenced by abbot John de Seez, 1117, and completed 1528. It is cruciform, 476 feet long, with transepts 203 feet broad, ceiling 78 feet, and tower 150 feet high. See G. A. Poole: Peterborough, London, 1881.

PETER-PENCE (Denarius S. Petri, Census B. Petri, Ramses, Romesco) denotes a money-trust which several of the northern kingdoms of Europe annually paid to the see of St. Peter. It seems to have originated in England, and was, according to the report of later chroniclers, paid there for the first time by King Ina of Wessex (725), though not in the form of a tribute, but as a support of the Schola Saxorum, — an educational institution in Rome for English clergy. The whole report, however, is somewhat doubtful, as Beda knows nothing of the affair. The first certain notice of it is found in a letter from Leo III. to Cenulph, large-lys 1. "Conc. XIII.; Jaffe : Regest., No. 1915), in which the Pope states that Offa (d. 786), the predecessor of Cenulph, had promised for himself
and his successor to pay annually three hundred and sixty-five mancua to the apostle Peter for the maintenance of the poor and the illumination of churches. By the middle of the tenth century it seems to have been paid regularly, first as a charity, but afterwards as a duty. Gregory VII. even tried to use it as a means of bringing England into a relation of vassalage to the papal see; but William the Conqueror, though he declined the offer, refused to take the oath. The money was collected through the bishops, though not without some difficulties, partly because people refused to pay, partly because the bishops were unwilling to give the sums collected. Under Henry VIII. it was abrogated, by Act of Parliament, July 9, 1539. In Poland the pater-pence was introduced in the eleventh century, as later chroni-
clers tell us, from gratitude, because Benedict IX. absolved Casimir, on his accession to the throne in 1034, from the monastic vows. From Poland it was introduced into Prussia, at that time a fief of the Polish crown; but there it met with repeated protests, and was never paid regularly. In the Scandinavian countries it was proposed by papal legates in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but never paid in the form of a regular duty. In 1081 Gregory VII. endeavored to introduce it in France, arguing that Charlemagne had presented offerings of the kind to the papal see (GREGO-
rvy: Epist. 23); but he failed completely there as well as in Spain. From the middle of the six-
teenth century it disappeared altogether. See the Liber censuum Romano: eccleske, in Muratori: Libri IX. (Paris, 1630), Ecloga; Chronological
veterum scriptoritmloca (Paris, 1641), etc. His biography was written in Latin by Pierre For-
MY, Paris, 1673.

PETRA. See SelaH.

PETRI is the name of two brothers — Olaus (b. at Oerebro, 1497; d. in Stockholm, 1552) and Laurentius (b. at Oerebro, 1499; d. at Upsala, 1573), who were chiefly instrumental in the establish-
ment of the Reformation in Sweden. They studied theology at Wittenberg, and began, soon after their return home, to preach the Reformation, protected by Gustavus Vasa. Olaus was in 1523 made rector of the seminary of Strängnäs, and in 1539 preacher in Stockholm; Laurentius, professor in Upsala in 1523, and in 1541 arch-
bishop. Together with Lars Anderson, they translated the Bible into Swedish. Olaus also wrote a Manuale Sueticum, an Ordo Missae Sueticae, and a
number of polemical treatises in Swedish. Lau-
rentius wrote a Disciplina Sueticae, which became part of the Swedish constitution. See SWEDEN.

PETROBRUSHIANS. See PETER OF BRUYS.

PEUCER, Caspar, b. at Bautzen, Jan. 6, 1523;
d. at Dessau, Sept. 25, 1602. He studied in the university of Wittenberg, and was appointed pro-
fessor of mathematics there in 1564, and of medi-
cine in 1560, superintendent-general of the Latin
schools of Saxe, in 1566, and body-physician to the
 elector. From his arrival at Wittenberg he was an inmate of Melanchthon's house. In 1550 he married his youngest daughter, and after his death he became one of the most active representatives of the so-called Philippists; which article see. As he enjoyed the favor and confidence of the elector in an uncommon degree, it was easy for him to prevent anybody but Philippists from being appointed at the university. He was also very active in the publication, and introduc-
tion into the school, of the Wittenberg Catechism of 1571, which, on account of its antagonism to the doctrine of ubiquity, was an abomination in the eyes of the Lutherans. But through the electress, who was a strict Lutheran, his enemies finally succeeded in estranging the elector from him. In 1574 he was suddenly arrested, and kept in prison till shortly before the death of the elec-
tor, in 1586. After his release he returned to his old occupation, but his childish and unphilos-
ophic ideas into the pulpuit, partly on account of his relations to Juliane von Asseburg; which article
see. After that time, he retired into private life, and devoted himself to a literary propaganda for his mystical and chiliastic ideas. Of his works, which are very rare, the principal are: Her-
heit des herrlichen Reiches Jesu Christi, Magdeburg, 1692-93, 2 vols., and Geheimniss der Widerbringung
aller Dinge, Francfort, 1700-10, 3 vols. fol. He also wrote exegetical works, Latin and German
poems (the former edited by Leibnitz), and an autobiography, 1718. See Cohrodi: Geschichle
Peters, 1781, 2d ed., Zurich, 1794, 4 vols.

PETIT, Samuel, b. at Nimes, Dec. 25, 1694;
d. there Dec. 12, 1643. He studied theology at
Geneva, and was in 1618 appointed professor of Oriental languages, and pastor in his native city. Among his numerous works are Miscellaneorum
Libri IX. (Paris, 1630), Eclipsa Chronologicae
(Paris, 1632), Leges Attica (Paris, 1635, dedicated
to De Thou), Observationum Libri III. in varia
veterum scripture locum (Paris, 1641), etc. His
biography was written in Latin by Pierre For-
MY, Paris, 1673.
PHARISEES. The (Heb., persūāhīm, Arahmāic, persēūhā, persēthaya, the "separatists"), formed by a party among the Jewish people. The name they bore was not of their choice, but given them by their opponents, who looked upon them as separating themselves from the rest of the people on account of their superior piety. They called their way of life religious isolationism, splitting off from the rest of the people. They were the "separatists," who bore the name given them by their opponents. The epithet is followed upon the monuments by numerous laudatory titles, which ascribe to the man the attributes of the gods. Indeed, he was believed to be an earthly manifestation of Ra, the sun-god, and after death was apotheosized. His name was very antagonistic to the rising school of Wolff. His biography was written by Leporinus, Leipzig, 1726.

PEW. The word comes from the old French pui, an elevated space, puye, an open gallery with rails (hence applied to an enclosed space, or to a raised desk to kneel at), which is the Latin podion, a balcony, especially near the arena, where distinguished persons sat. So pews were originally places for distinguished persons in church. See SKEAT: Etymological Dictionary. In the Roman-Catholic churches on the Continent there are generally no pews, but in Protestant churches they are universal. In England they are said to date from the Reformation, and not to a raised desk to kneel at), which is the Latin podion, a balcony, especially near the arena, where distinguished persons sat. So pews were originally places for distinguished persons in church.

PEZZEL (PEZOLT, PEZOLD), Christof, b. at Plauen, March 5, 1539; d. in Bremen, Feb. 25, 1604. He studied theology at Jena and Wittenberg, and in 1567 appointed professor of theology in the latter place. As a representative of Philippism, he was discharged in 1574, and banished from the country in 1576. In 1580 he was appointed pastor in Bremen, and was in 1604 superintendant, and professor of theology. He edited Melanchthon’s correspondence with Hardenberg, 1608, and his Concilii Latini, 1602, and wrote the Bremer Catechismus, the Bremen Consensus, a sur-
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PHILADELPHIAN SOCIETY.

Its annual death-rate is only 10.06 per thousand. It has forty-five cemeteries. The first American paper, The Weekly Mercury, was established here in 1719.

The principal and oldest United-States Mint is located in the city. The American Sunday-School Union, organized in 1824, and also several of the missionary boards of the great religious denominations, have their head offices here. The Philadelphia, which was the first Sunday-school organization in America for missionary work, was formed here in 1791.

There are 611 places of worship in the city. There are 93 relief societies, 94 “homes” and orphanages, 43 hospitals, 29 dispensaries, 11 reformatories, 31 beneficial societies, 15 working-men’s clubs. The Girard College for orphan boys, founded by a wealthy Frenchman, 1832, is also located here, and now provides for the education of a thousand boys.

R. M. PATTERSON.

PHILADELPHIAN SOCIETY. As early as 1852, Dr. and Mrs. Pordage and Bromley established a gathering of mystics of the Jakob Böhme pattern. To their meetings Mrs. Leade, after the death of her husband, was admitted; and in 1670 she, with those already named, founded the Philadelphian Society. To it she soon gave what were called “the laws of Paradise,” which contained the ground ideas of the society. The new enterprise was designed to advance the kingdom of God by improving the life, teaching the loftiest morality, enforcing the duty of universal brotherhood, peace, and love. At the same time, no morality, enforcing the duty of universal brotherhood, peace, and love. At the same time, no
against the light of nature and the gospel. The
Philadelphians also believed firmly in what they
called the "divine secrets," — the wonders of God
and nature, the profound spiritual experiences
of regeneration and soul-resurrection, — in the speedy
establishment of Messiah's kingdom, and in the
building up of the future Church. These ideas found
such ready acceptance, that oral and epistolary
intercourse with many persons of Holland and
Germany was soon begun. Among those interest-
ated were Hörche, May, Petersen, and Spener.
Since the time for the ingathering of the Phila-
delphian Church had come, the living word must be
spoken by a living man. Accordingly, Joh-
annes Dittmar of Salzungen was appointed "ins-
pector," and, armed with credentials, was sent to
Germany for the purpose. One important part
of his mission was to unite the Philadelphians
with the Pietists, especially those with Professor
Franke at Halle. Although, kindly received,
his mission was well-nigh fruitless. At the end
of 1703 the Philadelphians drew up their Confes-
sion; but, instead of advancing, they declined. In
England they were forbidden to meet. The Hol-
land branch withdrew, — a particularly serious
embarrassment, since it had been the medium of
communication with Germany. Still, the visions
of Mrs. Leadbe to were to many irrefragable proofs
of divinity, and implicitly accepted. Her death end-
ed her repute, but, if the torrent has sunk in the
sand, she has the credit of first giving practical
expression to the idea of universal brotherhood.
See Lit. under LEADBE, H. H."
the spell by which the Pope kept bound all the nations of Western and Northern Europe. In order to defray the expenses of the war with England, he imposed a heavy tax on the French clergy. The clergy complained to the Pope; and, by a bull (not by the papal council of 1295), Boniface VIII. forbade in the most vehement expressions, and under penalty of excommunication, any layman, king, or lord, to levy tax on the clergy. Philip was compelled to yield, but he took revenge. He forbade the export from France of precious metal, coined or uncoined, and thereby cut off a considerable portion of the Pope's revenue. Boniface immediately entered upon the retreat. A new bull (Ineffabilis amor, Sept. 25, 1296), and several briefs to the king and the French clergy, tried to explain the bull Clerici laicos into harmony with the king's wishes. Aug. 11, 1297, he canonized Louis IX.; in June, 1298, he appeared as umpire between France and England,—all on the side of France, etc. The immense success, however, of the jubilee of 1300 again brought forward the papal dreams of a universal monarchy; and as Pierre Dubois at the same time published his Summaria brevis, advocating the conciliar idea, the clergy, alarmed at the French claims on a universal monarchy, and reducing the papal authority to purely spiritual matters, there came again a dangerous tension in the relation between the two sovereigns. Finally the sending of Bernard de Saisset, Bishop of Pamiers, as papal legate to the French court, brought about the crisis. Saisset was insolent; and as soon as his legatine mission was finished, he was summoned to Paris, placed before a mixed tribunal, accused of treason, and thrown into prison. Boniface convened the second council of the Lateran, which resulted in the bull Unam sanctam (Nov. 13, 1302), a completely unique piece of papal arrogance. Philip assembled the states-general for the first time in the history of France; and it was evident that the whole French nation was ready to support. Only the clergy preserved a respectful behavior towards the Pope. The university, headed by Occam, declared against him. Gilles Romanus wrote his De regimine principis; John of Paris, his De potestate regia et popoli, and Boniface was publicly caricatured in the French mysteries. Philip was, nevertheless, afraid of the effect of an excommunication; and Sept. 7, 1305, the day before the excommunication was going to take place in the Church of Anagni, Nogaret penetrated with a number of other conspirators into the papal palace, and took possession of the Pope. See Boniface VIII. The consequences of that audacious stroke were decisive. The successor of Boniface VIII., died shortly after his accession; and his successor, Clement V., was a mere tool in the hands of Philip. Clement was a Frenchman, and Archbishop of Bourdeaux; but he was known as a stanch adversary of Philip. Thus recommended to the Italian cardinals, he gained the votes of the French clergy. He compelled the edict of Nuremberg by the bull Clerici laicos (Feb. 25, 1296), Boniface VIII. forbade in the most vehement manner the teaching of the Templars to the pleasure of the king, and some other points. The Templars he actually delivered up to the avarice of Philip; his residence he took up at Avignon, thus inaugurating the Babylonian captivity of the popes; but the first point of the bargain he escaped from fulfilling. Nevertheless, his reign indicated in the plainest manner the decadence of the Papacy, and Philip was by no means anxious to conceal the real state of affairs. See Clement V. BOUTARIE: La France sous Philippe le Bel, Paris, 1881.

PHILIP THE FAIR.

Philip the Magnanimous, Landgrave of Hesse; b. at Marburg, Nov. 23, 1544; d. there March 31, 1567; one of the most prominent characters in the history of the German Reformation. He was only five years old when his father died, and only fourteen when he was declared of age. He was present at the Diet of Worms in 1521, but had at that time not yet made up his mind with respect to religious matters. He was, however, one of those who insisted that the safe conduct accorded to Luther should be kept sacred. He visited Luther in his lodgings, and on his return he allowed mass to be celebrated in German at Cassel. In the campaign against Franz von Sickingen, in 1522, he was accompanied by a Protestant preacher; and an incidental meeting with Melanchthon, on the road to Heidelberg, finally decided him. In February, 1525, he opened his country to the Reformation; in May he joined the Torgau Union; and in June he appeared at the Diet of Spires as one of the leaders of the Protestant party, surprising the Roman-Catholic bishop by his theological learning, the imperial commissioners by his outspokenness, and King Ferdinand himself by the open threat of leaving the diet immediately if the enforcement of the edicts of Worms was insisted upon.

The great task he had on hand was to unite the German and Swiss Protestants into one compact party, and at the Diet of Spires (1529) he succeeded in baffling all the attempts of the Roman Catholics of producing an open breach. The Conference of Marburg, in the same year, was also his work; and it had, at all events, the effect of somewhat mitigating the hostility of the theologians. Nevertheless, at the Diet of Augsburg (1530), the Luthers appeared to be willing to buy peace by sacrificing the interest of the Zwingians. Philip proposed war, open and immediate; but the Luthers suspected him of being a Zwingian at heart, and their suspicion made him powerless. He subscribed the Confessio Augstana, but reluctantly, and with an express reservation with respect to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Finally, when he saw that nothing could be done, while he knew that the emperor could not be trusted, he suddenly left Augsburg, and his resoluteness made an impression on the other Protestant princes; and in March, 1531, he was opened to the Reformation; in May he joined the Torgau Union; and in June he opened negotiations with Francis I., and in 1540 he again proposed to wage open war on the emperor.
But at that very moment his authority was greatly impaired, and his activity much clogged, by his marriage with Margarethe von der Saal,—a clear case of bigamy. She was maid-of-honor to his sister, the Duchess of Rochlitz, and sixteen years old. He fell in love with her, and, having eloped his legitimate wife, a daughter of Duke George of Saxony, to give her consent to double marriage. The theologians, even Luther and Melancthon, also consented, on the condition that the marriage should be kept a deep secret. The Duchess of Rochlitz, however, would not keep silent; and the question then arose, what the emperor would do. The case was so much the worse, as in 1535 Philip had issued a law which made bigamy one of the greatest crimes in Hesse. The emperor, however, simply used the affair to completely undermine the political position of the landgrave; but the profit he drew from it was, nevertheless, no small one. During the difficult times which followed after the peace of Crespy (1544), the Protestant party had no acknowledged leader; during the Smalciad war (1546-47), no acknowledged head. After the war, the emperor treacherously seized the landgrave, and kept him in prison for five years. After his release, in 1552, Philip was not exactly a broken man; but he was much humbled, and was compelled to play the part of the mediator, especially between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics; thus he was very active in promoting the conferences of Naumburg in 1554, of Worms in 1555.


KLUPPEL.

PHILIP II., King of Spain (1556-98), b. at Valladolid, May 21, 1527; d. at the Escorial, Sept. 13, 1598. He was the most powerful and relentless adversary of the Reformation. From his father, Charles V., he inherited Spain (which at that time furnished the largest, the best drilled, and best equipped army in the world), the Two Sicilies and Milan (the granary of Europe), the Netherlands (the seat of the highest industrial and commercial development), besides vast possessions in the West Indies and America, from which he drew an inexhaustible wealth of gold and silver and the choicest productions of the earth. But he was of a dull and barren nature, and knew not what to do with his riches. Devoid of sympathy, and capable only of a singular kind of cold fanaticism, egotism was the sole motive-power in his will; and all his exertions in behalf of the Roman-Catholic creed were due to the circumstance that it was his creed. His dealings with the Pope clearly show, that, even in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs, he could brook no other will than his own. He nominated to all the dignities and benefices of the Spanish Church. Appeals to Rome were absolutely forbidden. No papal bull or brief could be read in his realm without his placet. The statutes and decrees of the Council of Trent were received only with very important restrictions. A royal commissioner presided over the deliberations of the provincial synods; and in the concclave he did not content himself with the right of excluding some obnoxious candidate, but claimed also the right of proposing some favorite candidate. Pius IV. complained bitterly, in the presence of the cardinals and the Spanish ambassador, Vargas, of the exorbitant pretensions of the king. Pius V. tried to force him into compliance by withdrawing the subsidies of the clergy in his realm. Under Sixtus V., the Spanish ambassador Olivares actually proposed to the king to separate from Rome, and to convocate a national council as the best means of compelling the Pope to adopt another policy with respect to France. To the missionary activity of the school of English Jesuits at Douay, or the schemes of popular risings in Ireland, or the conspiracies of the Roman-Catholic party in England, he paid very little attention, in spite of the enormous religious consequences which might have been evolved from them; but as soon as he felt his own personal, political plans thwarted by Elizabeth, he sent the Armada against her, and was defeated; and the supremacy of the sea passed from Catholic Spain to Protestant England. In the Netherlands he stirred up the political passions as deeply as the religious; and many of his measures, though introduced under religious pretences, were really and chiefly of political import. In France he completely spoiled the game, and actually prepared the way for Henry IV. by claiming the crown for himself. Nevertheless, though principally prompted in all his doings by his egotism, he was the most formidable adversary the Reformation had to encounter, and in his own country he completely succeeded in burning it out. See Prescott: History of the Reign of Philip II., New York, 1855-58, 3 vols.: Baumstark: Philip II., Friburg, 1875.

PHILIP THE TETRARCH. See HEROD, p. 983.

PHILIPPI, the chief city of the eastern division of Macedonia, eight miles north-west of Neapolis, its seaport. Its original name was Crenides ("fountains") from its numerous springs; but Philip, the father of Alexander the Great, who took it (356 B.C.), called it after himself. In 42 B.C. a memorable battle was fought there between Octavius and Antony on the one side, and Brutus and Cassius on the other. The former were victorious; and the city, in consequence, was made a Roman colony by Octavius, who became Augustus 27 B.C. This bestowed peculiar privileges upon it, especially that of Roman citizenship. It was there that in A.D. 51 Paul preached upon his second missionary journey, was imprisoned, and, with Silas, his companion, miraculously delivered. The Jewish place of prayer on the banks of the Gangas, or Gangites, a tributary of the Strymon, now called Bournabachi, was the scene of their first labors in Europe; and Lydia, the first convert (Acts xvi. 12-40). A church was formed in consequence: to it Paul paid a visit subsequently, in 57 (Acts xx. 2), and apparently spent some little time there shortly afterwards (xx. 6). The church at Philippi is distinctively mentioned as contributing to Paul’s support (2 Cor. x. 9; Phil. iv. 10) and that of the Jerusalem Christians (2 Cor. xi. 24; Phil. ii. 1-6). It was peculiarly dear to the apostle’s heart; and to it he addressed, in A.D. 62, a letter of great tenderness, without those rebukes and criticisms which the other churches called forth. Ignatius of Antioch visited Philippi on his way to Rome (Martyr., c. v.), where he was martyred (A.D. 107). Polycarp of Smyrna wrote them a
letter, still preserved, at their request, and to
them sent all the letters of Ignatius in possession
of the Smyrna church (Polyc., Ad Phil., c. xiii.).
But, from this time onward, the Philippites,
from, save as one of its bishops signs his name to
some ecclesiastical document. The place itself
is now a mere ruins. See especially Lightfoot:

PHILIPPI, Friedrich Adolf, b. in Berlin, Oct.
15, 1809; d. at Rostock, Aug. 26, 1882. He went
up to Wittenberg and Leipzig who had adopted the
views of Melanchthon, and were accused of devi-
ting from pure Lutheranism, both in the direction
of Romanism and in the direction of Calvinism.
Afterwards it also assumed an ecclesiastico-politi-
cal significance, and was applied to the party,
which, under the lead of Peucer, Cracau, Stossel,
and others, labored to bring about a union be-
tween all the Protestant powers, and to break
down the confessional bar between Lutheranism
and Calvinism by means of Melanchthonianism.

Luther had hardly died before the peace of the
Lutheran Church was gone. The difference be-
tween him and Melanchthon had long been dis-
tinctly felt; but, as long as he lived, it was not
allowed to take positive form. Immediately after
his death, however, the Gnesio-Lutherans and the
Philippists arranged themselves over against each
other in open antagonism. The Gnesio-Luther-
ans—Amisdorf, Flacius, Wigand, Mörlin, and
others—considered themselves the representa-
tives of a district along the south-western coast
of Canaan, which, not counting the Negeb, south
of Gaza, was only about twenty-five miles in
length. We describe,—

The Leipzig Interim of 1548 gave occasion for
the first controversy between the Gnesio-Lutherans
and the Philippists; but the synergistic contro-
versy broke out only a little later; and all the
differences between the views of Luther and Me-
lanchthon concerning justifications of the Lord's
Supper, the freedom of the will, etc.—were at
once brought into the fire. The Gnesio-Luther-
ans were very violent; and the attacks which the
conventions of Weimar, Coswig, and Magdeburg
(1555–57), levied upon the universities. See the
highest degree offensive. The Philippists,
however, were equal to the situation, as may be
seen from their Synodus Avium, a satire by Johann
Major, and the famous Epistola Scholasticorum
Wittenbergensium, issued by the two Philippist
universities, and printed at Frankfort. The culmi-
ning point is indicated by the Philippist Confutatio
(1559), in which synergism, majorism, adia-
orphism, etc., are confuted, and condemned as
heresies. As it soon became apparent, however,
that the extravagances of the Gnesio-Lutheran
professors drove the students away from the uni-
versity, they were dismissed (1562–65), and Phi-
lpippi appointed in their stead. But after the
accession of Johann Wilhelm, in 1567, a re-action
took place, and the Philippist professors had to
give way to the Gnesio-Lutheran. A reconci-
ilation of the two parties was attempted by the col-
loquy of Altenburg, Oct. 21, 1568, but failed.
In 1589 the Elector of Saxony demanded that
all ministers in his country should subscribe to
the Corpus Doctrina Philippicum, which was a
great victory to the Philippists. But the elector
did so, not from any preference for Philippism,
but because he believed said instrument to be a
representation of pure Lutheranism, free from all
Flacian extravagances. The publication, how-
ever, of the Wittenberg Catechism (1571), contain-
ing a very outspoken exposition of the doctrines
of the Lord's Supper and the personality of Christ,
and the outcry which the whole Gnesio-Lutheran
camp raised against it, made him uneasy; and
when the Exegesis perspicua controversiae de sacra
cena appeared in 1574, he began to suspect that
he had been the victim of some kind of mystifica-
tion. The Philippist professors—Widebram,
Petzel, Cruciger, and others—were at once dis-
misse4, and treated in a rather harsh manner.
The blow thus struck at Philippism was fatal.
With the introduction of the Formula Concordia,
the Philippists lost their hold on the public at-
tention; and, with the exception of a short episode
in the history of electoral Saxony, 1586–91 (see the
art. KELL), it survived only as a local color-
ing of the theology of certain universities. See
the various representations in the histories of Prot-
estant theology, by Plaucck, Heppe, Frank, Gass,
Dorner, and others.

PHILISTINES — הַפָּלְטִים (הַפָּלְטִים) only Amos
ix. 7), LXX. ὁ Φίλιστήρ, and also Ἀλουφέριον, called
by Josephus, Arch. 1, 6, 2, ψηφιτόν, by Herodotus,
2, 104; 3, 5, 91; 7, 66, Ελληνικές — were the inhab-
itants of a district along the south-western coast
of Canaan, which, not counting the Negeb, south
of Gaza, was only about twenty-five miles in
length. We describe,—

1. THE COUNTRY. — Egypt, with its district
Pelusium, extends as far as the River of Egypt
(Gen. xv. 18; Num. xxxiv. 5, etc.), i.e., to the
modern el-Arish, which, coming northward out
of Arabia, flows into the Mediterranean where
the coast turns from the east to the north. Here
the Philistine territory commenced, and extended
to where the Sorek, which rises near Jerusalem,
empties into the Mediterranean. The district
south of Gaza already belongs to the Negeb, or
from the coast, it was surrounded by a plain rich in fruit and palm orchards. The city has now six thousand inhabitants. The streets are narrow and ugly: there is neither wall nor gate. It lies on a slope looking to the north. The most beautiful building is the chief mosque Jami-el-Muntar, one mile south-east of the city. The ancient Gaza was situated about two miles and a half south of the modern city. In the south-west portion of the city, tradition points out the spot whence Samson carried the gates. The Mount of Ashkelon was the most fertile districts. In this territory proper, from Gaza to Jabne we can distinguish between ℒ河水 ([Deut. i. 7; Josh. v. 1]), with the corresponding ℒ河水 (Josh. xi. 18; Jer. xxxii. 44, xxxiii. 13), and the hilly districts extending towards Judaea, ℒ河水 (Josh. x. 40, xii. 8).

Of the five chief cities, three were situated on the coast. The southern and most important, both formerly and now, is Gaza (Syr. and Assyr. Gazatha, Khazita, and probably the Кедрот of Her. 2, 159; 3, 5), the Powerful, now el-Ghazzeh. In olden times it was the chief medium of the Syrio-Egyptian trade, and is at present yet an important market. Situated on the edge of the desert, and twenty stades (two miles and a half) from the coast, it was surrounded by a plain rich in water and vegetation. North-west of the city is an olive woods, the largest and most beautiful in Palestine. In the south there are immense fruit and palm orchards. The city has now sixteen thousand inhabitants. The streets are narrow and ugly: there is neither wall nor gate. It lies on a slope looking to the north. The most beautiful building is the chief mosque Jami-el-Kebir, a Mohammedan reconstruction of an ancient Christian church. The ancient Gaza was probably situated about two miles and a half south of the modern city. In the south-west portion of the city, tradition points out the spot whence Samson carried the gates. The Mount Hebron mentioned Judg. xvi. 3 is probably the эль-Мунтар, one mile south-east of the city.

- Four geographical miles to the north of this, and almost on the coast, lie the ruins of Ashkelon. The city was really situated in the Wady Samt, which extends to the sea north of Ashdod, then its territory was comparatively large. No ruins of a former city are found here.

- Ekron, the Accaron of the Greeks and Latins, was the most northern of the five Philistine cities; and Robinson (iii., p. 229 sqq.) correctly finds it in the village of Akir, two miles and a half north of the Wady Surar. There are, however, few evidences of a high antiquity found here. Jabne is also called a Philistine city in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, identical with the border city of Judah, Jabneel (Josh. xv. 11). Later it was called laevia or Ḥebron (Joseph, B. J., 1, 7, 7; Strab. 16, 759; Plin. 5, 14). It is, beyond a doubt, the modern Jebna.

II. The People. — Although never able permanently to subdue any important portion of Palestine, yet the inhabitants of Philistia were sufficiently warlike to oppose Israel's supremacy in Canaan, generally to maintain their independence, in later times to take part in the movements of the nations, especially of Hellenism against Judaism, and for a long time to resist the introduction of Christianity. Their historical importance, as far as Israel was concerned, consisted in their mission of calling forth the better purposes and activity of the latter, and hence adding to its preservation and development.

The name גמל was probably connected with the word fatascha, retained in the Ethiopic, and related to גמל. In harmony with this is that I.XXX., from Judges on, always translates גמל as גמל. They bore this name of "Immigrants," probably because they arrived in Canaan later than the other inhabitants. The poetic form, גמל, in the sense of immigration, was originally also the name of the people. (Cf. Ps. lx. 10, lxxiii. 8, lxxxvii. 4, civii. 10; Jer. xiv. 29, 31, but cf. Exod. xv. 14.) The country is called גמלים [Gen. xxxii. 32, 33; Lev. xiii. 17; 1 Sam. xxi. 1, 7, xxi. 11; 1 Kings xvi. 21; 2 Kings viii. 2, 3]. The corresponding Greek name was Παλαιστίνη, in which form it appears for the first time in Herodotus (2, 12, 104, 157; 3, 5, 91; 7,89), and certainly
by Josephus (Arch. 12, 610), for the land of the Philistines exclusively, but afterwards employed for all Canaan.

In reference to the origin of the Philistines, Gen. x. 14, and, in connection with it, Deut. ii. 23, Amos vi. 7, Jer. xlvii. 4, come into consideration.

In the first passage they are traced to the Caaluinhim, in the others to Caphtor. 1 Chron. i. 12, and the older versions, show that the statement in Gen. x. 14 is not a lapsus calami. Both statements are undoubtedly correct. The descendants of Caphtor probably first went to the Caaluinhim, and then migrated to Canaan. Thus Baur and Köhler. The passages can be harmonized only if Caaluinhim and Caphtorim are virtually one and the same. Good authorities, on the basis of the view in the Targum Jerush., such as Knobel, Ebers, and others, connect Caaluinhim with the Coptic kas = hill, and lokh = sterility, the Arabic el-Rasrun, and find the locality in the dry district along the northern coast of Egypt, near Pelusium. But how about Caphtor? Many think it is Crete, because in 2 Sam. viii. 18, xv. 18, xx. 7, Creti and Piueti (= Philistines) are joined; and because in 1 Sam. xxx. 14, the south country of the Philistines is called "בַּכָּת " (cf. Zeph. ii. 5; Ezek. xxxv. 16), and because Caphtor is in Jer. xlvii. 4 expressly called an "אֹֽלַּיִּ֖ד " ("isleland"). But these evidences are not convincing. For, if Caphtor is Crete, then all Philistines should be called Cretes as well as Caphtorim. The juxtaposition of Creti and Piueti speaks rather for a distinction. Only Zeph. ii. 5; Ezek. xxxv. 16 use דֵ֤נֵי תָּרָ֣ם in a general sense, of the Philistines, and then only manifestly to have a nomen suitable for the omen. In the other passages there is probably a confusion between the names of Cretes and Carians, and, besides, "אָלַּיִֽד " is used also of a seas-coast. Further: there is nothing in the ancient Philistines to connect them in any way with Crete. The connections found in the Graeco-Roman literature are a “fabel fabricated by the learned” (Stark, p. 581). The Crete hypothesis is rejected by modern investigators with great unanimity, and they find Caphtor along the northern coast of Egypt and Pelusium. Certainly the Philistines, it was doubtless a matter of importance, that outside of the five chief cities, also the country was densely populated. As is seen from Josh. vi. 1; Judg. xv. 5, the larger cities had offshoots as far as the River of Egypt (cf. also 1 Sam. xvi. 5 and 1 Sam. xiii. 5). The productive agriculture was probably mostly in the hands of the remnants of the original inhabitants. (Cf. Deut. ii. 23.) The herds were kept mostly in the Negeb (2 Chron. vii. 11); the vine and the olive were cultivated (Judg. xv. 5). Here the Philistines had nothing whatever to do with the Pelasgians, as Hitzig and others imagine; but they are “nothing else than Semites” (Schneider: Keil-u. d. A. T., p. 74), i.e., Hamitic, degenerated Semites,—Semites in the wider sense of the word, in the same sense as the other Canaanites were such.

In reference to the language, the surest index of the origin of a people, Hitzig has attempted to connect the twelve to fifteen names and titles which we know as Philistine, with the Sanscrit and Greek, in order to support his Pelasgic theory. But everywhere the Semitic etymology proves to be the better, as the names Gaza, Gath, Abimelech, Delliath, Dagon, Jiahihi, Jitall, and Saph show. Other names, such as Achusath (Gen. xlii. 28), Goliath (1 Sam. xvii. 4), have, as can be easily explained from the etymology of the Semitic, Egyptian, and Phoenician languages.

The political government of the five principal cities was in the hands of five chiefs, called דִּּבְּר (LXX., ἀρχηγῶν τῶν Φιλιστίων; according to Genesis, thus, “axes of wagons,” after the Arabic; according to Ewald, “ruler,” from the same root
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with "א"), sometimes כ"א (1 Sam. xviii. 30, xxix. 3, 8). They were more than mere leaders in war (Judg. vi. 5, 8, 15, 27, 30; 1 Sam. vi. 8, 11, vi. 12). At the same time there are references to kings among them. (Cf. Gen. xxvi. 1, 8; 1 Sam. xii. 12, xxvii. 2 sqq.; 1 Kings ii. 39; Amos i. 8; Zech. ix. 5; Jer. xxv. 20; 1 Kings v. 1.) These are probably different names for the same office. In all probability there was a union of the different rulers, as they always act in harmony and unison.

III. THE HISTORY.—Beside the old Enakim, whose descendents were found in Gath, Gaza, and Ashdod (Josh. xi. 22; 2 Sam. xxi. 19–21; 1 Chron. xxi. 5–8), and to whom Goliath and other giants belonged, the Avim belonged to the original inhabitants (Deut. ii. 23; Josh. xiii. 2), who, since they are not reckoned among the Canaanites, south of Gaza, in the days of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 13), and the nomads in the mountains, appear, in all probability, to be the Canaanites of Canaan. When the Philistines proper migrated into this country cannot be accurately ascertained. According to Gen. xxi. 32, 33, and xxvi. 1, 8, 14 sqq., 18, they already occupied the district of Gerar, south of Gaza, in the days of Abraham and Isaac. Hence this migration had no connexion whatever with the expulsion of the Hyksos, about a hundred and fifty years before Moses. The statement of Herodotus (2,128), that Philemon whatever with the expulsion of the Hyksos, (Judg. xiii. 23; Josh. xiii. 3). They are mentioned, therefore, as some of the pre-Canaanitic inhabitants of Canaan. When the Philistines proper migrated into this country cannot be accurately ascertained. According to Gen. xxi. 32, 33, and xxvi. 1, 8, 14 sqq., 18, they already occupied the district of Gerar, south of Gaza, in the days of Abraham and Isaac. Hence this migration had no connexion whatever with the expulsion of the Hyksos, about a hundred and fifty years before Moses. The statements of Herodotus (2,128), that Philis- litis, or Philition, led his flocksnear Memphis, about a hundred and fifty years before Moses. The statementsof Herodotus (2,128), that Phi- litionwhatever with the expulsion of the Hyksos,
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the tribe of Judah deemed it necessary to deliver Saumon into their power (Judg. xv. 11). Encouraged by Samuel's words, they at once turned in order to drive them back into their own territory; but the Philistines succeeded in achieving a great victory, and secured the ark of the covenant (1 Sam. iv. 1 sqq.). Only when Israel had been more united, through Samuel's far-reaching activity, did it succeed in its endeavors against the Philistines.

After forty years of oppression, but one example of many similar but less important. Samson's adventures are probably of a similarcharacter, but seem to belong to a later period. The great activity in the movements of the Philistines in the days of Eli, Samuel, and David, are not the results of a renewed immigration of Caphtorim, as Ewald and G. Baur think, but are rather connected with the general uprising of the Eastern nations, especially the Amorites, Elamites, and Medes. When the Philistines took possession of the cities along the coasts; they occupied Philistia in the days of Moses is stated very distinctly in Exod. xiii. 17 sqq. They occupied Gath and Gaza before the days of Moses (Judg. xiv. 5). The Philistines seem to belong to a later period. The great activity in the movements of the Philistines in the days of Eli, Samuel, and David, are not the results of a renewed immigration of Caphtorim, as Ewald and G. Baur think, but are rather connected with the general uprising of the Eastern nations, especially the Amorites, Elamites, and Medes.

But they kept up their warlike proclivities to the very days of Assyrian and Babylonian conquests. The Assyrian king, Biunirar (about 800 B.C.), mentions that he conquered Philistia; Tiglath-pileser boasts of having overcome Hanno (Haamun) of Gath, and that they were captured and destroyed Gaza and other cities; his general (Tartan) later took Ashdod; Sanherib add-
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To this the conquest of Ashkelon and Ekron; and Asaph addeth that he overthrew seven of the little countries in connection with the conquest of all Egypt and Asia east of the Mediterranean. (Cf. Schrader: "Keilinschrift. u. d. A. T., pp. 112, 145, 171 sqq.; 212, 237 sqq."

Psammethicus could take Ashdod, which had been strongly fortified by the Assyrians, only after besieging it for forty days (2 Kings ii. 25, 26), and then took Gaza also. A later Pharaoh conquered Gaza a second time (Jer. xxvii. 1). Yet, notwithstanding all these humiliations, they had not suffered like the Israelites. They were not all led into captivity; and their cities were soon built up anew, though probably, in part, inhabited by Edomites from Southern Judea. Ashdod is mentioned in Neh. iv. 7 as an enemy of Judea; and the Philistine language is called "the speech of Ashdod." (Neh. xiii. 24). Neither the conquest of Gaza by Cambyses, and not even the terrible destruction of the city by Alexander the Great, after a siege of two or more months, could annihilate the community of this city. (Cf. Arrian. Alex., 2, 26, 27; Curtius, 4, 5, 6.) The latter made the place his armarium, and left Macedonian guards there. Immediately the old and revived antipathy of the Jews seems to have sought the destruction of the Philistine nationality. Judas Maccabaeus marched against Ashdod (1 Macc. v. 60 (89)): Jonathan plundered and burned the city and the Dagon temple (1 Macc. x. 86, xi. 60). The Syrian king, Alexander Balas, made the latter a present of Ekron: he forced Gaza to sue for peace (1 Macc. xi. 61 sq.). Gaza was not entirely destroyed until under Alexander Jannaeus (96 B.C.). Some of these ruined cities again were built up. Gabinius, one of Pompey's generals, again built up Ashdod (55 A.D.), and founded a new Gaza, south of the old (in 65 A.D.). Pompey placed the cities along the coast under the jurisdiction of the Syrian province (Joseph., Arch., 14, 4, 4, 5); only under Herod and Agrippa I. were they to some extent united again with the Jewish kingdom. Herod favored the growth of the Philistine cities; and, owing to this favor, Ashkelon at that time assumed an importance even greater than that of its magnificent buildings, which were afterwards called the "Bride of Syria." In consequence of their Hellenistic spirit the Philistine cities adhered to Vespasian in the last Jewish war; and the Jews, as a consequence, burned Gaza and Anathodon in 65 A.D. While Judea was utterly laid waste by this war, and later by the insurrection of Barcocheba, the Philistine cities continued to flourish. Jannaeus even was selected by the Jews as a place of refuge; and the Sanhedrin held its meetings there for a while after the destruction of Jerusalem, and a Jewish academy was maintained in its midst. (Cf. Mishna, Bith. Hahamim, 4;畜牧. 1, 4.) In the days of Trajan it became the spiritual centre of the Jewish rebellion. Gaza received a new impetus under Hadrian, and in this city the Jewish captives of the last war were sold as slaves. Ammianus Marcellinus (about 350) mentions Ashkelon and Gaza as egregiae civitates of the province of Syria, and as signis civitates. Business and even literature flourished in Gaza in the days of the Romans. In the mean while Christianity had already found its way into Philistia. Philip was already directed to the way of Gaza (Acts x. 26); preached in Ashdod (viii. 40); which city later became the residence of a bishop. Tradition reports Gaza as the place where Philemon, to whom Paul addressed one of his letters, was the first bishop. At any rate, Bishop Sylvanus of that city suffered martyrdom there in 256 A.D., under Diocletian; and bishops and peoplev of six other bishops of Gaza are preserved. However, the Hellenistic culture that prevailed here since the days of Alexander the Great seems to have broken the influence of Christianity. Eight heathen temples were still found there at the end of the fourth century. In 684 A.D. the city was taken by the Caliph Abuk伯, and in the period of the crusades the different Philistine cities at times played important roles.


PHILLPOTTS, Henry, D.D., Bishop of Exeter; b. at Gloucester, 1777; d. at Bishopstoke, Sept. 18, 1869. He was graduated B. A. at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 1795; was successively prebendary of Durham (1809), dean of Chester (1828), and bishop of Exeter (1830). He was the recognized head of the High-Church party, and, in the House of Lords, was upon the extreme Tory side, opposing every kind of liberal measure. He was also involved in several memorable controversies, especially with the Roman-Catholic historians. Lingard (1808) and Charles Butler (1822). But he is best known in the "Gorham Case" (which see). On the reversal of the lower courts' decision before the House of Lords, he presented A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury (London and New York, 1850), in which he defended the archbishop.

PHILO, b. at Alexandria about 20 B.C.; d. in the reign of Claudius. Very little is known of his life. The sources consist only of scattered notices in his own writings ("Legat. ad Caj., 22, 28; Contra Flaccum; De spec. leg., ii. 1; De provid., 2, 107), and in those of Josephus (Ant., XVIII. 8, 1, XX. 5, 2), Euse-

The peculiar blending of Jewish monotheism and Hellenic pantheism which meets us in the works of Philo is not simply an individual feature of the author. An attempt at combination between Greek and Hebrew wisdom, a process of assimilation of those two elements, had gone on for a long time in Alexandria. It may be traced back even to the translators of the Septuagint. But Philo is the legitimate representative of that movement, its result. Already the Fathers were struck by the thoroughness with which his whole mind seemed permeated by Plato. Either Philo platonizes, or Plato philonizes, says Suidas; and Philo himself always speaks of Plato as the great, the holy. This must not be understood, however, as if Philo had sacrificed anything substantial of the faith of the Old Testament to the fancy of the Greek philosophy, any thing substantial of Judaism to Platonism. By no means! His faith in the living, personal God never wavered,—the Creator and the Ruler of the world, who, out of the whole human race, had chosen Israel as his own people, and revealed himself to them through Moses. To Philo, Moses was the prophet among the prophets, and the Mosaic law the sum total of all revealed wisdom. The fundamental character of his mind is positive, not negative. Faith and piety are to him the highest virtues: criticism is nothing. The influence he has received from Hellenism consists chiefly in a certain element of mysticism, which tempers the sternness of the Jewish consciousness of God, and softens the austere morality of the Old Testament. See WOLFF: Philo's Philosophie, Gothenburg, 1859; STEENBERG: Om Philos Gudserljendelse, Copenhagen, 1870; [DRUMMOND: Philo: Principles of the Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy, London, 1877].

His allegory contra Platonum, always artificial, often extravagant, and sometimes violent, has been exclusively from the Greek philosophers, especially Plato and the Stoics. The Stoics liked to dissolve the Greek myths into abstract ideas, to reduce to simple observations the images and personifications contained in the traditions of the popular religion; and the method they employed was the allegory. This method Philo adopted, and applied to the Bible. The Bible he taught has a double meaning,—a literal and an allegorical; the latter pervading the former like a fine fluid; and there are cases in which the literal sense must be altogether excluded, as, for instance, when a passage states something unworthy of God (God planting trees, questioning Adam, descending from heaven, etc.), or something self-contradictory (Ishmael with Hagar, at the same time a sucking infant and a half-grown boy, Cain building a city, the eunuch Poliphar having a wife, etc.). See STEENBERG: Om Philos Gudserljendelse, Copenhagen, 1870, and C. Siegfried: Philo als Ausleger d. A.T., Jena, 1875.

By writers of the rationalistic school, Philo is generally represented as having exercised a deci-
sive influence, not only on the ancient Christian theology, but even on Christianity itself. See Ballenstedt: Philo und Johannes, 1812; Gföhrer: Philo, 1831; and Geschichte des Urchristentums, 1838; Grossman: Quaestiones Philonicae, 1829; and others. But not the least bit of evidence has ever been offered of an historical connection between Philo and the founder of Christianity, or his apostles. The whole basis of the assertion is a merely incidental resemblance between certain theological ideas and expressions in the works of Philo and the books of the New Testament; and, when the logos-doctrine of John has been represented as directly derived from the logos-doctrine of Philo, the representation rests upon a gross mistake. The logos of Philo is a cosmic, naturalistic power, without real personality, borrowed from the Greek philosophy; while the logos of John is an ethical personality in the highest sense of the word,—the realization of the Messianic idea of the Old Testament. Philo's 

Lehre von den göttlichen Mittelwesen, Leipzig, 1846; Max Heine: Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie, Oldenburg, 1872; Soulier: La doctrine du Logos chez Philon, Turin, 1875; F. Klaseen: Der Logos der jud.-alex. Religionsphilosophie, Freiburg, 1879. But his exegetical method, with its principle of allegorization, was generally adopted and extensively employed by the ancient Fathers, not only by Barnabas, Justin, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and Eusebius, but also by Jerome and Ambrose. See Dähne: Geschichtliche Darstellung der jud.-alex. Religionsphilosophie, Halle, 1884.

Zöckler.
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PHILOPATRIS is mentioned in Polybius (Vita Epiphanii, c. 49), and by Suidas; but whether he was from the city of Carpassia in the Island of Cyprus, or from the Island of Carpathes, situated between Creta and Rhodus, cannot be ascertained, nor whether he is the author of the Commentary on the Canticles, which was published in a Latin translation in 1587, by Stephanus Salvianus, in Paris. Gass.

PHILOPATRIS is a name of a dialogue found among the works of Lucian, and generally quoted as an example of Greek philosophy. Its literary worth is null, but the historical notices it contains have given rise to some investigations concerning the date of its authorship. Geiger places it in the time of Julian (De aetate et auctore dialogi ... qui F. inscribitur, Jena, 1714); Ehemann (see Studien der engl. Geistlichkeit Würtemberg, 1839), in the time of Valens; Niebuhr (Kleine historische und philosophische Schriften, ii.), in the tenth century, under Nicephorus Phocas, 963-989; and Wessig (De aetate et auctore P. dialogi, Coblenz, 1868), under Johannes Tzimies, 989-976. Niebuhr's hypothesis is supported by a recent writer, Salzmann.

PHILOPATRIS. See JOHN PHILOPONUS.

PHILOPONUS. See JOHN PHILOPONUS.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION. Both philosophy and religion must first have had some historical development before their relations could appear for investigation. In fact, they may be said to have moved apart until the Christian era, when they openly met as strangers whose mutual interests were yet to be perceived and adjusted. It was not until Christianity had emerged from the symbols of Judaism, that religion stood forth in a mature form, free from philosophic speculation; and it was not until Grecian wisdom had outgrown the myths of Heathenism, that philosophy appeared in a pure state, disengaged from religious superstition. Nor was it strange that the first meeting of the two great powers should have resulted in misunderstanding and conflict. The early Christians, claiming a revealed knowledge from Heaven, could only denounce philosophy as the foolishness of this world; and the philosophers, in their sceptical pride of intellect, were fain to despise Christianity as a mere vulgar superstition. The struggle had its practical issue in the bitter persecutions which prevailed until the triumph of Christianity under Constantine. Since this first encounter, the relations of philosophy and religion have passed through various phases, marked by the chief epochs of church history. In the patristic age (A.D. 200–500) the previous conflict had become exchanged for an alliance; and philosophy and religion were blended within the limits of Christian civilization. The Greek Fathers—Justin Martyr, Clement, and Origen—stooped to base their apologetics upon the theism and ethics of Plato, and even to couch the mysteries of the trinity, the incarnation, and the atonement, in terms of the Platonic metaphysics. And though some of the Latin Fathers, such as Tertullian and Ireneaus, betrayed an anti-philosophical tendency, yet others, such as Lactantius and Augustine, did not scruple to employ the rhetoric and logic of Aristotle. The union had its hybrid fruit in that half-Pagan, half-Christian civilization which perished in the fall of the Roman Empire.

In the scholastic age (A.D. 900–1400) the former alliance grew into a bondage; and religion in a dogmatic form subjigated philosophy to the service of orthodoxy. The great schoolmen, such as Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus, simply aimed to systematize the patristic opinions by means of the Aristotelian logic, treating the physics and metaphysics as mere tributary provinces of revealed theology. There were a few philosophic divines, such as Scotus Eriugena, Abelard, Roger Bacon, who for their speculations and researches incurred persecution as heretics. The despotism had its imposing manifestation in that pseudo-Christian civilization which rendered all the art, as well as science, of the middle ages, subservient to the aggrandizement of the papal hierarchy.

In the reforming age (A.D. 1500–1800) the bondage bred a rupture, and philosophy and religion once more became independent. On the philosophic side, the revolt of reason appeared successively in Italian naturalism, as led by Pompontius, Cardan, Vanini; in English deism, as led by Herbert, Hobbes, Hume; in French atheism, as led by Voltaire, Helvétius, Diderot; and, more recently, in German pantheism, as led by Strauss and Feuerbach. On the religious side, the recoil of faith was seen in Roman Catholicism, as re-established by Bellarmin and Loyola on the traditional patristic and scholastic dogmas; in Protestantism, as organized by Luther, Calvin, Knox, and Cranmer, by means of the reformed creeds and confessions; and ultimately in a growing sectarianism, which has filled Christendom with polemical feuds to the present hour. At the same time, the wonderful intellectual activity of the
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period has been practically expressed in that rich, progressive Christian civilization which has resuscitated Europe, colonized America, and is already advancing throughout Asia and Africa.

At length, in this present critical age (A.D. 1800-83), the schism has become a truce; and philosophical religion and divines, as well as Clarke and Wolf, have been striving to show that the Christian religion is reasonable as well as credible. But, although in proof, both evidentialschools (Chalmers and Mansel, as well as Mansel, Parker, and Greg, who have been constructing a separatedevelopmentsoextreme. Never before have they reached a separate development so extreme. Never before have their relations appeared so problematical; and never before has the need of their reconciliation become so imperative. A few theologians may still talk of dispensing with philosophy, and a few philosophers may dream of superseding religion; but the intelligent mass of thinkers and divines is confidently awaiting an harmonious settlement.

At the threshold of the question, it is necessary to discriminate between true and false religious and profane philosophy. All the great philosophers, from Plato to Hegel, instead of assailing religion, have claimed to free it from superstition and error; and all the great theologians, from Clement to Calvin and Schleiermacher, have interpreted St. Paul as deprecating, not so much a sound Christian philosophy, as one that was deceitful, and not after Christ. Only by some gross abuse of either or both has the union between them ever bred what Bacon terms an heretical religion and a fantastical philosophy.

It may be well also to distinguish their theoretical from their practical import. Their relative worth and dignity as pursuits and interests cannot predetermine their abstract truth and knowledge. Let it be assumed, once for all, that religion is the one supreme human concern, to which philosophy itself is but subsidiary, and we may then safely proceed to define their reciprocal relations and prerogatives.

The Relation of Philosophy to Religion. — The relation of philosophy to religion has become apparent in every province of religious science. (1) In natural theology, philosophy comes as a witness to prove the divine being and attributes, the divine government, the present state of probation, the future state of rewards and punishments. These are tenets common to all religions, and logically prior, if not fundamental, to revealed religion. The Pagan, the Deist, and the Christian — Cicero, Herbert, and Butler — have been agreed in accepting them; and orthodox divines, as well as devout philosophers, have ever employed the physical and mental sciences for their confirmation and illustration.

In apologetical theology, philosophy appears as a judge to collect the evidences of Christianity, both internal and external, and estimate their logical and ethical value. It was long ago argued by Bishop Butler, that reason, which is our only faculty for judging any thing, is a proper critic of the evidences, though not of the purport or content, of a supposed revelation, unless the latter be found plainly absurd or immoral; and all the great apologists, from the time of Justin Martyr, have adopted this principle. The divine authority of Christianity is reasonable as well as credible. But, whether its miracles or its doctrines be put foremost in proof, both evidential schools (Chalmers and Mansel, as well as Clarke and Wolf) have claimed to offer a more or less philosophical vindication of its truth and value. The countless works which have accumulated on the miraculous, prophetical, historical, scientific, and experimental evidences of Christianity, remain as but so many philosophic judgments in its favor.

(3) In dogmatic theology, philosophy is admitted no longer as a witnes or a judge, but rather as a disciple and handmaid of revealed religion, to learn its teachings, and organize them into a logical system. Once inside an accredited revelation, reason herself is ready to accept mysteries and even paradoxes. But the truths of Holy Scripture, however clear to believing minds, are not given in scientific terms, and can only be formulated by the rational faculty as trained in schools of human learning and consecrated by the Divine Spirit. Accordingly, the Fathers, the schoolmen, the reformers, and the later divines have all proceeded more or less philosophically in their conceptions. Not only so, but the most peculiar mysteries of revelation — the trinity, the incarnation, the atonement — have found frequent expression and illustration in philosophical systems of purely human origin; so that the dogmatic theology still current is full of the ideas and terms of Greek, Roman, and Arabian philosophy, as well as of the later schools of French, English, and German thought. The names of Malebranche, Cudworth, Schleiermacher, and Hodge, are enough to suggest how largely theologians have made use of philosophical learning and speculation.

(4) Even in polemical and practical theology, philosophy may be of essential service in adapting revealed doctrines to the existing state of Christianity and civilization.

The Relation of Religion to Philosophy. — The relation of religion to philosophy, though not so obvious, is quite as important, according to any definition that may be employed. (1) Philosophy, as the comprehensive science of things divine and human, embraces theology with the other sciences, and would remain forever incomplete without it. Religion is at least a conspicuous phenomenon to be explained, and the philosophy of religions is recognized as having a state of rewards and punishments. These are tenets common to all religions, and logically prior, if not fundamental, to revealed religion. The Pagan, the Deist, and the Christian — Cicero, Herbert, and Butler — have been agreed in accepting them; and orthodox divines, as well as devout philosophers, have ever employed the physical and mental sciences for their confirmation and illustration.

(2) In apologetical theology, philosophy appears as a judge to collect the evidences of Christianity, both internal and external, and estimate their logical and ethical value. It was long ago argued by Bishop Butler, that reason, which is our only faculty for judging any thing, is a proper critic of the evidences, though not of the purport or content, of a supposed revelation, unless the latter be found plainly absurd or immoral; and all the great apologists, from the time of Justin Martyr, have adopted this principle. The divine authority of Christianity is reasonable as well as credible. But, whether its miracles or its doctrines be put foremost in proof, both evidential schools (Chalmers and Mansel, as well as Clarke and Wolf) have claimed to offer a more or less philosophical vindication of its truth and value. The countless works which have accumulated on the miraculous, prophetical, historical, scientific, and experimental evidences of Christianity, remain as but so many philosophic judgments in its favor.

(3) In dogmatic theology, philosophy is admitted no longer as a witnes or a judge, but rather as a disciple and handmaid of revealed religion, to learn its teachings, and organize them into a logical system. Once inside an accredited revelation, reason herself is ready to accept mysteries and even paradoxes. But the truths of Holy Scripture, however clear to believing minds, are not given in scientific terms, and can only be formulated by the rational faculty as trained in schools of human learning and consecrated by the Divine Spirit. Accordingly, the Fathers, the schoolmen, the reformers, and the later divines have all proceeded more or less philosophically in their conceptions. Not only so, but the most peculiar mysteries of revelation — the trinity, the incarnation, the atonement — have found frequent expression and illustration in philosophical systems of purely human origin; so that the dogmatic theology still current is full of the ideas and terms of Greek, Roman, and Arabian philosophy, as well as of the later schools of French, English, and German thought. The names of Malebranche, Cudworth, Schleiermacher, and Hodge, are enough to suggest how largely theologians have made use of philosophical learning and speculation.

(4) Even in polemical and practical theology, philosophy may be of essential service in adapting revealed doctrines to the existing state of Christianity and civilization.
ency. Separate from theism, the metaphysical ideas of causality, absoluteness, and infinity, can only appear vague and contradictory; but they at once become clear and congruous in the conception of an Absolute Will or Infinite Reason as the first and final cause of the phenomenal universe. Such a conception is not to be arbitrarily set aside as a mere anthropomorphic sentiment or superstition because it happens so largely to be the result of mere fancy, and the delusion of the imagination. In the dry light of pure thought it affords a consistent theory of the world, which has satisfied even atheistic and pantheistic metaphysicians like Schopenhauer and Hegel, as well as theistic metaphysicians like Descartes and Berkeley; while in practical research it has been used as a sort of rational postulate by great physicists like Newton and Herschel, who have thus sought to give unity to their scientific knowledge. The agnostic school of Hamilton, Mansel, and Herbert Spencer, has simply been purging theology from that grosser anthropomorphism which philosophic divines have ascribed from the time that St. Paul first reproved it at the Athenian altar to the Unknown God. In like manner the pessimistic school of Hartmann and Bahrnsen is but emphasizing the riddles of evil, pain, and chance, which were long since met by revealed religion, and can only be fully solved through its aid, as the younger Fichte and Ulrici have shown. And though the history of Christian Gnosticism, as seen especially in the schools of Schelling and Marbeinecke, has been full of mystical conceits, yet it serves at least to show to what extent the dogmas of creation, redemption, and judgment, have been philosophically employed in explaining the origin, development, and destiny of the universe. Theology, therefore, besides being the highest of the empirical sciences, is also their metaphysical foundation and complement, without which they would fall into nescience and absurdity, and the chief problems of philosophy remain forever insoluble.

(3) Philosophy, as the supreme science of the sciences, admits revelation as a correlate factor with reason in each of those sciences. Revelation by its very definition is complementary to reason, making known the otherwise unknowable, and thus meeting our intellectual and moral necessities. The Christian revelation in particular is found to be a transcendent communication of divine wisdom, and as such has been largely employed by philosophers, no less than theologians, in supplementing and completing the purely rational portions of our knowledge. It is, in fact, the fitting reward of philosophy for her service to theology in demonstrating the authority of revelation, that she thereby supplies the exigency of reason, and so may connect the infinite mind of God with the finite mind of man throughout the realm of cognition. The few irreligious thinkers like Comte, Mill, and Spencer, who have treated of the logic of the sciences in an otherwise luminous manner, have strangely overlooked, not merely the whole metaphysical domain of those sciences, but the existence therein of a conspicuous, objective revelation, historically attested by an immense mass of cumulative evidence. This evidence, in itself, is not as to their extent, as those which uphold the Newtonian theory of the solar system. And even Christian thinkers, the most learned in divinity, have yet to see more clearly the strictly philosophical value of that revelation in removing intellectual error and ignorance, as well as moral and practical depravity, and thus perfecting science no less than religion. The truth is, that philosophy, in order to accomplish its own highest aim and function as the science and art of knowledge, must begin by assuming revelation and reason to be joint factors of knowledge, and then be able to ascertain their normal, existing, and prospective relations in the scale of the sciences, and to formulate the logical rules for organizing the existing medley of rational and revealed truths, theories, and doctrines. In other words, the very foundations of a complete philosophical system must be partly laid in natural theology and the Christian evidences; and no one can foretell to what extent even dogmatic theology, as we now know it, may yet enter with the physical and mental sciences into the growing superstructure of the temple of knowledge.

(4) Finally, in the most practical sense, philosophy as the pursuit of wisdom, needs the religious graces of reverence, docility, and faith, together with the more purely philosophical virtues of abstraction, candor, and catholicity, in all efforts after knowledge and truth.

**The Harmony of Philosophy and Religion.** — If the foregoing definitions be correct, the relations of philosophy and religion are neither hostile nor indifferent, but reciprocal and harmonious. In their actual development they have become so connected that neither can do without the other; and in their mutual completion, whenever attained, would be involved at once the consummation of human knowledge and the full vindication of the Christian religion. To such an ultimate philosophy, so based upon the concurrence of reason and revelation, the Christian thinkers of all ages have aspired with more or less intelligence; and a clear presentiment of its inevitable approach may be said to have already arisen in minds of "large discourse, looking before and after."

It is an encouraging sign of the times, that these views have begun to pervade our systems of education, learning, and literature. The apparent breach between philosophy and religion is becoming practically healed in divinity schools, colleges, and learned societies, by the establishment of professorships, lectureships, prize-essays, and memoirs, specially devoted to the harmony of science and faith, and the promotion of Christian philosophy. The press is also teeming with works to the same purport, so numerous that it would be impossible to name them. The reader is referred to the writings of the younger Fichte, Ulrici, and Zöckler of Germany, Murphy, Calderwood, and Fairbairn of Great Britain, and Henry B. Smith, McCosh, and Porter, for examples of authors who have more or less directly treated of the subject of this article.

**PHILOSOPHY, American Christian Institute of,** was founded in 1881, by Rev. Dr. C. F. Deems of New-York City, for the purpose of investigating fully and impartially the most important questions of science and philosophy, more especially those that bear upon the great truths revealed in Holy Scripture. The institute holds
PHILOSTORGIUS. the Arian church historian; b. in Cappadocia in 368; studied mathematics, astronomy, medicine, etc., in Constantinople; and died after 426: nothing more is known of his life. Of his Ecclesiastical History, in twelve books, only excerpts have come down to us, made by Photius (Bibl. Cod., 40), who recommends its ornate and pleasant style, though, of course, he condemns its tendency. It began with the controversy between Arius and Alexander, and ended at 426. It represents Arianism as the older, the genuine Christianity, which was overthrown by the violence and intrigues of the so-called orthodox party, and sides at every point with the Arians, but contains, nevertheless, many valuable historical notices. The excerpts were first edited by Juc. Gothofredus, Geneva, 1493, then by Vale- sius, Paris, 1673, and at Canterbury, 1720. They were reprinted by Migne.

PHILOSTRATUS, Flavius, b. in the second half of the second century of our era; a native of the Island of Lemnos; studied rhetoric in Athens, and afterwards taught philosophy in Rome, where he became acquainted with Julia Domna, the wife of Alexander Severus. At her instance he wrote a life of Apollonius of Tyana,— partly from documents in her possession,— which at various times has played quite a conspicuous part in the attacks on Christianity. It was translated into English by Charles Blount (1800) and by Rev. Edward Berwick (1809), into French by Chatillon (1774), and into German by Eduard Baltzer, Rudolstadt-i.-Th., 1883. He also wrote Lives of the Sophists, Commentaries on the lives of the Heroes of Homer, descriptions of paintings, letters, etc. The best critical edition of his poetical works by Kayser, Leipzig 1870, 2 vols.

PHILOXENUS, whose true name was Xenias; b. at Tahal in Persia; consecrated Bishop of Hierapolis (Mabug), near Antioch, about 500; was one of the leaders of the Monophysite party, and one of the most active adversaries of the Chalcedon Decrees. Of his writings, only the titles have come down to us (De trium vitae et incantatione, De uno ex trium vitae incantate et passo, Tractatus in Nosterianos et Eutychianos, etc.), and a few fragments, preserved by Barhebraeus and Dionysius Bar- libi, and collected by Assemani in his Bibl. Orient., II. For the Syriac version of the New Testament, which was made by Rural Bishop Polycarp, and is called the Philoxenian, see Bible Versions, p. 287.

PHOCAS, a gardener of Sinope in Pontus; suffered martyrdom in the most cruel manner under Trajan, or perhaps under Diocletian. He was the Eastern counterpart of the St. Erasmus or St. Eimo of the West, both of whom are among the sailors, who during the storm sung hymns to his praise, left a place vacant for him at the dinner-table, and, when the trip was over, distributed a portion of the profit in his name to the poor. The Emperor Phocas considered him as his patron-saint, and built a magnificent church in his honor at Dihippion, near Constantinople. He is commemorated by the Greek Church on Sept. 22, by the Latin on July 14. See Asteni Aen. orat. in Phocam, in Migne: Patr. Graec., vol. 40. Different from him is the Anthochian martyr of the same name, race, and name of Tours, in his De glor. mart., 99. To touch the door of his tomb was a sure cure when bitten by a serpent. Act. Sanct., July III. ZöCKLER.

PHOENICIA (Greek, Φωνικία; Latin, Phœnicia). The derivation of the name is doubtful, as the Greek Phœnix means both a date-palm and a deep-red color: the latter sense, however, referring to the reddish-brown color of the skin of the Phœni- cians, seems to be preferable. The natives called themselves Kenaani, and their land Kenaan. The Old Testament generally designates the Phœnicians as Canaanites, though sometimes, also, as Sidonians: in the New Testament the land is spoken of as the coasts of Tyre and Sidon (Matt. xxv. 11; comp. Mark iii. 8, vii. 24). According to Augustine, the Punic peasants of Northern Africa, descendants of Tyrian settlers, still called themselves Chanaani in the fifth century.

The country occupied the narrow plain between the Mediterranean and the western slopes of Lib- banon, from the Eleutherus in the north, to Mount Carmel in the south. It was well watered and very fertile, and produced an enormous amount of wheat, wine, fruit, etc. Iron and copper mines were worked. Glass and purple were among its most famous manufactures. The Bible mentions the following cities: Acrab, Azib, Zor (Tyre), Zarpath, Sidon, Berothah, Gebal or Byblos, Tripolis, Orthosias, Sin, Arke, Simyra, Arvad or Aradus.

According to Gen. x. 6, 18, the Phœnicians were Hamites, as were all the Canaanites. That statement, however, has been much questioned on account of the close relation between the Phœnician and the Hebrew language. Hebrew is, indeed, in Isa. xix. 18, called the language of Canaan. And how came the Phœnicians to speak a Semitic language, when the Semitic race has entirely different features,— a race which allied them to the Egyptians and Ethiopians? There seems to be no other explanation possible than a change of tongue; though it must be left undecided whether that change took place before or after their settlement in Canaan, in the midst of a native Semitic population. Herodotus tells us, that, according to their own traditions, the Phœni- cians came from the Erythraean Sea (the Per- sian Gulf), and penetrated through Syria to the Mediterranean coast, about three thousand years before our era; and Strabo contains the remarkable notice, that the inhabitants of Tyrrus and Aradus, two islands in the Persian Gulf, had temples similar to those of the Phœnicians, and declared the Phœnician cities of Tyre and Aradus to be their colonies. Nevertheless, though the Phœnicians adopted the Semitic tongue, and lived, at least at times, in very friendly relations with Israel, their organization, their commercial and industrial spirit, their talent for navigation and colonization, etc., distinguish them very clearly from the Sem- ites, and corroborate the statement of the Bible, that they were Hamites.
PHOCENIA. PHOTIUS.
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Some traces of the oldest history of Phoenicia have been preserved in the monuments of Egypt. Shortly after the death of Alexander the Great, the Pharaohs began their campaigns into Asia; and for a long period the Phoenician cities stood under Egyptian authority. They paid an annual tribute, and enjoyed, in reward, certain commercial privileges in Egypt. In the first half of the twelfth century the precedence acquired by the Phoenicians over the Assyrians was extinguished by the Syrianization of their kingdom, and their commercial relations were divided between the Pharaohs and the Babylonians. At the same time the Phoenicians carried on their commerce along the shores of the western portion of the Mediterranean. They penetrated through the Strait of Tharsis (Gibraltar), visited the Canaries Islands and Britain; and in the middle of the century Carthage was founded by a Tyrian princess, Elis-sa, the Dido of Virgil. At the same time the contests began between the Phoenicians and the Assyrians. In most cases, however, the Phoenicians preferred to secure their commercial privileges by the payment of a tribute; though at times some very fierce fighting took place, as, for instance, against Nebuchadnezzar, in 592 B.C. The Persian kings, who were very much in need of maritime support, were consequently accommodating in their policy towards Phoenicia. After the conquest of Tyre by Alexander, the precedence passed to Aradus, and afterwards to Tripolis, the Three-City (thus called because it was founded by colonists from Sidon, Tyre, and Aradus), where the council of three hundred senators assembled under the presidency of the king of the three mother-cities. Under the Roman rule the Phoenician cities retained their municipal organization, with the only change that the royal power was abolished.

Their great name in the history of the world the Phoenicians owe to their commercial talent and energy: for centuries they carried on the whole exchange between Asia and Europe, the East and the West. Some of their reputed discoveries—the art of writing, of glass-making, of purple-dyeing, etc.—may not be original in the strict sense of the word: but the utilization of those arts, their general introduction, was, at all events, due to the Phoenicians; and they were, without doubt, the most audacious and enterprising navigators of antiquity. It was not without reason that the Greeks called the polar star the Phoenician star. Their literature was probably considerable; but only a few remnants of it have come down to us through Greek translations—the so-called Periplus, the history of Sauchunia (fragments in Eusebius), etc. In the second century of our era their language died out in Asia, superseded by the Greek: in Northern Africa it lived on among the peasants until the sixth century; and in Carthage, by the preachers of St. Augustine, into the seventh century. It exists only in a number of inscriptions on coins, medals, sarcophagi (Eshmanazar), etc. For their religion, see the articles on ASTARTE, BAAL, etc.


PHOTIUS, a native of Ancyra, a pupil of Marcellus, and afterwards Bishop of Sirmium in Pannonia; was consecrated by the bishop of Ambro- tius (344) as an adherent of the homoousian doctrine, and also by the synod of Milan (345), because he developed the homoousian doctrine into open antagonism to the doctrine of hypostasis. He was finally deposed by the synod of Sirmium (351); but his party continued on, as the synod of Aquileia (381) may still see in his expression. His writings have perished; but his opinions are known to us through Athanasius (De Synod. 20–27), Socrates (Hist. Eccl., ii. 19, 30), Hilary (De Synod. 37), and the acts of his condemnation in Mansi: Coll. Ampl., ii. and iii. W. MÖLLER.

PHOTIUS, b. in the first decade of the ninth century; d. in 891. In 846 the Empress Theodora, regent during the minority of her son Michael III., appointed Ignatius, the youngest son of Michael I., and a man of unblemished character, Patriarch of Constantinople. Bardas, however, the vicious uncle of Michael III., succeeded in estranging the young emperor from his mother; and when Ignatius refused to force Theodora into a nunnery, and in 857 even dared to exclude Bardas from the Lord's Supper on account of his abominable behavior, the latter had him deposed, and banished to the Island of Tere-butha. The patriarchal see of Constantinople thus became vacant, and Bardas was looking about for a fit occupant. His choice fell upon Photius.

Photius was rich; he belonged to a distinguished family; he held a prominent position in public life; and he was already celebrated as one of the most learned men of his time: but he was not a theologian. Of course, as he had studied the science of the age in its widest compass, he was well acquainted with the Christian dogmas, and well versed in ecclesiastical affairs. But his official position was that of protospatharios, or captain of the body-guard; and he had been most active as a diplomat. It was not without precedence, however, that a layman was raised to the patriarchal see; though it certainly looked a little strange that Gregory of Syracuse, a bitter enemy of Ignatius, in five days hurried him through the five orders of monk, lector, sub-deacon, deacon, and presbyter, and on the sixth consecrated him patriarch. But Ignatius could not be made to submit, though a synod of Constantinople (859) confirmed his deposition and condemnation. He found support in the West, and soon the whole clergy of the Eastern Church was divided into two hostile parties. The emperor addressed a letter to the Pope, asking him to interfere; and Photius also wrote to him, modestly, even submissively, and defending himself with great shrewdness and tact. Nicholas I. accepted the invitation; but, on the basis of the newly introduced pseudo-Isidorian decretals, he accepted it, not as mediator, but as judge. He sent two bishops—Rhadalof of Porto, and Zacharias of Anagni—as legates to Constantinople, where a numerously attended synod was convened in 861. By intrigues, and, as some say, by violence, Ignatius was forced to accept the Photian creeds. The latter again wrote to the Pope in order to explain the position, and, if possible, to gain his favor. But Nicholas I.
had now become fully informed about the true state of the affairs. In 868 he convened a synod in Constantinople, punished the legates for disobedience, and excommunicated Photius. The emperor answered in a letter full of furious invectives. The new papal embassy was not allowed to enter Constantinople; and Photius at once changed attitude, turning the controversy between the patriarch of Constantinople and the obedient to the creed, and called upon all bishops, archbishops, and patriarchs of the Greek Church to unite firmly and cordially against the common foe.

The controversy between the Eastern and the Western Churches had now become fully informed about the true state of the affairs. In 868 he convened a synod in Constantinople (867), and which, though it was packed, pretended to be ocumenical, he formally excommunicated the Pope. But in September, same year, Michael III. was assassinated; and the first act of his assassin and successor, Basilios Macedo, was to depose Photius, and recall Ignatius. Political calculations seem to have been the ruling motive for these proceedings. Basilios needed the support of the party of Ignatius and of the Pope; and consequently the papal supremacy was recognized, and the papal legates were again received in Constantinople. A synod was convened in 869, and Photius was not only deposed, but condemned as a liar, adulterer, parricide, and heretic, and shut up in the dungeon of a distant monastery, where he was even deprived of his books. As time rolled on, however, circumstances changed. Photius was allowed to return to Constantinople; he was even made tutor to the imperial princes. He was also reconciled to Ignatius; and, when the latter died (in 878), he quietly took possession of the patriarchal see. The Roman legates who were present at the synod of Constantinople (879) — the so-called Photian Synod — made no objection; and the frauds which had taken place at the two preceding synods were put down as the true cause of all the confusion. Even the Pope seemed willing to drop the case. He afterwards changed his mind, however; and in 882 he renewed the ban on Photius, which none of his successors could be induced to take away. Shortly after, Photius fell under the suspicion of political intrigues, and embezzlement of public money; and in 886 the emperor, Leo Philopator, a son of Basilios, banished him to an Armenian monastery, where he remained for the rest of his life. Whatever verdict may be given on Photius as a church officer, his literary merits, not only in the field of theology, but also in those of philosophy, canon law, and history of literature, are beyond cavil. The principal monument which he has left of his erudition is his Πραξική, a church officer, his literary merits, not only in the field of theology, but also in those of philosophy, canon law, and history of literature, are beyond cavil. The principal monument which he has left of his erudition is his Πραξική, a work unique in its kind, the product of a stupendous industry, and the most comprehensive lexicon of its age. It consists of codices, that is, chapters of unequal length, strung together without any material or chronological principle of arrangement, and containing the legates for disobedience, and excommunicated Photius. The emperor answered in a letter full of furious invectives. The new papal embassy was not allowed to enter Constantinople; and Photius at once changed attitude, turning the controversy between the patriarch of Constantinople and the obedient to the creed, and called upon all bishops, archbishops, and patriarchs of the Greek Church to unite firmly and cordially against the common foe.

Photius. 1838

Phylactery, the ψηλακτήρα (Matt. xxiii. 5). [i.e., a receptacle for safe-keeping], is a small square box, made either of parchment or black calf-skin, in which are enclosed slips of parchment or vellum, with Exod. xiii. 2-10, 11-17, Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-22, written on them, and which are worn on the head and left arm by the Jews, [on weekdays] mornings during the time of prayer. Jewish tradition finds the injunction concerning phylacteries in Exod. xiii. 5, 16; Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-22; but the Karaites, Lyons, Grotius, and others, take the passages in question in a figurative sense. At what time phylacteries were first worn is difficult to say; but the Jewish...
I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercies: and thou shalt know the Lord. 

As to the manner in which they are made, the following will give an illustration. A piece of leather is soaked, stretched on a square block cut for the purpose, sewed together with gut-strings while wet, and left on the block till it is dried and stiffened; so that when it is taken off it forms a square leather box. As the Mosaic code enjoins one for the hand, and another for the head, two such boxes are requisite for making the phylacteries. The box of which the phylactery for the hand is made has no inscription outside, and only one cell inside, wherein is deposited a parchment strip with the four following sections, written thereon in four columns. The striped box of which the phylactery for the head is made has on the outside, to the right, the regular three-pronged letter Shin, being an abbreviation for Shaddai ("the Almighty"), and on the left side a four-pronged letter Shin. Every male Jew, from the time that he is thirteen years of age, is obliged to wear the phylacteries. He first puts on one on the left arm through the sling formed by the long leather strap, wherewith the phylactery is attached about two thousand members. It is especially numerous in Austria-Hungary, where about twenty thousand pupils are under their care.

PIERCE. 

Phylactery. 1839


LEYERK. (B. PICK.)

PIARISTS, or Fathers of the Pious Schools, or Paulinian Congregation, an order of the Roman-Catholic Church, founded in 1600, in Rome, by a Spanish nobleman, Joseph Calasanze, and Josephus a Matre De; b. at Calasanze in Aragon, Sept. 11, 1556; d. in Rome, Aug. 22, 1648; canonized by Clement XIII. in 1767. He studied law at Lerida, and theology at Alcala; was ordained a priest in 1583, and went in 1592 to Rome, where he devoted his life to ascetic practices, nursing the sick, and teaching among the poor. He reassembled about two thousand members. It is especially numerous in Austra-Hungary, where about twenty thousand pupils are under their care.


ZÖCKLER.

PICAILDS, a corruption of Beghards, applied to some branches of the Bohemian Brethren. See Adamites.

PICTET, Benedict, b. at Geneva, May 30, 1655; d. there June 10, 1724. He studied theology, travelled much, and was in 1702 appointed professor of theology in his native city. His conversational writings (Entretiens de Philandre et d'Eva*, etc.) were also much valued. [See his Life by E. de Bude, Lausanne, 1874.]

HERZOG.

PICUS OF MIRANDULA. See Mirandula.

PIERCE, Lovick, D.D., a distinguished minister of the Methodist-Episcopal Church South; was b. in Halifax County, N.C., March 24, 1783; and in Sparta, Ga., Nov. 9, 1878, in the ninety-fifth year of his age. When he was but three years old, his parents moved to Barnwell District, S.C. His early educational advantages were very limited. In December 1865, he was "admitted to the military trial" into the South-Carolina conference. In 1809 he was married to Miss Ann Foster, daughter of Col. George Foster of Greene County, Ga., in the war of 1812 he served as chaplain in the army. At the conference which met in 1814 he located, but continued to do active service as a local preacher. He studied medicine and gradu-
PIERPONT. 1840

PIETISM.

Continued to practice medicine at Greensborough, Ga., until 1821 or 1822, when he re-entered the travelling connection of the Georgia conference; and from that time until his death he devoted himself actively and exclusively to the work of the ministry. He is the father of Bishop George F. Pierce, an eloquent divine of national denominational reputation. Dr. Pierce was pre-eminently an extemporaneous preacher. He was abundant in labors, and always ready. He possessed remarkable physical endurance, and was a man of great intellectual force and moral power. His preaching was eminently scriptural, practical, and spiritual, and was directed immediately to the conversion of sinners, or the upbuilding of believers. He was a strong believer in and advocate for the Wesleyan doctrine of sanctification. He was one of the first to encourage, and did much to advance, the cause of higher education in his church. No name is more intimately connected with the history of American Methodism than that of Dr. Lovick Pierce. Born six years before John Wesley died, he lived through, and worked with, three generations of Methodism; he lived to enjoy a peaceful old age, and crowned with the honors of a long and useful life the very principles of the Lutheran Reformation; and it would, no doubt, have developed, even though there had been no orthodoxy to react upon. The personal development of Spener before his public work began in 1670, assimilating, as it did, a great number of various influences, is one evidence. Another is the effect of his work, which was by no means spent with the end of the pietistic controversies at the death of Löschner, in 1747.

The movement first took shape in France, where Spener was appointed pastor in 1666. He met there with some of the worst features of the Lutheran Church,—sacerdotal arrogance, superficial confession-practice, neglect of the cure of souls, neglect of the instruction of the youth, etc.; and in 1670 he invited to a kind of friendly re-union in his study, for the purpose of reciprocal study to the church. Meanwhile, he published before his public work began in 1670, assimilating, as it did, a great number of various influences, is one evidence. Another is the effect of his work, which was by no means spent with the end of the pietistic controversies at the death of Löschner, in 1747.
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PILATE.

PILATE, Pontius, the fifth Roman procurator (prætor, "governor," Matt. xxvii. 2) of Judea and Samaria from A.D. 26-36, the successor of Valerius Gratus. His cognomen Pilate was derived either from pilum ("a javelin") or pilus ("the felt cap given to a manumitted slave in token of his freedom"): if from the latter, he had either been such a slave, or was the descendant of one, but his freedom "fervent with as much warmth as the pietists themselves.

Nevertheless, the fundamental ideas of Spener and his friends were too truly Christian, and too intimately related to the very principles of the Reformation, not to find a warm reception. Less than half a century pietism spread its influence through all spheres of life, and through all classes of society; and when, after the accession of Frederick II., it had to give way, in Northern Germany, to the rising rationalism, it found a new home in Southern Germany. What Spener, Francke, Anton, Breithaupt, Arnold, and others had been to Prussia and Saxony, Bengal, Weismann, Oetinger, Hahn, and others were to Württemberg and Baden. Indeed, the older school of Tübingen was principally based on pietism.
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PILGRIMAGES.

PILATE. from the Latin pergrinus ("foreign"), are journeys to holy places for the sake of devotion and edification. They are common to all religions,— to Hinduism, Judaism, and Mohammedanism, as well as to Christianity. Though Christ, in his conversation with the woman of Samaria (John iv.), warned against ascribing any particular value to any particular place, when the question of the salvation of our souls, it was not to be wondered at, that, when he found followers among foreign nations in foreign countries, they should feel attracted towards the places where he had wandered when in the flesh. The feeling is poetical in its character, rather than religious, and it becomes superstitious in the same degree as it pretends to be religious; but it is none the less natural. And in the middle of the fourth century, when Constantine and his mother Helena had visited Golgotha, Bethlehem, etc., and built churches there, pilgrimages to the Holy Land became quite frequent. In the eighth century Charlemagne made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem with Harun al-Raschid to procure safety to the Christian pilgrims in Jerusalem, and founded a Latin monastery in that city for their comfort. In the eleventh century it was the outrages to which the Christian pilgrims were exposed in Palestine, which, more than anything else, contributed to bring about the crusades. But in the mean time the church had taken the matter in hand; and, under her care, pilgrimages entirely changed character. They became "good works," penalties by which gross sins could be expiated, sacrifices by which holiness, or at least a measure of it, could be conquered. The pilgrim was placed under the special protection of the church: to maltreat him, or to deny him shelter and alms, was sacrilege. And when he returned victorious, having fulfilled his vow, he became the centre of the religious interest of the village, the town, the city, to which he belonged,—an object of holy awe. Thus pilgrimizing became a life-work, a calling. There were people who actually adopted it as a business, wandering all their life through from one shrine to another; for at that time the church had come to think that it was not necessary to send all those longing souls so far away as Palestine. Places of pilgrimage entirely changed character. They belonged, — an object of holy awe. Thus pilgrimizing became a life-work, a calling. There were people who actually adopted it as a business, wandering all their life through from one shrine to another; for at that time the church had come to think that it was not necessary to send all those longing souls so far away as Palestine. Places of pilgrimage entirely changed character. They belonged, — an object of holy awe. Thus pilgrimizing became a life-work, a calling. There were people who actually adopted it as a business, wandering all their life through from one shrine to another; for at that time the church had come to think that it was not necessary to send all those longing souls so far away as Palestine. Places of pilgrimage entirely changed character. They belonged, — an object of holy awe. Thus pilgrimizing became a life-work, a calling. There were people who actually adopted it as a business, wandering all their life through from one shrine to another; for at that time the church had come to think that it was not necessary to send all those longing souls so far away as Palestine.
were performed at Lourdes; immense crowds gathered every year; and in 1876 a large church was built above the grotto. To Knock, also, multitudes came for help, bodily and spiritual. But many modern pilgrims travel by rail. For the Roman-Catholic position on the subject, see Concord. Trident. Sessio xxx.; Schaff: Creeds, ii. p. 201; J. Marx: Das Wallfahren in der katholischen Kirche, Treves, 1842.

PILKINGTON, James, Bishop of Durham: b. at Rivington, Lancashire, Eng., 1599; d. at Bishop's Auckland, Jan. 23, 1575-76. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; was on the Continent during the reign of Mary; on his return he was appointed master of his college (1559), and on March 2, 1560-61, was consecrated bishop of Durham. He was one of the earliest promoters of Greek learning in England. His writings were much admired by the Puritans. They embrace Commentaries upon Haggai (London, 1560), Obadiah (1560), and upon part of Nehemiah (1585). These and other of his works were reprinted by the Parker Society in vol. Cambridge, 1842.

PIRME, Dominicus, D.D., b. at Annapolis, Md., April 17, 1810; d. at Cockeysville, Baltimore County, Md., July 4, 1888. He was graduated at St. John's College, Annapolis. He was successively rector in Somerset County, Md., 1836-38; from 1838 to 1855 at St. John's College, Cambridge; was on from 1855 to 1870 in Washington. On Oct. 6, 1870, he was consecrated assistant bishop of Maryland. On Oct. 17, 1879, he succeeded Bishop Whittingham as bishop. He was a decided Low-Churchman.

PIRKE Aboth (Sayings of the Fathers), the ninth tractate of the fourth order ("Damages") of the Mishnah. It consists of six chapters of chronologically arranged pithy sayings of eminent rabbis, like Hillel, Gamaliel, and Jehuda ha-Nasi, the redactor of the Mishnah. It is the oldest uncanonical collection of Jewish gnomes, and, by its easy Hebrew and interesting forms, forms an admirable introduction to rabbinical literature. Numerous are the reprints and editions of it; the most recent of the latter is by H. L. Strack: Die Sprüche der Väter, Karlsruhe, 1882 (56 pp.). Twice it has been translated into German (by G. H. Lehmann, Leipzig, 1884: and by Paul Eisinger, Erlangen, 1895), and once into English (by Charles Taylor: Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, Cambridge, 1877).

PIRMIN, St., flourished in the middle of the eighth century, but was almost entirely forgotten in the middle of the ninth. See the biographies of him in Mone: Quellenammlung, Carlruhe, 1818, Acta Sanctorum, and by M. Gürtingen, Zweibrücken, 1841. He founded many monasteries,—Reichenau, on Lake Constance; Marbach, in Upper Alsace; Hornbach, near Zweibrücken; where he died Nov. 3, probably 753. He is believed to be the author of the Dietc abbatis Prima, in the Vulgar Latin, and edited by C. P. Caspari, Christiana, 1885.

PISA, Councils of. 1. The first Council of Pisa was held in 1409, and was the result of an attempt to heal the great schism which had distracted the church since 1378. Two popes—one in Rome, and one in Avignon—were a heavy drain upon ecclesiastical resources; and their hostilities gave rise to extortions which were felt to become intolerable. The University of Paris took the lead in attempting to heal the schism; but it was difficult to find any way of dealing with the Papal monarchy, which was regarded as absolute by the canon law. The first papal, for a voluntary abdication on the part of both popes, naturally failed. The university then advocated a withdrawal of obedience from the popes, but this was found to be impracticable. On a vacancy in the Roman Patriacy, in 1409, the cardinals elected, not a pope, but a "commissioner for unity," in the person of the aged Gregory XII., who was bound by oath to abdicate, if the French Pope (Benedict XIII.) would abdicate also. Negotiations for this purpose were set on foot, and were warmly supported by the French court. Gregory XII. agreed to a conference with Benedict XIII. at Savona; but his greedy relatives, and the ambitious Ladislas, king of Naples, dissuaded him from fulfilling his promise. He advanced as far as Lucca in 1408, and there showed signs of pursuing an independent policy. As the first step in this direction, he announced his intention of creating a new batch of cardinals. As this was contrary to the oath which he had taken on his election, his cardinals resisted the proposal. When Gregory XII. persisted, they fled from Lucca to Livorno, and there issued a letter to the princes of Christendom, accusing Gregory of breach of faith. The king of France at the same time withdrew from obedience to Benedict XIII., and exhorted the cardinals to restore the peace of the church. The majority of the two colleges of cardinals united at Livorno, and summoned a general council to meet at Pisa in March, 1409. The aid of Florence, and of Cardinal Cossa, the Papal legate at Bologna, secured the council against King Ladislas, who tried to prevent its meeting.

The summons of a general council was felt at the time to be a great innovation. It was the result of the long schism and of the discussions which it had awakened. There was no constitutional means of bringing it to an end; and, in default of any recognized method, recourse was had to the primitive customs of the church. It was admitted that the assembling of a council had, for the sake of order, been limited by the papal power of summons; but this limitation did not extend to cases of urgency and necessity. In the present necessity, when the law of the church had failed, the wider equity of a council must interpret the law. These opinions had their origin in the theologians of the University of Paris, and were accepted by the cardinals as a justification of their procedure.

The council, which was largely attended, opened on March 25, 1409. It first cited the rival popes, who had been duly summoned. When they did not appear, they were declared contumacious. On April 24 charges were brought against them of being obstinate in their refusal to heal the schism, and consequently of being themselves schismatics and heretics. Commissioners were appointed to receive testimony on these points. On May 22 they reported that the charges were true and notorious. On June 5 the council declared Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. to be deposed as schismatics and heretics. All the faithful were absolved from allegiance to them; and they were declared to be of no effect. After this the
cardinals declared themselves ready to make a new election. On June 15 they went into conclave, and on June 26 elected Peter Philargii, a native of Crete, who took the title of Alexander V.

The cardinals, before the election, had agreed that the council should not dissolve until "a due, reasonable, and sufficient reform of the church, in head and members, had been brought about." But this work was never undertaken. The Pope's feeble health, and the desire of the members to leave Pisa, were given as excuses. A future council was promised, in which the question of reform should be taken up; and the Council of Pisa was dissolved on Aug. 5.

The Council of Pisa was not successful in its great object, — the restoration of the unity of the church. Instead of getting rid of the contending popes, it added a third. Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. might have fawen as enemies; but, so long as they had any, the Council of Pisa was a failure. This was recognized by the Council of Constance, which negotiated afresh for the abdication of Gregory and Benedict. According to the rules of canonists, the Council of Pisa was not a true council, because it was not summoned by a pope. It was regarded, soon after its dissolution, as of doubtful authority. This was greatly due to its want of success. It did not act wisely nor discreetly. From the beginning it over-rode the popes, and did not try to conciliate them. It accepted as valid all that the cardinals had done previously, and did not wait to take proceedings of its own. Moreover, it was unduly precipitate in its action, and did not give the popes an opportunity for submission, if they had wished it. Its importance lies in the fact, that it was the expression of the reforming ideas which the schism had brought into prominence. It was the first-fruits of the conciliar movement, which was the chief feature of the ecclesiastical history of the fifteenth century.

Lit. — Richer : Historia Conciliorum Generalium, lib. iv., part 1 (Cologne, 1883), contains the proceedings of the council and several of the writings to which it gave occasion. The Papal side is given in Raynaldu: Annales Ecclesiastici, sub annis 1511-12, 2 vols., Bois le Duc, 1877. — Mandell Creighton.

PISCIATOR (Fischer), Johannes, b. at Strasburg, March 27, 1546; d. at Herborn, July 26, 1526. He studied theology at Tübingen, and was in 1572 appointed professor in Strasbourg, but was soon after dismissed because he leaned towards Calvinism. In 1574 he was appointed professor at Heidelberg, but in 1577 he was dismissed again, for the same reason. Finally he was settled at the academy of Herborn, founded by the Reformed Count Johann of Nassau; and there he remained for the rest of his life. He translated the Bible (Herborn, 1602-24, 3 vols.), wrote Commentaries on several books both of the Old and New Testament, and published a number of doctrinal and polemical treatises. His doctrine of the insufficiency of the "active obedience" of Christ was rejected by the synod of Gap (1603), — and the synod of Rochelle (1607) even went so far as to denounce him to Count Johann as a heretic, — though it was accepted by many of the most learned Reformed theologians, as for instance, Pareus, Scultetus, Cappel, and others. Kerzog.

PISE, Charles Constantine, D.D., Roman-Catholic divine; b. at Strasbourg, March 27, 1546; d. at Herborn, July 26, 1526. He studied theology at Tübingen, and was in 1572 appointed professor in Strasbourg, but was soon after dismissed because he leaned towards Calvinism. In 1574 he was appointed professor at Heidelberg, but in 1577 he was dismissed again, for the same reason. Finally he was settled at the academy of Herborn, founded by the Reformed Count Johann of Nassau; and there he remained for the rest of his life. He translated the Bible (Herborn, 1602-24, 3 vols.), wrote Commentaries on several books both of the Old and New Testament, and published a number of doctrinal and polemical treatises. His doctrine of the insufficiency of the "active obedience" of Christ was rejected by the synod of Gap (1603), — and the synod of Rochelle (1607) even went so far as to denounce him to Count Johann as a heretic, — though it was accepted by many of the most learned Reformed theologians, as for instance, Pareus, Scultetus, Cappel, and others. Kerzog.

PISGAH, the summit from which Moses obtained his view of the promised land, and immediately before his death (Deut. xxxiv. 1). It was also the place of Balak's sacrifice, and Balaam's prophecy (Num. xxiii. 14). It was within Reuben's possessions (Josh. xiii. 14). The exact identification of Pisgah was long a problem, until the Duke of Luynes (1864) and Professor Paine of the American Palestine Exploration Society (1873), independently, for the duke's account was not published until after Paine's, identified it with Jebel Slaghah, the extreme headland of the range of Abarim, of which the highest summit is Nebo. See Nebo.
PISIDIA, a district of Asia Minor north of Pamphylia, and south of Phrygia. It was twice visited by Paul (Acts xiii. 14, xiv. 21-24). Very likely it was while going through this district that Paul was "in perils of robbers" (2 Cor. xi. 26), for the Taurus mountains, which ran through it, were infested with warlike tribes, which were a terror of the surrounding country. These tribes, under their own leaders, successfully resisted even the power of Rome. In Pisidia was a city called Antioch, to be distinguished from the store-city,— a fresh link connecting him with the oppression of the Israelites. It would seem that the terror of the surrounding country. These tribes, under their own leaders, successfully resisted even the power of Rome. It was the entrance of the East." It was a name common to several towns, such as Heliopolis. But Pithom-Succoth was called Hero ("storehouse"), or Heroopolis ("city") by the Greeks and Latins; "Hero" being the Greek transcription of Har, Ari, or Aru, which means "storehouse." M. Naville prepared a work on his Pithom discoveries, which was printed by the Egypt Exploration Fund, London, 1885.

PIUS is the name of nine popes. — Pius I. reigned in the middle of the second century; according to Iust., 142-157 (Reg. Pontif. Rom., 2d ed., Leipzig, 1881); according to Lipsius, 159-164, or 141-156 (Chronologiae d. Röm. Bischöfe, Kiel, 1860). Of his reign nothing is known. The decrees ascribed to him are spurious. He is a saint of the Roman-Catholic Church, and his memory is celebrated on July 11. See DUCHESNE: Études sur le Libel Pontifical (Paris, 1877), and the treatises by E. N. LAlberti, in Jahrbücher für protest. Theologie (1878 and 1880). — Pius II. (Aug. 19, 1458-Aug. 15, 1464), Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini; b. at Corsignano, near Siena, Oct. 18, 1465; belonged to a noble but poor family. He was enabled, however, to study at Siena and Florence; and in 1482 he accompanied Bishop Capranica of Fermo to the Council of Basle, as the secretary of his secretary. At Basel he joined the opposition party, took an active part in the negotiations which ended with the deposition of Eugenius IV., wrote his Commentary on the Council of Basel, and his Libellus dialogorum de generalis Concilii auctoritate, in defence of the superiority of an oecumenical council over the Pope, and became secretary to Felix V. In 1442 he entered the service of Friedrich III., who showed him great confidence, and used him in many important diplomatical missions. He was frivoulous and sensuous, the author of a heap of worthless verses, a slippery love-story (Eurialus and Lucretia), and a scandalous comedy (Chritia); but he was an able diplomat, acute and insinuating. It became necessary for him to change front; and with great adroitness he approached Eugenius IV., and obtained forgiveness. He wrote a new Commentary on the Council of Basle, but from a papal point of view; and published in 1447 his Epistola retractoria, recanting all his errors of former days. Nicholas V. made him Bishop of Trieste, 1447, and Bishop of Siena, 1450. Calixtus III. made him a cardinal in 1456. As he grew older, his amorous aberrations ceased, but he became avaricious and grasping. He was known as the most scheming and shameless benefice-hunter at the papal court, next to Rodrigo Borgia, the later Alexander VI. By the aid of the latter, he was elected Pope after the death of Calixtus III., and assumed the name of Pius II., probably with an allusion to Virgil's Pius Aeneas, from whom he claimed to descend. The accession of the poet-pope was hailed with great enthusiasm; but he soon disappointed his brethren of the guild, who expected larger pensions and a more flattering attention than he saw fit to bestow upon them. Only the artists, architects, poets, and literary men found liberal support at his court. The leading idea of his whole policy was the new crusade. The conquest of Constantinople by the Turks seems to have made a deep impression upon him; and on June 1, 1458, he opened a
congress of princes at Mantua, for the purpose of uniting the whole force of Christendom against Islam. But the attendance was so small that nothing serious could be carried through; and the too high-strung tone of the bull Excrucior (Jan. 16, 1560), declaring the idea of the superiority of an ecumenical synod over the Pope heretical, abominable, and dictated by a spirit of rebellion, was ill suited to awaken sympathy. The papal propositions, that for three years the clergy should pay a tenth, and the laity a thirtieth, of their income, for defraying the expenses of the crusade, met with general opposition. France he entirely estranged from himself by his Neapolitan policy. In order to procure a principality for his nephew, he recognized Ferdinand as king of Naples. But such a recognition was in fact a rejection of the claims of the house of Anjou; and, though Pius II. succeeded in having the pragmatic sanction of Bourges cancelled in 1461, Louis XI. gave his consent, only on the condition that the Pope should dissolve his alliance with Ferdinand, and espouse the cause of René of Anjou. The Pope neither could nor would fulfil that condition; and the consequence was, that France would hear nothing of his crusading schemes. In Germany matters proved as difficult. Though Pius II. succeeded in breaking the opposition of Gregory of Helmburg, and humiliating Diether of Isenburg, the thirty-two thousand men which Germany had promised to equip for the war against the Turks never came to an agreement as swiftly as possible; and an agreement was, of course, most easily obtained when the candidate gave sure prospect of a new election.

Pius IV. (Jan. 8, 1556-Dec. 9, 1565). His original name was Giovanni Angelo Medici, but he did not belong to the famous Florentine family of that name. He was born at Milan, in stunted circumstances; studied law, and became in 1527 prothonotary to the curia. Clement VII. and Paul III. employed him in several important missions; and the latter made him a cardinal in 1549. Under Paul IV., however, he found it advisable to exile himself from Rome, and to live very quietly in his native city. But his exile paved the way for him to the papal throne. The attempt of Paul IV. at ruling in the spirit of the Gregories and the Innocents had failed utterly. The relations between the papal see and the foreign powers were very strained, and in the papal dominions the cruelty and violence of the Inquisition had spread general discontent. It was necessary to change system, and everybody's eyes fell naturally on the exiled cardinal in Milan. He was chosen, and the choice proved a success. He understood that the supremacy of the sacerdotium over the imperium could not be maintained any more, because its weapons — the ban, the interdict, etc. — had lost their effect; and he was willing to seek support for the sacerdotium from the imperium. The most difficult task which awaited him was the re-opening of the Council of Trent, and the finishing up of its business. The dangers to the papal authority were very great. Spain acted on the maxim, that the episcopacy was itself a divine institution, and not a mere emanation from the papal power; France maintained that the ecumenical council had the highest power in the church; a power to which even the Pope had to bow; and the Germans went even into details, and demanded reforms of the curia, the clergy, the monasteries, abolition of the ecclesiastical celibacy, granting of the cup in the Lord's Supper to the laity, etc. The bull of convocation was issued on Nov. 20, 1560. The first session, however, did not take place until Jan. 18, 1562. The temper of the council was unmistakable; but Pius IV. was able, by adroit management, and by direct negotiations with the Emperor Philip II. and Cardinal Guise, to avert all danger. Indeed, the close of the Council of Trent (Dec. 3, 1563) must be considered a great triumph for the papacy. The Pope confirmed its decrees, as if they were not valid without such confirmation; and, though they were received with some reserve in all countries, they gradually forced their way through. With the close of the Council of Trent, the new chapter begins, 1564. The Church of Rome. His bulls and decrees are found in Cockerill: Bullarum amplissima collectio, iii. His speeches have been edited by Mansi: Oraciones politica et ecclesiastica Pii II., Lucca, 1735-50, 3 vols. See Hilweing: De Pii II. rebus gestis, etc., Berlin, 1823; Beets: De Aenea Sylvii, etc., Harlem, 1839; Hagenbach: Erinn. an A. S., Beroburg, 1855; A. S. Pius II. und die deutsche Rechtsgeschichte, Erlangen, 1860; Georg Voigt: En. Sil. de’ P., Berlin, 1856-63, 3 vols., the best work on the subject. — Pius III. (Sept. 10-Oct. 13, 1503). He was a nephew of Pius II., and by him made Archbishop of Siena, and cardinal in 1450. His election after the death of Alexander VI. he owed chiefly to the circumstances of his being very old and very weak. The approach of the French army and Cesar Borgia made it possible to come to an agreement as swiftly as possible; and an agreement was, of course, most easily obtained when the candidate gave sure prospect of a new election.
order when he was fourteen years old; acted for some time as inquisitor in Como, Bergamo, and the Venetian; was called to Rome in 1550 as member of the Board of Inquisition; and made a cardinal in 1557. As Pope, he inspired the Inquisition in Italy, Spain, and the Netherlands with new vigor. The Duke of Alba he presented with a consecrated sword; Elizabeth of England he put under the ban; the bulls of Pius V. are found in Chrenodines: Bullar. Magm. Ill.; his Rerota Apostolicae have been edited by F. Gobau, Aulwerb, 1840. See Hieron. Catena: Vita del glor. consessimo papa P. V., which contains his correspondence; and Falloux: Histoire de S. P. V., Angers, 1846, 2 vols.

PIUS.

Pius VI. (Feb. 15, 1775- Aug. 29, 1799). He belonged to a noble but poor family; studied law; entered the service of the church, and was appointed secretary to Benedict XIV. in 1755, and director of the papal treasury in 1768. In 1773 he was made a cardinal. One of his first acts as a pope was a curious prescript against the vain-shaped, high-colored dresses of the Roman clergy, their powdered perukes, their card-playing in the cafés, their visits to the theatres, and nocturnal promenades with ladies, etc. The intention was, no doubt, very good. But, unfortunately, Pius VI. was himself a very handsome man, and by no means indifferent to his looks; and rumors had more than once told of his own adventures with the fair sex. There was, indeed, in every thing he did a want of perfect consistency, a hesitaton with respect to the last consequences of the principles adopted. The most pressing business at hand was the process Rome the Papist. But the Pope would not confirm the bull of his predecessor (Dominus ac Redemptor noster), dissolving the order; nor dared he re-establish the society. He chose a middle way. In Prussia, under Friedrich II., he allowed the brethren to go on with their work, only under another name and in an order when he was fourteen years old; acted for some time as inquisitor in Como, Bergamo, and the Venetian; was called to Rome in 1550 as member of the Board of Inquisition; and made a cardinal in 1557. As Pope, he inspired the Inquisition in Italy, Spain, and the Netherlands with new vigor. The Duke of Alba he presented with a consecrated sword; Elizabeth of England he put under the ban; the bulls of Pius V. are found in Chrenodines: Bullar. Magm. Ill.; his Rerota Apostolicae have been edited by F. Gobau, Aulwerb, 1840. See Hieron. Catena: Vita del glor. consessimo papa P. V., which contains his correspondence; and Falloux: Histoire de S. P. V., Angers, 1846, 2 vols.
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Jesus, and the bull of June 26, 1816, condemning of Jan. 25, 1813, renouncing his temporal power, forced and half persuaded to sign the concordat on the way to Russia, Napoleon ordered him to of Aug. 7, 1814, re-establishing the Society of the peculiar character of the restored papal gov-ernment was too plainly indicated by the decree of Aug. 7, 1814, re-establishing the Society of Jesus, and the bull of June 26, 1816, condemning Bible Societies as "a fiendish instrument for the undermining of the foundation of religion." The life of Pius VII. was written by Henry Simon, Paris, 1823, 2 vols.; Jäger, Frankfort, 1824; Guadet, Paris, 1824; Pistoleti, Rome, 1824, 2 vols.; Artaud de Montor, Paris, 3d ed., 1839, 8 vols.; Guicci, Rome, 2d ed., 1864, 2 vols. See also Wiseman: Recollections of the last Four Popes, London, 1858; Gay: Recollections of the last Four Popes, London, 1850. ZOEPPEL.

Pius IX. (June 10, 1846-Feb. 7, 1878). His original name was Giovanni Maria Mastai Ferretti; and he was born of a noble but poor family at Sinagaglia, May 10, 1792. Of his earlier life not much is known, nor does it seem to contain any thing of particular interest. When he was eighteen years old he made an application for a place in the papal guard; but, as he was subject to epileptic fits, he was not admitted. The military career thus being closed to him, he entered the ecclesiastical career, and was ordained a priest in 1818. In 1823 he went to Chili as the secretary of the papal legate. In 1829 he was made Archbishop of Spoleto, in 1832 Bishop of Imola, and in 1840 a cardinal. As a bishop he won the esteem and love of his flocks by the gentleness and liberality of his character; and, in the con-sequence of the death of Gregory XVI., he was, indeed, the candidate of Young Italy. Nor did he in the first years of his reign disappoint the expectations of his party. More than six thou-sand political prisoners and exiles were pardoned; the most harassing restrictions of the press were removed; great reforms were introduced in the administration and the courts; a Consulta — a transition to a constitutional form of government — was established under the presidency of Gизzi. The Ultramontanes stood aghast; the Jesuits denounced the Pope as a Robespierre with the tiara; and the Liberals joined him with such an enthusiasm, that he could probably have given an entirely different character to the papacy if he had been resolute enough to place himself at the head of that movement which finally resulted in the union of Italy. But he shrank from a war with Austria, one of the pillars of the Church of Rome; and, indeed, had he taken the first retrograde step before a rising in Rome compelled him to flee (in 1848). He took up his residence at Gaeta as the guest of the king of Naples; and when he returned to Rome, two years later, under the protection of a French army of occupation, he had completely changed his views, and (à la Consalvi) he was no more. The result was the loss of the Romagns in 1859, of Umbria and the Marches in 1860, of Rome itself in 1870; that is, the complete de-stuction of the temporal power of the Pope. See
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PLATINA.

art. Church, States of the. The character of the spiritual reign of Pius IX. is strikingly represented by the establishment of the dogma of the immaculate conception, by his encyclical letter and the syllabus accompanying it, and by his establishment of the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope; by which three acts he threw, or at least endeavored to throw, the Church of Rome six centuries back, and to prevent her from ever advancing. See the arts. Immaculate Conception, Syllabus, and Vatican Council. The life of Pius IX. was written by Legge, London, 1875; Villefranche, Lyons, 1876; Trollope, London, 1877, 2 vols.; Testi-Fasserini, Florence, 1877; J. G. Shea, New York, 1877; Gillet, Paris, 1877; De Bussy, Paris, 1873; Pfeiffer, 1878; and Zeller, 1879. His speeches were published in Rome, 1872-73, 2 vols. See Gladstone: Speeches of Pope Pius IX., in Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion, London and New York, 1875.

PIUS SOCIETIES are associations formed in Germany for the defence of the freedom and independence of the Roman-Catholic Church. The first society of the kind was formed at Mayence in March, 1848, consisting of five hundred members, and naming itself after the Pope. But the idea met with so much sympathy, that a general assembly at Cologne, in August, same year, no less than eighty-three such societies were represented. To make the Church entirely independent of the State, and absolutely authoritative in the school, was adopted by the assembly as the principal proposition of its programme. For more special purposes, branch societies with special names have been formed,—the Vincent Societies, for the inner mission; the Francis Xavier Societies, for missions among the heathen; the Canisius Societies, for pure and true education in the Roman sense of the words); and others. General assemblies, developing the programme, and perfecting the organization, of the societies, meet almost every year; and their influence is strongly felt in the political world.

ZÖCKLER.

PLACEUS (Josua Laplace), b. in Bretagne, 1606; was in 1625 appointed preacher to the Reformed congregation in Nantes, and in 1632 (together with Amyraut and Capellus), professor of theology at Saumur, where he d. Aug. 17, 1655. His Opera omnia appeared at Franeker in 1609, and at Aubenet in 1702, in 2 vols. quarto. His views of a mediate, not immediate, imputation of the sin of Adam, first developed in his De statu hominis lapsi ante graticum (1640), caused considerable uneasiness in the Reformed Church. But when, in 1645, the synod of Clarendon condemned those who denied the imputation of the sin of Adam, he defended himself as being not at all included under that verdict. After his death, however, the Formula consensus of 1675 presented a formal rejection of the views of Laplace and Amyraut, and, in general, of all the novelties of Saumur.

A. SCHWIZER.

PLACES OF EGYPT. See Egypt, p. 710.

PLANCK is the name of two noticeable German theologians, father and son. — Gottlieb Jakob Planck, b. at Nürtingen in Württemberg, Nov. 15, 1751; d. at Göttingen, Aug. 31, 1833. He studied theology at Tübingen, 1769-74, and was appointed professor at Stuttgart, 1775-82, and at Saumur. A. Schweitzer.

PLANCK, Heinrich Ludwig Planck, b. at Göttingen, July 18, 1785; d. there Sept. 28, 1851. He studied theology at Göttingen, 1798-74, and was appointed professor there in 1810. His studies were chiefly exegetical. He published Bemerkungen über den ersten Brief an den Timotheus (Göttingen, 1808), De vera natura atque indole orationis græca N. I. (Göttingen, 1810), Abriss d. philos. Religionstheorie (Göttingen, 1821). See WAGENMANN.

PLATINA, Bartholomneas, b. at Andanza (Lis Platina), in the diocese of Cremona, 1421; d. in Rome, 1481. His true name was Sacchi. He first entered the army, but afterwards devoted himself to literature, and was appointed apostoli-
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PLATONISM AND CHRISTIANITY. "The peculiarity of the Platonic philosophy," says Hegel, in his History of Philosophy (vol. ii.), "is precisely this direction towards the supersensual world,—it seeks the elevation of consciousness into the realm of spirit. The Christian religion also has set up this high principle, that the internal spiritual essence of man is his true essence, and has made it the universal principle."

Some of the early Fathers recognized, as they well might, a Christian element in Plato, and ascribed to him a kind of propedectic office and relation toward Christianity. Clement of Alexandria says philosophy is "a sort of preliminary discipline (προποδευτική) for those who lived before the accession of Eugenius IV. to the death of Plato; and, between our view of the being of liches (πλατώνοις), which is the leading modern works of Christian antiquity." Ackermann, in the first chapter of his Das Christliche des Platonismus (which is the leading modern work on this subject),—"Justin was, as he himself relates, an enthusiastic admirer of Plato before he found in the gospel that full satisfaction which he had sought earnestly, but in vain, in philosophy. And, though the gospel stood infinitely higher in his view than the Platonic philosophy, yet he regarded the latter as a preliminary stage to the former. In the same way did the other apologetic writers express themselves concerning Plato and his philosophy, especially Athenagoras, the most spirited, and philosophically most important, of them all, whose Apology is one of the most admirable works of Christian antiquity."

The Fathers of the early church sought to explain the striking resemblance between the doctrines of Plato and those of Christianity, principally by the acquaintance, which, as they supposed, that philosopher made with learned Jews and with the Jewish Scriptures during his sojourn in Egypt, but partly, also, by the universal light of a divine revelation through the "Logos," which, in and through human reason, "lighteth every man that cometh into the world," and which illumined especially such sincere and humble seekers after truth as Socrates and Plato before the incarnation of the Eternal Word in the person of Jesus Christ.

Passages which bear a striking resemblance to the Christian Scriptures in their picturesque, para-bolical and allegorical form, especially those which illumine the soul after death by the light of God, may be found in the Dialogues, even those that treat of physical, political, and philosophical subjects; and they are as characteristic of Plato, as is the infintimitly large, and, for the purposes from the accession of Eugenius IV. to the death of Paul II., is a source, lie also wrote a history of the city of Mantua, and other works. See D. G. Müller. Dissertatio de B. Platina, Altdorf, 1694.
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bones and muscles would have been only the means on instruments of the light, which his mind and will would have been the cause. And just so it is in all the phenomena of nature, in all the motions and changes of the material cosmos. And life in the highest sense, which we call spiritual and eternal life, all that deserves the name of life, is in and of itself, from the soul, which moves it and animates it. And the body only clogs and entombs (Gorg., 492, 493). Platonism, as well as Christianity, says, Look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporary (εφικτα), only for a season; but the things which are not seen are eternal.

2. The philosophy of Plato is eminently a theistic philosophy. "God," he says, in his Republic (716 A), "is (literally, holds) the beginning, middle, and end of all things. He is the Supreme Mind or Reason, the efficient Cause of all things, eternal, unchangeable, all-knowing, all-powerful, all-preserving, all-conforming, just, holy, wise, and good, the absolutely perfect, the beginning of all truth, the fountain of all law and justice, the source of all order and beauty, and especially the cause of all good " (see Philebus, Phædo, Timæus, Republic, and Laws, passim). God represents, he impersonates, he is the True, the Beautiful, the Absolutely Perfect, the Beginning of all things, the Middle, and the End of all things. He is the Supreme Good: God in the true and proper sense of the word. God is the Reason (the Intelligence, θοs; Phæd., 97 C) and the Good (τα ἀγαθα, Repub., 508 C); he is also the Artificer, the Maker, the Father, the Supreme Ruler, who begins, disposes, and orders all (cf. Timæus, passim, with places just cited). He is the θεός and θεός, Phæd., 106 D, and often elsewhere. Plato often speaks also of θεός in the plural; but to him, as to all the best minds of antiquity, the inferior deities are the children, the servants, the ministers, the angels, of the Supreme God (Tim., 41). Unaided by the inferior deities God made the world by introducing order and beauty into chaos matter; and then only, do we know how it is and the cause of its being so (Phæd., 97). Material causes are no causes; and inquiry into them is impertinent, unphilosophical, not to say impious and absurd. Thus did Plato build up a system of rational psychology, cosmology, and theology, all of which are largely teleological, on the twofold basis of a priori reasoning and mythology, in other words, of reason and tradition, including the idea of a primitive revelation. The eschatology of the Phædo, the Gorgias, and the Republic, is professedly a πόριs, though he insists that it is also a λόγοs (Repub., 523) or a πανδύς λόγοs (709). His cosmology he professes to have heard from some one (Phæd., 108 D); and his theology in the Timæus purports to have been derived by tradition from the ancients, who were the offspring of the gods, and who must, of course, have known the truth about their own ancestors (40 C). Yet the whole structure is manifestly the work of his own reason and creative imagination; and the central doctrine of the whole is, that God made and governs the world with constant reference to the highest possible good; and "ideas" are the "forces," by which the end was to be accomplished.

3. The Platonic philosophy is teleological. Final causes, together with rational and spiritual agencies, are the only causes that are worthy of the study of the philosopher: indeed, no others deserve the name (Phæd., 98 sqq.). If mind (νοs) is the cause of all things, mind must dispose all things for the best; and when we know how it is the best for any thing to be made or disposed, then and then only, do we know how it is and the cause of its being so (Phæd., 97). Material causes are no causes; and inquiry into them is impertinent, unphilosophical, not to say impious and absurd. Thus did Plato build up a system of rational psychology, cosmology, and theology, all of which are largely teleological, on the twofold basis of a priori reasoning and mythology, in other words, of reason and tradition, including the idea of a primitive revelation. The eschatology of the Phædo, the Gorgias, and the Republic, is professedly a πόριs, though he insists that it is also a λόγοs (Repub., 523) or a πανδύς λόγοs (709). His cosmology he professes to have heard from some one (Phæd., 108 D); and his theology in the Timæus purports to have been derived by tradition from the ancients, who were the offspring of the gods, and who must, of course, have known the truth about their own ancestors (40 C). Yet the whole structure is manifestly the work of his own reason and creative imagination; and the central doctrine of the whole is, that God made and governs the world with constant reference to the highest possible good; and "ideas" are the "forces," by which the end was to be accomplished.

4. The philosophy of Plato is pre-eminently ethical, and his ethics are remarkably Christian. Only one of his Dialogues was classified by the ancients as "physical," and that (the Timeæus) is largely theological. The political Dialogues treat politics as a part of ethics,—ethics as applied to the State. Besides the four virtues as usually classified by Greek moralists,—viz., temperance, courage, justice, and wisdom,—Plato recognized as virtues humility and meekness, which the Greeks generally despised, and holiness, which they ignored (Eutypahryn, passim): and he insists on the duty of non-retaliation and non-resistance as strenuously, not to say paradoxically, as it is taught in the Sermon on the Mount (Crit., 49). That it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong is a prominent doctrine of the republic (508 C). But as the highest "idea" is that of the Good, so the highest excellence of which man is capable is likeness to God, the Supreme and Absolute Good. A philosopher, who is Plato's ideal
of a man, and, so to speak, of a Christian, is a lover of wisdom, of truth, of justice, of goodness (repub, bk. vi., passion), of God, and, by the contemplation and imitation of his virtues, becomes like him as far as it is possible for man to resemble God (Rep., 613 A, B).

So much for a religious philosopher. His ethics, his politics, and his physics are all based on his theology and his religion. Natural and moral obligations, social and civil duties, duties to parents and elders, to kindred and strangers, to neighbors and friends, are all religious duties (laws, bk. ix., 881 A, xi., 881 A). Not only is God the Lawgiver and Ruler of the universe, but his law is the source and ground of all human law and justice. "That the gods not only exist, but that they are good, and honor and reward justice far more than men do, is the most beautiful and the best preamble to all laws" (laws, x. 887). Accordingly, in the Republic and the Laws, the author often prefaced the most important sections of his legislation with some such preamble, exhortation, or, as Jowett calls it, sermon, setting forth the divine authority by which it is sanctioned and enforced.

6. Plato gives prominence to the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments. At death, by an inevitable law of its own being, as well as by the appointment of God, every soul goes to its own place; the evil gravitating to the evil, and the good rising to the Supreme Good. When they come before their Judge, perhaps after a long series of transmigrations, each of which is the reward or punishment of the preceding, those who have lived virtuous and holy lives, and those who have not, are separated from each other. The wicked whose sins are curable are subjected to sufferings in the lower world, which are more or less severe, and more or less protracted, according to their deserts. The incurably wicked are hurled down to Tartarus, whence they never go out, where they are punished forever (rov oei xενεις) as a spectacle and warning to others (Gorg., 525 sqq.; Phed., 113 D sqq.).

The Holy, on the other hand, by a holy and piously, especially those who have purified their hearts and lives by philosophy, will live without bodies (Phed., 114 C), with the gods, and in places that are bright and beautiful beyond description. More solemn and impressive sermons were never preached in Christian pulpits than those with which Plato concludes such dialogues as the Gorgias, the Phaedo, the Republic, and the Laws.

We have space only to allude to other characteristic features of Plato's philosophy, such, for example, as his doctrine of "ideas"—the True, the Beautiful, the Good, the Holy, and the like,—which, looking at them now only on the ethical and practical side, are eternal and immutable, and not dependent even on the will of God (the holy, for instance, is not holy because it is the will of God, but it is the will of God because it is holy; just, and good—Euthyph., 10 D); the indisputable necessity, in the Platonic system, of laws and education, instead of a new heart and a new spirit, by community of goods and of wives, instead of loyalty and love to a divine-human person like Jesus Christ. Baur (socrates and Christ) does indeed find in the idealized Socrates of Plato an analogy (speculatively interesting, perhaps, but practically how unlike!) to the personal Christ, and in the Logos, not only for the doctrine of the "Logos" as it was developed by Philo and other Neo-Platonists, but also for the Incarnate Logos of the Gospel of John, with which it may, indeed, have some philosophical relation, but probably no historical connection, still less any corresponding influence on the history of the world.

The history of Platonism, and its several schools or sub-schools of thought and opinion, does not come within the scope of this article. It may be remarked, in general, that, in the Middle and the New Academy, there was always more or less tendency to scepticism, growing out of the Platonic doctrine of the uncertainty of all human knowledge except that of "ideas." The Neo-Platonists, on the other hand, inclined towards dogmatism, mysticism, asceticism, theosophy, and even thumaturgy, thus developing seeds of error that lay in the teaching of their master. After the Christian era, ante the Christian era, for after all followers of Plato, we find, at one extreme, the devout and believing Plutarch, the author of that almost inspired treatise on the Delay of the Deity in the Punishment of the Wicked, and the practical and sagacious Galen, whose work on the uses of
the Parts of the Human Body is an anticipation of
the Stoic Treatises, both of which, like Socrates, we can hardly help feeling, would have
accepted Christianity if they had come within
the scope of its influence; and, at the other ex-
trême, Porphyry, and Julian the apostate, who
wielded the weapons of philosophy in direct hos-
tility to the religion of Christ. Between them
were the major part of the philosophers
of the Neo-Platonic and eclectic schools who came
in contact with Christianity on their way in
proud indifference, neglect, or contempt of
the religion of the crucified Nazarene. But not a few
of the followers of Plato discovered a kindred
and congenial element in the eminent spirituality
of the Christian life, and, coming in through the ves-
tibule of the Academy, became some of the most
illustrious of the fathers and doctors of the early
church. And many of the early Christians, in
turn, found peculiar attractions in the doctrines
of Plato, and employed them as weapons for the
defence and extension of Christianity, or, per-
chance, cast the truths of Christianity in a Pla-
tonic mould. The doctrines of the Logoi and the
Trinity received their shape from Greek Fathers,
who, if not trained in the schools, were much in-
fluenced, directly or indirectly, by the Platonic
philosophy, particularly in its Jewish-Alexandrian
form. That errors and corruptions crept into the
church from this source cannot be denied. But
from the same source it derived no small additions,
both to its numbers and its strength. Among
the most illustrious of the Fathers who were more
or less Platonic, we may name Justin Martyr,
Athenagoras, Theophilus, Irenaeus, Hippolytus,
Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Minutius Felix,
Eusebius, Methodius, Basil the Great, Gregory of
Nyssa, and St. Augustine. Plato was the divine
philosopher of the earlier Christian centuries: in
the middle ages Aristotle succeeded to his place.
But in every period of the history of the church,
some of the brightest ornaments of literature,
philosophy, and religion,—such men as Anselm,
Erasmus, Melanchthon, Jeremy Taylor, Ralph
Cudworth, Henry More, Neander, and Tayler
Lewis,—have been "Platonicizing" Christians.

LIT. — The Works of Plato, in the original
Greek, edited, with prefaces and commentary,
by Gottfried Stallbaum, Leipzig, 1821-25, 10
vols., 2d ed., 1833-42; Translations of the Dia-
logues (in German) by F. Schleiermacher,
Berlin, 1804-10, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1833-42; his In-
troductions were translated by W. Dobson,
Cambridge and London, 1836, (in English) by B.
Jowett, London and New York, 1871, 4 vol.,
and, (parallel translation) by W. Whewell, Cam-
bidge, 1860. — Works upon Plato and Platonism
in Different Relations. G. C. B. Ackermann :
Das Christliche im Platon u. in der Platonischen
Philosophie, Hamburg, 1835, Eng. trans.,
Christian Element in Plato and the Platonistic
Philosophy, with Introductory Note by Professor Sheed, Edin-
burgh, 1861; F. C. Baur: Das Christliche d.
Philosophie d. Altertums, in Drei Abhandlungen, ed. Zel-
ler, Leipzig, 1878; Taylor: The Platonists and the Atheists;
or, The Tenth Book of the Dialogues on
Laws (Greek), with Critical Notes, New York,
1845; R. D. Hampden: The Fathers of the Greek
Philosophy, Edinburgh, 1862; H. v. Stein: Gesch.
PLATONISTS.

Ralph Cudworth, Christian philosophy in conflict with materialism; Henry More, Christian theosophy and mysticism. For Cudworth and More, see separate articles.

Benjamin Whichcote was born in 1610, graduated at Emmanuel College in 1629, fellow, 1633-43. His appointment as provost of King's College, in 1644, marks the origin of the new philosophical and religious movement at Cambridge. His personal magnetism, and power as a preacher, greatly moved the university, and excited suspicion of his orthodoxy among the Puritan leaders. Removed by Charles II, he died, in 1683, on one of his visits to Cambridge, in the house of "his ancient and learned friend Dr. Cudworth." Archbishop Tolstoson preached his funeral sermon. His principal works—Apostolical Apothegms and Select Sermons—were collected and published after his death. The Earl of Shaftesbury furnished the Preface for the Sermons. The following aphorism illustrates the Platonic cast of his mind and the general drift of his teaching: "Religion is being as much like God as man can be like him."

John Smith was born in 1618, took his bachelor's degree at Emmanuel College in 1640, and his master's in 1644, in which latter year he was also chosen fellow of Queen's College. He died in 1652, at the age of thirty-four, "a thinker without a biography." His funeral sermon was preached by John Worthington, and his Select Discourses were edited by Symon Patrick. The Discourses are ten. His original plan contemplated discourses on what he enumerates as the three main articles of religious truth: (1) The immortality of the soul; (2) The existence and nature of God; (3) The communication of God to man through Christ. But he did not live to enter upon the third of these topics. His Platonism and the central principle of his argument may be seen in the statement, that it is only "by a contemplation of our own souls that we can climb up to the understanding of the Deity."

We cannot, therefore, under the minor members of the school. Culverwell, author of a Discourse of the Light of Nature, was a hearty Puritan and a decided Calvinist. Worthington was an ardent educational Reformer, which was a point of connection and sympathy between him and John Milton. Rust was the admirer and panegyrist of Jeremy Taylor, and his successor as Bishop of Dromore. Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester, and Patrick, Bishop of Chichester and of Ely, were offshoots of the school, but are known chiefly as dignitaries of the church.


Principal Tulloch, in the second volume of his Rational Theology in the Seventeenth Century, which is devoted to the Cambridge Platonists, characterizes the teaching of the school as follows: Benjamin Whichcote, rationalist religion; John Smith, foundations of a Christian philosophy;

PLITT, Gustav Leopold, one of the editors of the second edition of Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie: b. at Genin, near Lübeck, March 27, 1836; d. at Erlangen, Sept. 10, 1880. He studied theology at Erlangen and Berlin, and was in 1867 appointed extraordinary, and in 1875 ordinary, professor of church history and encyclopedia in the former university. In 1872 he was given the degree of D.D. by Dorpat. His studies were chiefly historical, and concentrated on the period of the Reformation. After a number of minor treatises (De auctoritate articulorum Smalcaldorum symbolism, Erlangen, 1862; Desiderius Erasmus, 1863, etc.), followed, in 1867-68, his chief work, Einleitung in die Augustana, 2 vols., of which the first contains the history of the evangelical church till the diet of Augsburg; and the second, the origin and development of the doctrinal system of the evangelical church. In 1873 he published Die Augsburger und Wittenb. Synodikus, 2 vols.; Symbolik für Vorlesungen: in 1876, Jodokus Trutfetter; and in 1879, Gabriel Biel; and at his death he left a nearly finished Luthers Leben und Wirken, which has been finished by E. F. Petersen (chief pastor in Lübeck), and appeared at Leipzig in 1888.

Although popular, it is scholarly; for Plitt was regarded as one of the best Luther scholars in Germany, and especially fitted to answer Roman-Catholic slanders against the Reformer. He also edited the Correspondence of Schelling, the great philosopher (Aus Schellings Leben, in Briefen, Leipzig, 1860, 1870, 3 vols.), whose grand-daughter he had married. When Dr. Herzog undertook the second edition of his Real-Encyclopädie, he asked Professor Plitt, his colleague, to join him, as one eminently qualified by general learning, tireless energy, executive ability, and catholic sentiments. He lived, however, to see only six volumes through the press, dying before Dr. Herzog.

Professor Plitt, however, was no mere student and writer. He frequently preached with acceptance, and took great interest in missions, foreign and domestic. In 1867 he succeeded Professor Deltzach as president of the Bavarian Society for the Conversion of the Jews. He took a prominent place in philanthropic work and in the organization of the Christian Commission in the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71). Consumption first showed itself in the winter of 1874-75; and, although able to work at times, he gradually succumbed to the disease.

PLUMER, William Swan, D.D., LL.D., Presbyterian divine; b. in Greensburg (now Darlington), Penn., July 29, 1802; d. in Baltimore, Md., Oct. 22, 1880. In the nineteenth year of his age he was a pupil of the venerable Dr. McElhany of Lewisburg, W. Va., with whom he pursued his studies until he was prepared to enter Washington College, Lexington, Va., where he graduated. He received his theological training at Princeton Seminary; was licensed to preach by the presbytery of New Brunswick in 1826, and was ordained by the presbytery of Orange in 1828.

After several years of evangelical labor in North Carolina, he returned to Virginia; and, after a short term of service in Prince Edward County, he was called to Petersburg in 1831. He removed to Richmond in 1834, to become the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church. In the thirteenth year of his labors in Richmond, he accepted a call to the Franklin-street Church, Baltimore, of which he had pastoral charge from 1847 to 1854, when he was elected to the chair of didactic and pastoral theology in the Western Theological Seminary at Alleghany, Penn. Owning to complications caused by the civil war, his connection with the seminary having been severed, in 1862 he supplied the pulpit of the Archstreet Church, Philadelphia, until 1865, when he accepted a call to the Second Presbyterian Church of Pottsville, Penn. In 1867 he was elected to the professorship of didactic and polemic theology in Columbia Seminary, South Carolina; and, after filling that chair for eight years, he was transferred, at his own request, to the chair of historic, casuistic, and pastoral theology, which position he continued to hold until 1880, when he was made professor emeritus by the board of directors. After his connection with Columbia Seminary closed, he continued to supply different churches in Baltimore, and other cities and towns in Maryland, until his labors were terminated by death.

This condensed enumeration of dates, and fields of labor, illustrates not only the vicissitudes of Dr. Plumer's life, and the versatility which characterized him, but the important positions and responsible trusts committed to him by the Great Head of the church.

Dr. Plumer was a man of commanding personal appearance. His manner in the pulpit was peculiarly impressive. There was a dignity, and even a majesty, in his presence, that commanded attention.

He was a voluminous writer. He wrote a Commentary on the Psalms, a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, another on the Epistle to the Hebrews, many practical works calculated to establish the faith of believers, or to awaken the impenitent, besides innumerable tracts for the Presbyterian Board of Publication, for the Methodist Book Concern of Nashville and of New York, for the Board of Publication of the Reformed Dutch Church, for the Baptist Publication Society of Philadelphia, for the American Sunday-school Union, and for the Presbyterian Publication Committee of Richmond.

Some of these works were republished in Europe: others were translated into German, French, Chinese, and modern Greek. While professor in the Western Theological Seminary, he was also the successful pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church of Alleghany. While professor in Columbia, the church to which he ministered steadily grew in numbers, and was blessed with precious revivals. While pastor in the city of Richmond, he edited The Watchman of the South.

The presidency of several colleges, and the secretarieship of several of the boards of the church, were at different times offered him; but he never saw his way clear to accept any of these appointments. In 1838 Washington College (Pennsylvania), Lafayette College (Pennsylvania), and Princeton College, conferred upon him the title of doctor of divinity; and in 1857 the University of Mississippi conferred upon him the degree of
PLURALITIES.

1856

PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

But, preaching in country-places, they were there spoken of as "Brethren from Plymouth;" hence elsewhere, "Plymouth Brethren." The largest number ever in regular communion at Plymouth was a thousand, more or less. Amongst those that here embraced the "testimony" was the late S. P. Tregelles.

The title to communion originally, at Plymouth as in Dublin, may be gathered from Darby's Correspondence with Rev. J. Kelly (1839). He there writes of "real Christians," that "we should undoubtedly feel it wrong to shut them out," whatever their peculiarity of doctrine: "we receive all that are on the foundation, and reject and put away all error by the word of God and by the help of his ever-present Spirit." A notable instance had occurred of the excision of one, who, in the story of his religious opinions, has narrated his early connection with the Brethren amongst whom he sought to introduce heterodoxy as to Christ. The Brethren, however, have always restricted discipline, or departure from others, in respect of doctrinal error, to cases falling under the care of the Rev. John. Darby had written to the assembly, that "degeneracy claimed service, and not departure" (Ibid.). But there is enough evidence of sharp discipline from the outset to forbid the notion that the so-called "Exclusives" have later employed more stringent measures than was the wont of the Brethren at first: they may have become less consistent and systematic.

The Brethren had given practical expression to their views of ministry. Darby's Christian Liberty of Preaching and Teaching the Lord Jesus Christ appeared in 1834. In the same year was begun the Christian Witness, for which Darby wrote, On the Character of Office in the Present Dispensation (1835), uprooting all official appointment. In the same periodical he wrote, On the Apostasy of the Successive Dispensations (1836).

We present an outline of these treatises:

"The old economy had fallen by the unfaithfulness of the covenant-people. The whole people was placed under the law, made responsible for its observance. As a whole, it apostatized. Failure over marks man placed under the judgment of Christ. The whole Christian system depended upon continuance in God's goodness. If Christendom depart from the divine path for this dispensation, his goodness is abandoned. This is 'the ruin of the church.' Every present ecclesiastical organization is abnormal; all Christendom obnoxious to judgment. According to Darby's tracts, Sur la Formation des Eglises (1840) and sequel, there remains but I'apostasie fatale et sans remede. A new church organization supposes a new apostolate. Cf. his Reply to the Zionsbote (vi. Jahrgang). All are rejected, Romanist and Protestant alike: they repose upon an unchristian sentiment. Unlike other separatists, Darby places dissenters' systems under the same ban as national churches; only he sees more corruption in the latter. He falls back upon his promesse an seigneur (Matt. xvi. 20), which provides a motto for the assemblies into which the church should resolve itself. Moreover, ecclesiastical office is impaired by the church's ruin. See a tract, On the Apostasy—What is Succession of? (1840); also Le Ministere considere dans sa Nature, etc. (1843), and De la Presence et de l'Action du S. Esprit dans l'Eglise, etc. The acceptance of official ministry as medium between God and man ignores the privilege, enjoyed by every believer, of access to the throne of grace. There are, nevertheless, ministers in the word; because, without such,
Christ's work would have been imperfect: he has intrusted man the word of reconciliation. This is not a particular office; service in the word is the faithful exercise of a spiritual gift, something divine, for which the individual concerned is responsible to Christ alone. There are many such gifts. Every believer possesses, besides the general gift (town of the Spirit), a special gift (apostles and bishops), which he should exercise for the good of the assembly. The Spirit distributes those gifts equitably, variet in Switzerland, France, etc. (cf. App. Darby). Since the decease of the last apostle, of Timothy or Titus, apostolic delegates, no one has had the authority to appoint to any. From all church officers, believers must separate, to unite with assemblies of the same in substance as that in which all assemblies found themselves who had not the added characteristic of the advocates thereof (v. infra).

Such opinions, largely adopted in England, took root in Switzerland, France, etc. (cf. App. Darby). Associated therewith are prophetic views characteristic of the advocates thereof (v. infra).

The Brethren presented an unbroken front until 1845, when Darby, at the request of one of the leaders at Plymouth, repaired thither, only to have his solicitude for a consistent testimony exercised by the relapse of Newton, residing there. The spell that had held the Brethren together was broken by the spirit of clericalism (Miller), which sprang up at Plymouth. Newton had from the first isolated himself. Darby says, “I sorrowed over this unhappy trait of isolation, love of acting alone, and having his followers for himself; but I had no suspicion of any purpose, bore with it. . . . As to the teaching I heard in Ebrington Street from Mr. Newton, the one undeviating object seemed to be to teach differently from what other Brethren had taught, no matter what, so that set their teaching aside” (Narrative of Facts). And Trotter: “The system thus introduced . . . was directed to the undermining of all the truth by which God had acted on the souls of Brethren, and to the setting-up afeath in other form all that had been denounced. The real unity of the church, as one body, indwelt and governed by the Holy Ghost, as the presence and sovereign rule of the Holy Ghost in the church was substituted the authority of teachers. There was also the endeavor to form a party distinguished by Mr. Newton's views of prophecy and church order, to which the appellation 'the truth' was arrogated.” Newton impeded an investigation, treating it as an attempt by a rival to "thwart and spoil his plans." He suppressed a long-standing weekly church-meeting. On Nov. 17 Darby publicly accused him of moral dishonesty, and, unable otherwise to effect a renunciation, on Dec. 28 started a separate assembly. The opinion spread to other places. Lord Congleton withdrew from fellowship at Rawstorne Street, London, because it upheld Darby's action; but he would not, as Tregelles at Plymouth, support the Newtonian programme.

Since 1848 the position taken by Darby has been placed in a clear light. The points in dispute, so far, had concerned the ecclesiastical testimony, the raison d'etre of the Brethren: the precise standpoint of their chief representatives was not yet brought into relief. Harris, having in 1847 acquired some notes of a lecture by Newton which contained teaching subversive of the truth as to our Lord's person, exposed the evil. Christ “was represented as born at a distance from God; involved in the guilt of the first Adam, because he was born of a woman; and under the curse of the broken law, because of his association with Israel” (Miller). The next year “the rulers of Bethesda,” Bristol, — strictly a Baptist congregation, but associated with the Brethren, — “received to the Lord's table several of Mr. Newton's partisans, known to hold his heresy. . . . Faithful men on the spot protested, and entreated that such doctrine should be judged, and its teachers put out of communion. Their remonstrances being unheeded, they were obliged to withdraw from communion at Bethesda; one of them printing a letter explanatory of his reasons for seceding. This brought forth a paper signed by ten chief persons at Bethesda, vindicating their conduct” (ibid.). This is known as The Letter of the Ten. The ground taken was this: “Supposing the author of the tracts were fundamentally heretical, this would not warrant us in rejecting those who come from under his teaching, until we were satisfied that they had imbibed views essentially subversive of the truth as to Christ, as not one defending or upholding Mr. Newton's views should be received into communion.” At a church-meeting in July, George Müller, one of the leaders, demanded the confirmation by the Brethren of this letter. “The majority acquiesced, and assumed a neutral position. The question was fairly raised as to whether Brethren were really gathered . . . as independent congregations. . . . Several meetings throughout the country followed the example of Bethesda, while others [countenanced by Darby] maintained the position they had previously occupied” (ibid.). The seceders, and all linked with them, obtained the name of “Exclusives.” While rigidly excluding all on Bethesda ground, they freely receive into communion Christians, as well members of the Established Church as nonconformists, subject to objection raised either of ungodly life or radical error. “The explanation is this: the neutral Brethren . . . by not the presence of the Holy Ghost, profess to be one body: in receiving a single member from a body that professes to be a unit, the whole body, sound or unsound, is in principle received. But in the Church of Eng-
land, and in the various forms of dissent, no such position is assumed (11bid.). The motto of the open Brethren became, "The blood of the Lamb is the union of saints." With this compare Darby's 330th, which contrasts the unity between the union of God's saints on one foundation,— and that in the blood, — and latitudinarianism. The "Exclusives" have jealously guarded the balance of truth by not so employing 2 John as to contravene Rom. xiv., xvi. But thenceforth they definitely proclaimed "separation from evil as God's principle of unity." Many companies of the Brethren followed Müller. The assembly at Vevey, amongst others, was affected by Newton's doctrine, and divided; but an increasing number have carried on the testimony under Darby's guidance. Thus was made a fresh start, with accession from this time of doctrinal intelligence and definiteness. The original Christian Witness was in 1849 revived by The Present Testimony, first conducted by Mr. Kelly. To each of these serials Darby contributed largely.

No further rupture occurred until after the publication of Darby's Sufferings of Christ. The author had entered upon ground previously fatal to others. He held that our Lord passed through certain non-atoning sufferings in consequence of the position he had taken voluntarily in Israel, in fulfilment of some psalms, and as typical of the tribulation of the godly "remnant" in the last days. Some, unable to distinguish between this doctrine and that already condemned, raised a storm against Darby (1869), withdrawing from communion; but no division ensued.

Between 1878 and 1881 a second great breach rent the Brethren, completed in Darby's lifetime. A "gathering" at Ryde failed to deal with depravity in gremio. Warnings from Brethren elsewhere seemed futile; but all recognized its status. Heedless of this, an old associate of Darby, desiring to set the matter right, visited the place, only to inaugurate another. Several secedors from the old one at Temperance Hall, his act was resisted by Darby as a breach of unity; and discipline was called for against the offender. The Brethren at Kennington, London, where the latter lived, were slow to judge his misdeed. The leaders of Park Street, another London meeting, directed the crusade against him: hence a second division of the Brethren, solemn as the former, — a departure from Park Street, London, for having thrown its mantle over Guildford Hall, Ramsgate, as before from Bethesda, Bristol, the champion of Ebrington Street, Plymouth. The rejecters of Guildford Hall follow Kelly: the others, since the decease of Darby, — just a year after this event, — have been without an ostensible leader. Each side charges the other with "Independency." A further disintegrating movement had been at work, with small result. Another Irish elder, Samuel O'Malley Cluff, brought up an accusation of sacrilege against one akin to that of R. Pearsall Smith of America, and called "Death to Nature," antidote to Laodicean religion, by Cluff supposed to prevail amongst them. This was refuted and condemned by Darby. Cluff and his followers quietly seceded.

The Brethren have resolved themselves into the following sections:

1. The so-called "Exclusives" in three branches, — (a) The followers of the late J. N. Darby, committed to his ecclesiastical course, — the Brethren in the church; (b) The followers, since 1881, of W. Kelly, characterized by a general adhesion to Darby's views, but with a tenet of no other Old Testament action, — the church from a Pauline point of view, modified by Johannine elements; (c) The followers of Cluff, with a special scare of Laodicea. 2. Bethes- dia, neutral, open Brethren, like the "Exclusives." 3. Bristol, — pronounced leanings to Baptist views, and upholding Independency in discipline. 4. Newtoni- ans, with leanings to Reformation and promul- gating prophetic views peculiar to their leader. They, too, maintain that the church is fallen.

Of the body of doctrine of which the first-mentioned class are the special representatives, we subjoin a further synopsis:

The Godhead. — They maintain the Catholic doc- trines. Human Nature. — Adam was first sinless, not virtuous, or holy. The fall introduced unquali- fied ruin. Person of Christ. — The Catholic doctrine. The Atonement. — Viewed in two aspects: (a) God- wards, propitiation; (b) Manwards, substitution, the purchase of all, redemption of believers specifically. Cf. C. H. Mackintosh's Notes on Leviticus. Corre- spondence. — Lucidly treated by Mackintosh, in his Notes on Exodus, also his tracts, Forgiveness of Sins, What is it? and Regeneration, What is it? The Brethren's teaching forms the staple of the addresses of D. L. Moody. Predestination. — As regards the doctrines of grace, they hold a modified Calvinism, denying as well freewill as reprobation, and proclaim an unlimited gospel. Election regarded as arbitrary. Justification. — The righteousness in which the believer stands is God's own; distinction between active and passive obedience of Christ denied; the basis of jus- tification laid in Christ's death alone. State of Grace. — There is for the child of God "full assurance," not alone moral certainty; it is a question of nature. Believer eternally accepted, delivered from the wrath to come. Grace, available by prayer, the only power for holiness of life. While he is bound to do good works, neglect thereof, most surely followed by dis- cipline, does not alter his status. Self-abasement and confession of sin insane sense of divine forgive- ness, Christ's own priesthood preserves from sin; his advocacy restores. The cleansing of sin by Christ's blood once for all accomplished; cleansing by water (the Word) company formed on repentance; the cleansing of sins by Christ's blood, after conversion, a matter of faith. The belief in the inspiration or authority of the Protestant Bible is fatal. Every believer, a saint to begin with, sanctified practically in the truth. "Sourcements." — They hold to (a) the baptism of infants they differ, Darby having been a Pediobaptist; (b) Lord's Supper, celebrated weekly. Discipline. — V. supra, and cf. Darby's Collected Writings, vols. i. and iv. v. The Church. — Their doctrine is "essential to a full understand of Brethren's position" (Kelly). Non-existence of the church before Pentecost. Viewed from God's side, it is the body of Christ, the Spirit's workmanship, intact; from man's side, the house of God, human workmanship, marked by failure, distinct from the "kingdom." Ministry. — V. supra. Darby writes, "I hold it to be God's ordi- nance, an essential part of Christianity, in re- spect of title to minister. Kelly says, "Ordination was never practised as to . . . evangelists, or pas- tors, or teachers." Worship. — Of the simplest kind. No music, hymns (from a prescribed collection), praise, and prayer, as the Spirit leads. Cf. Kelly's Lecture (1850) and Reply to Rees, vindicating their practice: also his Thoughts on the Lord's Prayer, for their disuse of the latter, conceived to be a symbol of the position and desires of the Jewish " remnant." Eschatology. — Distinction between the time of Christ to gather his saints, the "rapture" (initial escez), and his appearing for judgment (fz. "parousia"); the day of the Lord, "generically. No true reign after that will pass through the "tribulation of the Prefect." Advent; personal reign of Christ upon, that of the church over, the earth for a thousand years. Israel restored and converted; Christ's earthly Bride to
administer his government of the nations under millennium. After the ascension of the wicked dead, the living nations have been judged at the beginning of the Messianic reign. The immortality of the soul vindicated as well by Darby (Collected Writings, vol. x.) as by F. W. Grant of America. Endless punishment: cf. Darby’s Elements of Prophecy. Kelly’s Lectures on the Minor Prophets and Revelation, as to the Resurrection of the Roman Empire, Antichrist, etc.

Their testimony is in the main as to the church, without neglect of evangelization. For their attitude towards ecclesiastical communities in general, see Darby’s Considerations on the Religious Movement of the Day (1840) and his Evangelical Protestantism and the Biblical Studies of M. Godet (1875). National churches they regard as too broad; non-conformity, as too narrow. Naturally the Evangelical Alliance has not their support. They hold the Holy Spirit’s presence in the church to be characteristic of this dispensation. “Their appreciation,” says Bledsoe, “of the Holy Spirit’s presence, power, and guidance, is the grand and distinctive character of their theology.”

In 1879 Miller wrote as follows: “In the United States 91 meetings have sprung up of late years; in Canada there are 101 meetings; in Holland, 39; in France, 243; in Switzerland, 72; in the United Kingdom, about 730, besides a charge to his clergy for an attack upon them. In Germany, 189; in France, 146; in Switzerland, 72; in the United Kingdom, about 730, besides twenty-two countries where the meetings vary from 1 to 13.” In 1836 we find Brethren already in India. Bishop Wilson of Calcutta employed a charge to his clergy for an attack upon them.


E. E. Whitfield, M.A. (Oxf. member Brethren).

PNEUMATOMACHI, a name applied generally to all who held heterodox views concerning the Holy Spirit, and more especially to the followers of Macedonius; which article see. It originated in the fourth century, and on the death of Ladislas (in 1457) was elected King of Bohemia by the Diet. The reign of King George (1457–71) marks the decisive period in the religious history of Bohemia. The Hussites had been in a manner reconciled to the church by the Compacts made with the Council of Basle. On the dissolution of the council, the Papacy neither accepted nor disavowed the Compacts, and hoped to foster a Catholic reaction within the land, which would slowly bring back Bohemia to Catholicism. Podiebrad was the great opponent of this policy, and was the greatest statesman of his age in Europe. He wished to unite Bohemia, and organize it into a great power. This was impossible, so long as Bohemia was rent by religious discord, and, through want of Papal recognition, was isolated from European politics. Podiebrad could not make peace with the Papacy without losing his hold on Bohemia; he could not attack the Papacy without losing his political position in Germany. He accordingly engaged in negotiations with the Papacy, and skilfully managed to lead the Popes, Calixtus III. and Pius II., to think that he was more compliant than he really was. Every mark of confidence which they showed he promptly used to assure his political position abroad. In 1664 he publicly acknowledged the Italian claims to him in his own kingdom, where the city of Breslau refused to acknowledge him, and was the centre
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POCOKK, Edward, D.D., Orientalist; b. at Oxford, 1628; d. there, Nov. 8, 1691. He was educated at Oxford; elected fellow of Corpus Christi College, 1682; chaplain to the English factory at Aleppo, 1630–36 (during which time he made a collection of Greek and Oriental manuscripts and coins on commission of Archbishop Laud); professor of Arabic at Constantinople, to seek for manuscripts, 1637–39; rector of Childrey, Berkshire, 1643; re-instated in his chair, 1647; professor of Hebrew, and canon of Christ Church, 1648; and in spite of bigoted and prejudiced opposition from Roundheads, and the indifference of Cavaliers, he retained these positions till his death. He was one of the foremost Orientalists in his day. His works are numerous and valuable. His Theological Works were published in 2 vols. folio, London, 1740; with a Life by the editor, Leonard Twells. They embrace Portu Musia (a Latin translation of Maimonides’ six discourses prefatory to his Commentary upon the Mishna, 1655). English Commentaries upon Hosea (1855), Joel (1691), Micah and Malachi (1677), and a Latin treatise upon ancient weights and measures. The Commentaries formed part of Fell’s projected Commentary upon the entire Old Testament. They are heavy and prolix, but learned. Pocock took a prominent part in Walton’s Polyglot, furnished the collations of the Arabic Pentateuch, and was consulted by Walton at every step. (See Polyglot Bibles.) He translated Grotius’ De rerum Christiane religiosis (1686) and the Church-of-England Liturgy and Catechism into Arabic (1674). His chief work was his edition of Gregorii Abul Farajii historia dynastiarum, Oxford, 1683, 2 vols, Arabic text with Latin translation. For Pocock’s life, see Theological Works mentioned above.

PODIEBRAD, George of, a Bohemian noble (b. 1420), who by energy and capacity rose to such importance, that, in the abeyance of the Bohemian kingdom, he was made governor in 1432. On the accession of Ladislas (1442) he remained the chief person in the kingdom, and on the death of Ladislas (1457) was elected King of Bohemia by the Diet. The reign of King George (1457–71) marks the decisive period in the religious history of Bohemia. The Hussites had been in a manner reconciled to the church by the Compacts made with the Council of Basle. On the dissolution of the council, the Papacy neither accepted nor disavowed the Compacts, and hoped to foster a Catholic reaction within the land, which would slowly bring back Bohemia to Catholicism. Podiebrad was the great opponent of this policy, and was the greatest statesman of his age in Europe. He wished to unite Bohemia, and organize it into a great power. This was impossible, so long as Bohemia was rent by religious discord, and, through want of Papal recognition, was isolated from European politics. Podiebrad could not make peace with the Papacy without losing his hold on Bohemia; he could not attack the Papacy without losing his political position in Germany. He accordingly engaged in negotiations with the Papacy, and skilfully managed to lead the Popes, Calixtus III. and Pius II., to think that he was more compliant than he really was. Every mark of confidence which they showed he promptly used to assure his political position abroad. In 1664 he publicly acknowledged the Italian claims to him in his own kingdom, where the city of Breslau refused to acknowledge him, and was the centre
of a Catholic opposition. At last Podiebrad's diplomacy came to an end. Huni was alarmed at his increasing influence; and in 1462 disclaimed the Compacts, and demanded Podiebrad's unconditional obedience. At first Podiebrad temporized, then aimed a mighty blow at the Papacy. He proposed to the various courts of Europe the summoning of a parliament of temporal princes to depose Paul II. Paul II. did not hesitate to abandon Bohemia to the horrors of a civil war that followed was not a religious war; it was a war of conquest on the part of King Mathias. Still Podiebrad was not conquered, and died victorious in 1471. Nor did Mathias gain his object, which was the one point in which the Catholic question to a more determined but less politic pope, Paul II. Paul II. did not hesitate in his increasing influence in Germany, and in intimate friendship with Antoinette Bourignon, the queen also knelt, and the cardinals arose and continued his speech, which the next day was printed, and distributed by the thousands among friends and foes. On Sept. 9, 1561, the first session was held, in the presence of the king, the queen, the princes and princesses of the royal house, and a great number of the highest dignitaries of the crown, gentlemen and ladies. The Roman Catholics were represented by the cardinals of Tournon, Lorraine, Chatillon, Armagnac, Bourbon, and Guise, the archbishop of Bourdeaux and Embrun, and thirty-six bishops; the Reformed, by thirty-four delegates, among whom were Beza and Peter Martyr Vermigli. The conference was opened by a speech of the chancellor, L'Hôpital, which showed the Reformed that they did not meet their adversaries, as they had demanded and expected, on exactly equal terms; but which also showed the Roman-Catholic prelates that they were not simply sitting in judgment, "for their verdict would have no effect if it were not found perfectly impartial and just." The word was then given to Beza. He appeared at the bar in the nobleman's black dress of the day; and, when he knelt down to pray,— the prayer which is still used in the French Reformed Church at the opening of divine service,— the queen also knelt, and the cardinals arose and uncovered. He made a long speech, and gave a succinct representation of the Reformed doctrines, in order that people might understand both the points of difference and the points of agreement between the Reformed and the Roman-Catholic churches. The speech was cool and calm and conciliatory; and it was listened to with breathless attention, its delivery being disturbed only at one single point. When Beza, in developing the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper, used the expression that the body of Christ was as far from the bread as the highest heavens are from the earth, Cardinal Tournon jumped to his feet, and cried out, " blasphemarit'." and such a tumult arose among the prelates that the queen herself had to interfere, and impose quiet. Beza, however, remained calm, and continued his speech, which the next day was printed, and distributed by the thousands among friends and foes. On Sept. 16 the second session was held. Cardinal Lorraine answered Beza. His speech was proud, but adroit and impressive. He avoided mention of transubstantiation and the mass; and, when he spoke of the bodily presence, he used terms which remind one of those of Luther. But he
refused to give the Reformed, or anybody else, a copy of his speech; and the Roman-Catholic prelates, in the same session—that is, the discussion in public. The following sessions (Sept. 24, 26, etc.) were consequently held in private; only the princes and the prelates and the Reformed delegates being present. In the session of Sept. 26, Cardinal Lorraine very cunningly proposed that the Roman Catholics should subscribe the Confessio Augustana; it was, indeed, his general policy to show off the difference which existed within the Protestant camp. But the Reformed as cunningly met the feint, urging that it would be of no use for them to subscribe the Confessio Augustana unless the Roman Catholics also subscribed. In the same session a mixed committee was formed, and charged with the drawing up of a formula consensus, which should be accepted by both parties. The committee actually succeeded in arriving at an agreement; and its formula consensus, though very vague and ambiguous, was accepted, not only by the court, but also by Cardinal Lorraine, who declared "that he had never had another faith." The doctors of the Sorbonne, however, rejected the formula as heretical; and, in the session of Oct. 6, the Roman-Catholic party presented a strictly Roman confession, which they demanded that the Reformed should subscribe. In the final session of Oct. 17 they went even farther, and demanded that all the churches and all the church property which the "heretics" had taken possession of in the various provinces should be restored. During the month which the conference lasted, a re-action took place in favor of the Roman Catholics. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands.
Pole, Reginald, Archbishop of Canterbury; b. probably in Lordington, Sussex, March, 1500; d. at Lambeth, Nov. 18, 1558. His mother was a niece of Edward IV., and governess of the eldest daughter of Henry VIII. Pole was brought up at the king's expense, educated at Oxford, given the income of several church preferments, although he was not ordained until his elevation to the archiepiscopal throne. In 1520 he was sent to Italy to continue his studies; returned, 1523.

In 1529 Henry used him as agent to procure from the Paris university a favorable opinion upon the divorce from Catharine of Aragon. In order to avoid any public expression of opinion upon the matter, on his return he retired to the monastery at Sheen, and there prosecuted theological studies. In 1531 he declined the archiepiscopate of York, and in the next year left England. In 1533, on the king's demand for a definite expression of opinion upon the divorce and upon the king's supremacy over the church, he wrote De unitate ecclesiae, in which he not only uttered a judgment adverse to the king upon both points, but heaped abuse upon his opponents. The book, of course, filled Henry VIII. with astonishment and rage. He ordered Pole to appear in person before him to answer for his deed. This Pole declined to do, but told the king to reply to the book if he pleased; and the Bishop of Durham undertook the task. Pole's motive in thus brushing aside the king's order was that there was much dissatisfaction in England with Henry's doings: he hoped to head the party to put Edward IV. on the throne, and thus bring England on the side of the emperor. He probably also desired to marry the cousin of the emperor, the Princess Marie, the daughter of Catharine of Aragon. On the day of the presentation of Bishop of Durham's answer, Pole was summoned to Rome. There he was highly honored by the Pope, Paul III.; made a cardinal; sent (1537) as legate to the Netherlands, and given much to do in preparing the revolt which was to dethrone Henry. The scheme came to nothing; and Pole found himself generally considered as a traitor, and as such he was mistrusted by both Francis I. and Charles V. The Pope, however, treated him kindly, and sent him (June, 1538) as legate to Toledo, and later (1541) to Viterbo. In the autumn of 1542, Pole's brother (the Countess of Salisbury) and his brothers into prison, and in 1541 executed them all, except the youngest brother, on charge of treason. In 1544, on the coronation of Mary, Pole returned to England as legate; entered heartily into the work of restoring the papal authority in England; was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury (March 22, 1558), and during his brief authority put to death as heretics five bishops, twenty-one priests, eight nobles, eighty-four artisans, a hundred peasants, twenty-six women; removed the bones of Peter Martyr Vermigli from Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford, to unconsecrated ground; exhumed the bodies of Butzer and Fagius, which had long rested in Cambridge, and burnt them. Yet Pole had been himself charged with heresy. To him had been attributed the famous book Del benefizio di Gesù Cristi confessa. He was more than suspected of maintaining the Lutheran justification by faith; and his election as pope, on the death of Paul III. (1549), when he really had received the majority of votes, was prevented by the charge of heresy brought by his foe, Caraffa; and, when the latter became Paul IV. (1555), he withdrew Pole's commission as legate to England (May, 1557), and summoned him to Rome to appear before the tribunal of the Inquisition. Death intervened before the order could be obeyed, but the Inquisition called him a heretic. Carnevecchi says of Pole, that "in Rome he was considered a Lutheran, in Germany a papist, at the Flemish court to belong to the French party, at the French court to the imperial party." It was characteristic of him to try to please all parties. But, although vacillating upon other points, he always held firmly to the defence of the papal authority, and to his desire to bring England in unconditional surrender to the Continent. But what he could to bring this policy into action; but the temper of the English people, the death of Charles V., and the fanatical zeal of the Pope, must have opened his eyes to its impossibility.

most effect. And again: conscious method is the beginning of science; not that polemics, though practised with great skill as an art, ever in antiquity developed into a systematic theory, a science. It was in the Reformation that, as it were, the Reformation showed itself a new and violent impulses, that the need of a complete theory of the art of polemics was felt. Hints of the kind are scattered through the works of Martin Chemnitz, Bellarmin, Hurriss, and others; but the Jesuits were the first to give systematic representations of the method of polemics: hence they were called "Methodists." The Protestants followed the example, and a considerable literature soon grew up. See Abraham Calovius (Synopsis controversiarum, 1655) on the Protestant side, and Virtus Picher (Theologia polemica, 1723) on the Roman-Catholic side. By Schleiermacher, finally, polemics was incorporated with the theologcal system as a part of philosophical theology. See his Darstellung des theologischen Studiums (Berlin, 1811), and more especially the work of his disciple, Sack: Christliche Polemik (Bonn, 1838). As the systematization of the various theological departments has varied, the place of polemics in the system has, of course, also varied. See Pelt: Theol. Encyclop., Hamburg, 1848; and J. P. Lange: Christl. Dogmatik, Heidelberg, 1849-52, 3 vols., etc. Such a change, however, does not materially alter its scientific character.

POLENTZ, George of. See George of Polentz.

POLIANDER, Johann, b. at Xeustadt, in the Palatinat, 1487; d. in Köngisberg, 1843. He studied at Leipzig; was rector of the Thomas school there, 1516-22, and acted as secretary to Eck during his famous dispute with Luther, in 1519, but was converted by Luther's argument, embraced the Reformation, and was in 1525 appointed preacher in Königsberg, where he spent the rest of his life. He was very active in introducing the Reformation into Prussia, and is the author of the celebrated hymn, Nun lob mein Seel den Herren ("Now to the Lord sing praises"), translated by Mills, in Horae Germanicae. See Rost: Memoria Poliandri, Leipzig, 1808.

POLITY, as applied to the church, means government or administration of the church, so far as the church is considered simply as an institution among other institutions. Among the most recent books in this department may be mentioned, G. A. Jacob: Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament, London, 1871; Charles Hodge: The Church and its Polity, New York and London, 1879; E. Hatch: The Organization of the Early Christian Churches, London, 1881; George T. Ladd: The Principles of Church Polity, New York, 1882; J. A. Hodge: What is Presbyterian Polity? Philadelphia, 1882; A. A. Pellicca: The Polity of the Christian Church of Early Medieval and Modern Times, translated from the Latin by J. C. Bellett, London, 1883; G. A. Jacob: Christliche Polenik (Bonn, 1838). As the systematization of the various theological departments has varied, the place of polemics in the system has, of course, also varied. See Pelt: Theol. Encyclop., Hamburg, 1848; and J. P. Lange: Christl. Dogmatik, Heidelberg, 1849-52, 3 vols., etc. Such a change, however, does not materially alter its scientific character.

POLYCARP, Bishop of Smyrna. Though Polycarp is one of the most celebrated characters in ancient Christendom, very little is known of his life. According to the account of his pupil, Irenaeus, he was himself a pupil of the apostles, more especially of John, and had conversed with many who had seen the Lord in the flesh. According to Tertullian (De prescriptione, 32) and Jerome (Catal. sacr. eccl., 17), he was consecrated Bishop of Smyrna by John. From the latter part of his life we know, that, while Anicetus was Bishop of Rome, he visited that city in order to establish uniformity throughout the Christian Church with respect to the term of the celebration of Easter. He did not succeed. But, on the other hand, the difference did not destroy the church communion; Polycarp participating in the Lord's Supper while in Rome. See Eusebius: Hist. Eccl., V. 23.

A more detailed account has come down to us of his martyrdom. The Martyrium Polycarpi was known to Eusebius, who incorporated all its chief events with his church history. It was first edited (Latin and Greek), but incomplete, by Halloix, then by Ussher, Ruinart, and others. The best edition is that by Zahn, in his Patr. Apost. Oper. Valesius declared those Acts, the oldest of the kind; and the genuineness of the document was generally accepted, until Lipsius, and, after him, Keim, raised some doubt. Lipsius dates the Acts at about 260; and his reasons are, the high-pitched reverence for the martyrs, an indication of the use of the Roman Easter-term, and the occurrence of the categoricalexpression, "the Catholic Church." But that expression was by no means new in 167. The hint at the Roman Easter-term, if really found, would compel us to fix the date of the document much later, which is impossible on account of Eusebius; and, finally, the reverence for the martyrs chimes in very well with the time. The only doubt which can be justly entertained with respect to the document is about its perfect authenticity. It may have been altered here and there, or subjected to interpolations.

About the year of the death of Polycarp, there has, of late, been much controversy. Eusebius fixes it, both in his Chronicon and in his church history, at 166; Jerome, at 167. In the chronological appendix to the Acts, Status Quaquarius is mentioned as proconsul of Asia; and, in his Collectanea ad Aristidis silvam, Masson computed the proconsular year of Quadratus at 165-166. Washington, however, in his Memoire sur l'histoire de la vie du héros Élius Aristide, in the Mem. de
POLYCHRONIUS.

The martyrdom took place on a series of ingenious hypotheses. Quadratus, the most prominent of the exegetes of the Antioch school, was first published in Latin by Faber Stapulensis, consequently worthless addition. The Acts themselves simply state that the martyrdom took place on Saturday, the 10th of Nisan; and the 16th of Nisan was a Saturday, both in 156 and in 155.

Of the letters of Polycarp, all have perished, with the exception of one to the Philippians. It was first published in Latin by Faber Stapulensis (1498), then in Greek by Halloix (1633), and afterwards often: the best edition is that by Zahn. It is only mentioned in the chronological appendix; and that appendix is most probably a later and consequently worthless addition. The Acts themselves simply state that the martyrdom took place on Saturday, the 10th of Nisan; and the 16th of Nisan was a Saturday, both in 156 and in 155.

As it contains a direct reference to the letters of Ignatius, all critics who reject those letters as spurious have tried to make its genuineness suspected. It was known, however, to, and accepted by, Ireneaus, Eusebius, and Jerome; and it is difficult to understand how a spurious letter of Polycarp could have been brought into general circulation at the time when Ireneaus wrote (about 180), and still more difficult to understand how it could be accepted by him, the pupil of Polycarp. Nevertheless, it involves very great difficulties, as, for instance, the visit of Polycarp to Rome could have been brought into general circulation. It was known, however, to, and accepted by, Ireneaus, Eusebius, and Jerome; and it is difficult to understand how it could be accepted by him, the pupil of Polycarp. Nevertheless, it involves very great difficulties, as, for instance, the visit of Polycarp to Rome could be accepted by him, the pupil of Polycarp.

POLYCHRONIUS.

Bishop of Apamea, and brother of Theodore of Mopsuestia, was one of the most prominent of the exegetes of the Antioch school. Of his life nothing further is known. He wrote Commentaries on Job, Daniel, and Ezekiel. But, though he was never formally condemned, he was nevertheless considered a heretic; and of his Commentaries, only fragments have come down to us in the Catena. See Bar- denhewer: Polychronius, 1879.

POLYGAMY. See Marriage.

POLYGLOT BIBLES are, in general, editions of the Scriptures in which two or more versions appear side by side. They have existed from very early times, perhaps from the period immediately following the return from the Babylonish captivity, when there are traces of a combination of the original Hebrew text and a Chaldee Targum. There is, in the Barberini Library at Rome, a Samaritan Pentateuch Triglot, which dates from the middle age, and contains the original Hebrew text, the same translated into the Samaritan dialect of the first Christian century, and also into Arabic. In respect to the New Testament, the necessities of the peoples to whom the gospel was carried obliged early translations from Greek, and led to the separation of diglots, in which were the original text and the vernacular version. Of this class there are some of very early date; e.g., among those having Greek and Latin texts are, for the Gospels, D (Codex Bezae), from A.D. 550; for the Acts, E (Codex Laudianus), from end of sixth century; and, for the Pauline Epistles, D (Codex Claromontanus), from second half of the fourth century; and, for the Apocalypse, T (Codex Borgianus), from the close of ninth century. The Codex Borgianus (T), in the Propaganda College, Rome, dates from the fifth century, and presents Greek text and Sahidic version. These manuscripts tell their own story. The original had ceased to be intelligible, but the Hebrew text was not yet come where it could be omitted: so there are Greek-Syriac manuscripts, Greek-Coptic, and many other similar combinations. The Roman Church has never authorized the use of the Vulgate in connection with any version. For the critical determination of the text of the Septuagint, Origen compiled the Hexapla, in which he presented the Hebrew text, in Hebrew and Greek letters, along with the Septuagint and three different Greek versions, — Aquila's, Symmachus', and Theodotion's. Thus, although there were five texts, there were only two languages.

But all these combinations of texts are not really polyglots in the present usage of the term. Nor is the word correctly applied to those editions of the Bible which contain, (1) Merely the Hebrew and Greek originals; (2) The originals and a single complete translation for exegetical purposes, usually modern, e.g., Greek New Testament with Latin translation of Erasmus or of Beza; (3) The originals and church authorized versions, e.g., with Vulgate, Luther, A.V.; (4) The originals and two versions in the same language, e.g., Greek text, authorized and revised versions; (5) Several versions, with the omission of the original, e.g., Canticles or the catholic Epistles in Ethiopic, Arabic, and Latin; (6) The so-called Biblia pentapla, i.e., five German translations; (7) The original, an old version, and then a translation of the version: such are triglots, but not polyglots; (8) The original, and several versions in one language, e.g., Rupester's English Hexapla, which contains the Wyclif, Tyndale, Cranmer, Genevan, Anglo-Rhemish, and authorized versions of the New Testament, placed in parallel columns under reprint of Scholz's edition of the text of the Greek New Testament. Excluding these spurious polyglots, there remain only a few works to which the name properly belongs; and among these are only four, which, on account of their importance, deserve special mention.

I. The Complutensian Polyglot (Alcala, 1513-17, 6 vols. folio), one of the rarest and most famous of printed works, prepared, under the care and at the cost of Cardinal Ximenes (d. 1517, see art.), by famous Spanish scholars, among whom the work was thus divided: the Hebrew and Chaldee texts were edited by three converted Jews, Alphonso of Alcala, Paul Cornillon of Segovia, and Alphonso of Zamora; the Greek and Latin texts, by Demetrius Dukas of Crete, Alitus Antonius of Lebria, Diego Lopez de Zuniga (Stunica), Fernando Nunez de Guzman, and others. Begun in 1502, in celebration of the birth of an heir to the throne of Castile, Charles V. (Feb. 24, 1500), it was carried through the press of Arlando Guillermo de Brocario, at Alcala de Henares, the Complutum (hence the name Complutensian), from 1513 to 1517, but not published until 1520, by special permission of Pope Leo X. (March 22, 1520). The delay enabled Erasmus to have the glory of editing the first Greek Testament published (1516). The Complutensian Polyglot is in six folio volumes (in one of them, the first four contain the Old Testament; the fifth, the New Testament (the printing of which was finished Jan. 10, 1514, performed by I. Duchesne: Vita sancti Poly. Smyr. episcopius auctore Pionio prim. Gr. et., Paris, 1881; LIGHTFOOT: Apostolic Fathers, Pt. II., 1885.) G. UHLHORN.

POLYGLOT BIBLES.
the type is large and peculiar); and the sixth, a Hebrew and Chaldee lexic on, with grammars, etc. (This volume was printed second, and was later separately published under title A L P H O N S I Z A M O R E N S Introductiones hebraice. Complutum, 1523 and often.) The entire work of printing was finished on Nov. 10, 1560, and was then separated into two parts, each of which was printed separately; the first, containing the Hebrew and Chaldee books, was printed by the Antwerp printer, who, perceiving that the cost of printing was excessive, and, after use, were returned. The first part, containing the Hebrew Old Testament with an interlinear translation, which is partly the Vulgate, and partly the version of Pagninus, corrected by the text, and afterwards reprinted. The Polyglot, looked at critically, is not very satisfactory. It depends a great deal upon the Complutensian; and its variations in the Greek New Testament are due to Stephen's readings, and not to any independent study of manuscripts. Because Arias had printed in the Polyglot the Targums and much matter from Jewish sources, he was accused by the Jesuits of leaning toward Judaism, and was obliged to defend himself at Rome against the charge of heresy. (See ARIAS.) Of this Polyglot, five hundred copies only were printed; and the greater part of these were lost at sea, on their way to Spain. It is therefore now a rare work. III. The Paris Polyglot (Paris, 1628-45, 10 folio, largest size), designed by Cardinal Duperron, edited by Gabriel Sionita (see art.), printed in Paris by Antoine Vitre, at the expense of the parliamentary advocate, Guy Michel le Jay. In external respects it is the finest of the polyglots, but in contents has the least critical value. It is substantially a mere reprint of the Antwerp Polyglot, and makes no use of printed materials which had come to hand since; e.g., the I.X.X., from the Codex Vaticanus (1587), and the Sixto Clementine Vulgate (1590, 1592). It presents, as its only novelties, the Samaritan Pentateuch with the Samaritan version of the same, a Syriac and an Arabic version of the Old Testament, each accompanied by a Latin translation. Cardinal Richelieu bid a hundred thousand pounds for the glory of being its patron, but Le Jay preferred to have the glory himself. So heavy was the expense, that it absorbed his entire fortune; while the defects of the work were so notorious, the volumes so unwieldy, and the price so high, that comparatively few copies were sold, except as waste-paper. Le Jay, financially a ruined man, entered the priesthood; became dean of Verzela; was made by Louis XIV. a councillor of state, and then afresh (1660), in different language, to Pope Alexander VII., as if it were a new work. The new title calls it BIBLIA Polvglotta. For an account of the Paris Polyglot, see Le Long: Discours historiques sur les principales editions des Bibbes Polyglottes, Paris, 1713, pp. 104-204.

IV. The London Polyglot (London, 1654-57, 6 vols. folio) is the most important, the most comprehensive, the most valuable (critically speaking), and the most widely spread of the Polyglots. It was edited by Brian Walton, printed by Thomas Roycroft, and dedicated, first to Oliver Cromwell (1657, these are the so-called "Republican" copies), and then afresh (1660), in different language, to Charles II. (these are the so-called "Loyal" copies, and are by far the more numerous.) Cromwell practically proved his interest in Walton's scheme by allowing the paper for it to be imported free of duty,—a service acknowledged in the original preface. In the "Loyal" copies, however, this acknowledgment is with- drawn, and Cromwell is spoken of as "the great Dragon." It was published by subscription,—probably the first work in England so published,—at ten pounds a set. Twelve copies of the Polyglot were printed upon large paper. Walton had the assistance of all the learned men in Eng-

---

1 Tregelles, Printed Text, etc., pp. 16-18, gives an official list of manuscripts used in the other parts of the Polyglot.
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land, particularly the Orientalists, of whom the most famous were Edmund Castell (Castellus), Edward Pocock, Thomas Hyde, Dudley Loftus, Abraham Wheelock, Thomas Graves (Gravina), and Samuel Clark (Clericus). It is said that an offer was made Le Jay for six hundred copies of his (Paris) Polyglot at half-price, for circulation in America; and that this offer, that the plan of a polyglot which should greatly exceed the Paris in convenience and value, but be much less expensive, was formed. The first four volumes contain the Old Testament in the following forms: Hebrew text, with the Antwerp Latin interlinear; the Samaritan Pentateuch; the Septuagint, from the Roman edition of 1587, with the various readings of the Codex Alexandrinus; the fragments of the Itala, collected by Flamininus Nobilius; the Vulgate according to the Roman edition, with the corrections of Lukas of Brugge; the Peshito, with translations of some Syriac apocrypha, — a much better text than the Paris; the Arabic version; the Targums from Buxtorf's edition; the Samaritan translation of the Pentateuch; and, finally, Psalms and Canticles in Ethiopic. All these texts other than the Vulgate are accompanied by Latin translations, and appear side by side. In the fourth volume are presented the Hebrew and Greek texts, with Septuagint, Latin, and German; 1599 the New Testament, in Greek, Syriac (Peshito), Romana, German (Luther), Latin (Sebastian Schmidt), with Greek, various readings, and Luther's glosses, Old Testament (1750–51, 2 vols.), only in Hebrew, Septuagint, Latin (Schmidt), and German (Luther).

(3) The most comprehensive polyglot of recent times is Burgard's (London, 1831, folio) in which are presented (besides the Greek and Hebrew originally) the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac, German (Luther), Italian (Diodati), French (Oesterwald), Spanish (Seio), and the authorized English versions. It was edited by Samuel Lee, and has good Prolegomena.

(4) The most generally used and the cheapest polyglot is the Bibliod (1855–54, 8 vols.; 4th ed. 1875, 4 vols., in 6 parts), edited by Rudolf Stier and C. G. W. Thiele, in which the Old Testament appears in Hebrew, Greek (Septuagint), Latin (Vulgate), and German (Luther); and the New Testament in Greek, Latin, German, and, in the fourth column, various readings from other German Bible translations, or, in some editions, the authorized English version. The New-Testament Greek text is substantially the "received," but with the more important various readings. (7) The Hexaglot Bible, edited by R. de Levante, London, 1871–73, 6 vols. quart, This work is a mere reprint. It presents the Hebrew and Greek texts, with Septuagint, Syriac (Peshito), Latin (Vulgate), English authorized version, German (Luther), and French versions.

Not falling under the head of polyglots, yet worthy of mention, are the New Testament in Greek, Latin (Tr&Mans), and, finally, such curiosities as the Lord's Prayer in a hundred and fifty languages, edited by Chamberlayne, 1716; J. Adelung's Mehrsprachiger (Berlin, 1806–17, 4 vols.), in which it appears in nearly five hundred languages and dialects; and H. Lamebeck's Psalm 104 im Urtext mit seiner Uebertragung in 11 Sprachen als Specimen einer Psalter-Polyglotte (Köthen, 1883).

POLYTHEISM. 1867

POLYTHEISM. The principal question relating to this subject is that of the origin of polytheism. The circumstance that polytheism so often has developed into pantheism, as, for instance, among the Hindus and the Greeks, seems to designate it as the primitive form of all religion; so that even the biblical monotheism might be considered as having grown up from it. The Bible itself, however, is far from countenancing such a view. Neither Gen. iv. 26, nor Exod. vi. 3, contains any reference to a previous polytheism. Neither the Pentateuch nor the prophets show the least trace of an original polytheism. Jafve-Elohim was with the patriarch before as after Noah; and was he who revealed himself on Mount Sinai, and made his sole worship the first commandment. The polytheism of heathendom is, indeed, in the Bible, considered a process of decomposition and degeneration. See HAP-PEL: Die Entstehung der Viilker, 1868.

Further on in the Old Testament, the gradual development of polytheism from the primitive monotheism may be learned from the history of Abraham. From a faith in the one God, Maccisedec is the same god as the El Shaddai of Abraham; but, according to Josh. xxiv. 2, Abraham separated from an idolatrous father and brother when he emigrated to Canaan; from the history of Jacob; who saw the abomination of images creep into his family from Mesopotamian relatives and his father-in-law Laban (Gen. xxxi. 19); from the history of Joseph in Egypt, who married a daughter of the priest of On (Gen. xli. 50); and, finally, from the history of Moses, who, in a tremendous struggle with Egyptian and Midianite heathenism, strove to keep his people firm in the faith in the one God. In the same manner the New Testament, whenever it touches the subject, presupposes that the Pagan religions have developed from a true religious principle by a process of decomposition and degeneration. See Rom. i. 21; Acts xiv. 16, xvii. 28.

In spite of the plain assertion of the Bible, the opposite view, considering monotheism as a simple evolution from polytheism, has, nevertheless, found many adherents among the disciples of modern naturalism. It first took shape among the English deists of the eighteenth century; and it now occurs under three different forms, accord-
Poole, Matthew, b. at York, Eng., 1624; educated at Emmanuel College, in Cambridge; he became minister of St. Michael-le-Quernes, London, in 1648, and devoted himself to the Presbyterian cause. In 1654 he published _The Blasphemous Slain with the Sword of the Spirit, against John Biddle_, the chief Unitarian of the time. In 1659 he published _Model for the maintaining of Students_, and _A Treatise on the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches_, which played an important part in the Unitarian controversy then going on. He retired in 1892, and in September of that year went to Bangor, Me., as professor of systematic theology in the theological seminary there, and taught in this department until 1856, when he became president, and professor of ecclesiastical and pastoral theology. In 1870 he retired from active service, although retaining his presidency until his death. To Dr. Pond, Bangor Theological Seminary is much indebted. When he came to it, it had only one professor and two students, and a library of five hundred volumes. He proved himself to be the right man in the right place; and, largely through his energy, the seminary was built up to its present strength. He was much beloved in the city and throughout the State. He was a voluminous author. Among his works may be mentioned _Christian Baptism_, Boston, 1817, 3d ed., 1832; _Morning of the Reformation_, 1842; _Swedenborgianism reviewed_, Boston, 1846 (new edition, _Swedenborgianism examined_, 1881); _Plato, his Life, Works, Opinions, and Influence_, 1848; _The Ancient Church_, 1851; _Lectures on Pastoral Theology_, Andover, 1856; _Lectures on Christian Theology_, Boston, 1858; _The Seals opened_, Portland, 1871; _A History of God's Church from its Origin to the Present Times_, Hartford, 1871; _Conversations on the Bible_, 1881.

Pomfret, John, a moral and sacred poet; was b. probably at Luton in Bedfordshire, 1677, and d. in London, 1703; educated at Cambridge, and lived the life of Malden, Bedfordshire. His _Poems_ appeared 1699, 10th ed., enlarged, 1736. Southey called him "the most popular of the English poets," and said, "Perhaps no composition in our language has been oftener perused than Pomfret's Choice," F. M. Bird.

Pomponatus, Petrus, b. 1462; d. 1524; descended from a noble family in Mantua; studied philosophy and medicine at Padua; taught afterwards there, and at Ferrara and Bologna; and was one of the most celebrated teachers of philosophy in his time. From Aristotle he drew conclusions which stood in direct opposition to the tenets of Christianity; but he escaped ecclesiastical interference by declaring that his propositions were true only in philosophy, and that personally he accepted the revealed and inspired truth of religion and science; and his views found great favor in his time. His principal works are, _De immortalitate animae_ (in which he denies the immortality of the soul on philosophical grounds), _De immortalitate hominis_, and _De fato_ of which tend in the same direction. See Olearius: _De Pomponatis_, Jena, 1705.

Pond, Enoch, D.D., Congregationalist; b. at Wrentham, Mass., July 29, 1791; d. at Bangor, Me., Jan. 21, 1882. He was graduated at Brown University, Providence, R. I., 1813; studied theology under Rev. Dr. Nathanael Emmons (see art.), and was licensed June, 1814, and ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Ward (now Auburn), Mass., March 1, 1815. There he remained until, in 1828, he went to Boston to edit _The Spirit of the Pilgrims_, an orthodox religious periodical, in which he played an important part in the Unitarian controversy then going on. He retired in 1892, and in September of that year went to Bangor, Me., as professor of systematic theology in the theological seminary there, and taught in this department until 1856, when he became president, and professor of ecclesiastical history, and lecturer on pastoral theology. In 1870 he retired from active service, although retaining his presidency until his death. To Dr. Pond, Bangor Theological Seminary is much indebted. When
death in the Popish Plot. He retired to Amsterdam, and died in October, 1679. Few names will stand so high as Poole's in the biblical scholarship of Great Britain. See Non-Conformist Memorial, London, 1862, p. 167, and an account of the life and writings of Matthew Poole, in the Annotated Vol. IV., Edinb., 1891. C. A. BRIGGS.

POOR, Daniel D., Congregational missionary; b. at Danvers, Mass., June 27, 1779; d. at Mepmy, Ceylon, Feb. 2, 1855. He was graduated at Dartmouth College, 1811, and Andover Seminary, 1814; sailed from Newburyport, Mass., for Ceylon, Oct. 23, 1815; returned home in 1848; went back to Ceylon, 1850. He was very successful in missionary labor. From 1823 to 1830 he was in charge of the mission seminary at Batickota; from 1830 to 1841, at Madura on the mainland, where, in his first year, he opened thirty-seven schools. From 1841 to his death, he labored in Ceylon. See Sprague: Annals of the American Pulpit, ii. 617.

POOR MEN OF LYONS. See Waldenses.

POPE. The word "pope" is the Latin "papa," from the Greek "patriarch," and means "father." It was anciently given to all Christian teachers, then to all bishops and abbots, then limited to the Bishop of Rome and the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople. In the Greek Church to-day it is the customary address of every secular priest. The name appears, as first applied to the Bishop of Rome, in the letter of a deacon, Severus, to Marcellinus (386-394); was first formally adopted by Siricius (Bishop of Rome from 384 to 398), in his Epist. ad Ortod. prov.; officially used since Leo I. (440-461); and declared the exclusive right of the papacy by the decree of Gregory VII. (1073-85).

Besides this title, the Pope is called Pontifex Maximus (literally, "chief bridge-builder"), in imitation of the Roman emperors, who united civil and religious functions; Vicar of St. Peter (Boniface, in 722, named the Pope this); Vicar of Jesus Christ, or of God (so, first, Innocent III., 1198-1216). The popes since Gregory I. (590-604) call themselves Servant of the servants of God (Servus servorum Dei).

The Pope dresses ordinarily in a white silk cassock and rochet: hence the expression "white pope," in contrast to the "black pope," the general of the Society of Jesus. Over this white dress he throws a scarlet mantle. When celebrating mass, he changes his gown according to the season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pope</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>POOR, Daniel D.</td>
<td>Congregational missionary; b. at Danvers, Mass., June 27, 1779; d. at Mepmy, Ceylon, Feb. 2, 1855. He was graduated at Dartmouth College, 1811, and Andover Seminary, 1814; sailed from Newburyport, Mass., for Ceylon, Oct. 23, 1815; returned home in 1848; went back to Ceylon, 1850. He was very successful in missionary labor. From 1823 to 1830 he was in charge of the mission seminary at Batickota; from 1830 to 1841, at Madura on the mainland, where, in his first year, he opened thirty-seven schools. From 1841 to his death, he labored in Ceylon. See Sprague: Annals of the American Pulpit, ii. 617.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>POOR MEN OF LYONS.</td>
<td>See Waldenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>POPE.</td>
<td>The word &quot;pope&quot; is the Latin &quot;papa,&quot; from the Greek &quot;patriarch,&quot; and means &quot;father.&quot; It was anciently given to all Christian teachers, then to all bishops and abbots, then limited to the Bishop of Rome and the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople. In the Greek Church to-day it is the customary address of every secular priest. The name appears, as first applied to the Bishop of Rome, in the letter of a deacon, Severus, to Marcellinus (386-394); was first formally adopted by Siricius (Bishop of Rome from 384 to 398), in his Epist. ad Ortod. prov.; officially used since Leo I. (440-461); and declared the exclusive right of the papacy by the decree of Gregory VII. (1073-85). Besides this title, the Pope is called Pontifex Maximus (literally, &quot;chief bridge-builder&quot;), in imitation of the Roman emperors, who united civil and religious functions; Vicar of St. Peter (Boniface, in 722, named the Pope this); Vicar of Jesus Christ, or of God (so, first, Innocent III., 1198-1216). The popes since Gregory I. (590-604) call themselves Servant of the servants of God (Servus servorum Dei). The Pope dresses ordinarily in a white silk cassock and rochet: hence the expression &quot;white pope,&quot; in contrast to the &quot;black pope,&quot; the general of the Society of Jesus. Over this white dress he throws a scarlet mantle. When celebrating mass, he changes his gown according to the season, from two cardinal deacons, who put it on his head, saying, &quot;Receive the tiara ornamented by the three crowns, and know that you are the father of bishops and kings, the earthly governor of the world, the vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom be honor, world without end.&quot; The official letters of the Pope are briefs or bulls (see art.). &quot;The Pope, as head of the church, acts successively as Bishop of Rome (the diocese comprehends the city and the country around within a radius of some miles, the cathedral of which is St. John Lateran), as Archbishop of the Roman province (which comprehends twenty-seven bishoprics, besides six suburban bishoprics), as Prior of Italy, and as Patriarch of the East.&quot; (S. Berger.) For the manner of the election of a pope, see Conclave; for the papal system, see Papacy. See C. F. B. Allnatt: Callecdra Petri; or, The Titles and Prerogatives of St. Peter and of his See and Successors, 3d ed., London, 1883. Cf. arts. Pope, by S. Berger, in Lichtenberg, Encyclopédie, vol. x. (1881), 163-170; Pope, by J. B. Mullinger, in Smith and Cheetham, Dictionary Christian Antiquity, vol. ii. (1880), 1651-77, and Dean Stanley's chap., &quot;The Pope,&quot; in his Christian Institutions, London and New York, 1861.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>Reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Alexander I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314–356</td>
<td>Eleutherus</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356–357</td>
<td>Theodosius I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357–399</td>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399–417</td>
<td>Damasus I</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417–431</td>
<td>Felix II</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431–492</td>
<td>Damasus II</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492–514</td>
<td>Innocent I</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514–523</td>
<td>Zosimus</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523–526</td>
<td>John I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526–528</td>
<td>Gelasius</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528–530</td>
<td>Liberius</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530–535</td>
<td>Johannes II</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535–553</td>
<td>John II</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553–556</td>
<td>Julius I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556–557</td>
<td>John III</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557–565</td>
<td>Simplicius II</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565–572</td>
<td>Marcellus</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572–575</td>
<td>John IV</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575–590</td>
<td>Damascus II</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590–604</td>
<td>Gregory I</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604–606</td>
<td>Honorius II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606–607</td>
<td>Zosimus II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607–615</td>
<td>Leo I</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615–619</td>
<td>Gelasius II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619–626</td>
<td>Felix III</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626–638</td>
<td>Leo II</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638–642</td>
<td>Simplicius III</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642–657</td>
<td>Nicholas I</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657–668</td>
<td>Martin I</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668–678</td>
<td>Leo III</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678–681</td>
<td>Gregory II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681–685</td>
<td>Benedict I</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685–686</td>
<td>Stephen I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686–687</td>
<td>Martin II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687–701</td>
<td>Honorius III</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701–716</td>
<td>Leo IV</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716–752</td>
<td>Nicholas II</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752–757</td>
<td>John V</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757–795</td>
<td>John VI</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795–817</td>
<td>Sixtus II</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817–827</td>
<td>Marcellus II</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827–847</td>
<td>Leo V</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847–867</td>
<td>Julius II</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867–884</td>
<td>Nicholas III</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884–887</td>
<td>Nicholas IV</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887–903</td>
<td>Leo VI</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903–918</td>
<td>Clement I</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918–928</td>
<td>Leo VII</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928–931</td>
<td>Stephen I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>931–934</td>
<td>Honorius IV</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934–938</td>
<td>Leo VIII</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>938–945</td>
<td>Stephen II</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945–955</td>
<td>Gregory III</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955–963</td>
<td>Benedict II</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963–974</td>
<td>Stephen III</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974–985</td>
<td>Honorius V</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>985–996</td>
<td>John IX</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996–1003</td>
<td>Benedict IV</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003–1005</td>
<td>Leo V</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005–1006</td>
<td>Gelasius III</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006–1007</td>
<td>Anastasius III</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007–1012</td>
<td>Honorius VI</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012–1013</td>
<td>Stephen VII</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013–1019</td>
<td>Gregory V</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019–1032</td>
<td>Calixtus II</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032–1049</td>
<td>Benedict VI</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1049–1054</td>
<td>John X</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1054–1055</td>
<td>Benedict VII</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055–1056</td>
<td>John XI</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1056–1057</td>
<td>Gregory VII (deposed)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057–1061</td>
<td>Benedict X</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1061–1065</td>
<td>Nicholas II</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065–1066</td>
<td>Alexander II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066–1068</td>
<td>Cadmus (Honorius II)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068–1070</td>
<td>Gregory VII (Eldad brand)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070–1074</td>
<td>Stephen X (deposed)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1074–1085</td>
<td>Benedict X</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085–1090</td>
<td>John XIX</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090–1096</td>
<td>Silverius III</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096–1100</td>
<td>Leo VI</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100–1102</td>
<td>Gregory VIII</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102–1103</td>
<td>John XVII</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103–1107</td>
<td>Siricius VII</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107–1111</td>
<td>Eugenius III</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111–1115</td>
<td>Benedict III</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115–1119</td>
<td>Leo VII</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1119–1124</td>
<td>Honorius II</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1124–1129</td>
<td>Innocent II</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1129–1132</td>
<td>Anacletus II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1132–1137</td>
<td>Stephen II</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1137–1143</td>
<td>Marcellus II</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1143–1147</td>
<td>Leo VII</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1147–1153</td>
<td>Benedict III</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153–1159</td>
<td>John VIII</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159–1165</td>
<td>Stephen III</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1165–1171</td>
<td>John X</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1171–1172</td>
<td>Gregory III</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1172–1175</td>
<td>Benedict III</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1175–1181</td>
<td>Stephen IV</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1181–1182</td>
<td>Stephen V</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1182–1183</td>
<td>Stephen VI</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1183–1184</td>
<td>Formosus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1184–1185</td>
<td>Boniface VI</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1185–1186</td>
<td>Stephen VII</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1186–1187</td>
<td>Romanus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1187–1191</td>
<td>Theodore II</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1191–1196</td>
<td>Honorius III</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Clement V. moved the papal seat to Avignon in 1309; and his successors continued to reside there for seventy years, till Gregory XII. After that date, arose a forty-years' schism between the Roman Popes and the Avignon Popes.

1277-1280 Urban V.
1280-1285 Boniface IX.
1285-1303 Celestine V (abdicated).
1294-1303 Boniface VIII.
1303-1304 Benedict XI.
1304-1314 Clement V.
1314-1316 John XXII.
1316-1334 John XXIII.
1323-1324 Benedict XII.
1324-1328 Clement VI.
1328-1334 Innocent VI.
1334-1370 Urban V.
1337-1378 Gregory XI.
1378-1381 Urban VI.
1381-1389 Clement VII.
1389-1404 Boniface IX.
1394-1406 Boniface VIII.
1406-1409 Innocent VII.
1409-1411 Alexander V.
1411-1413 John XXIII.
1413-1417 Gregory XII.
1417-1418 Martin V.
1418-1423 Eugene IV.
1423-1427 Eugene IV.
1427-1431 Sixtus IV.
1431-1447 Alexander V.
1447-1458 Calixtus IV.
1458-1461 Nicholas V.
1461-1464 Paul II.
1464-1471 Paul II.
1471-1478 Sixtus IV.
1478-1484 Innocent VIII.
1484-1492 Alexander VI.
1492-1494 Paul III.
1494-1503 Julius II.
1503-1513 Leo X.
1513-1521 Hadrian VI.
1521-1523 Clement VII.
1523-1534 Paul III.
1534-1565 Julius II.
1565-1572 Clement VII.
1572-1590 Gregory XIII.
1590-1591 Sixtus V.
1591-1595 Urban VII.
1595-1605 Alexander VII.
1605-1606 Clement VIII.
1606-1607 Leo X.
1607-1612 Alexander VII.
1612-1617 Gregory XIII.
1617-1619 Urban VIII.
1619-1621 Gregory XIV.
1621-1623 Urban VIII.
1623-1644 Urban VIII.
1644-1655 Innocent X.
1655-1667 Alexander VII.
1667-1685 Clement IX.
1685-1691 Clement X.
1691-1696 Alexander XI.
1696-1700 Alexander XII.
1700-1712 Clement XI.
1712-1724 Innocent XIII.
1724-1730 Benedict XIV.
1730-1740 Clement XII.
1740-1759 Benedict XIV.
1759-1774 Clement XIII.
1774-1799 Clement XIV.
1799-1803 Pius V.
1803-1829 Pius VII.
1829-1833 Pius VIII.
1833-1846 Pius IX. (longest reign).
1846-1878 Pius IX. (longest reign).
1878-1879 Leo XIII.
1879-1881 Leo XIII.
1881-1884 Leo XIII.
1884-1885 Leo XIII.
1885-1891 Leo XIII.
1891-1897 Pius X.
1897-1903 Pius X.
1903-1914 Pius XI.
1914-1922 Pius XI.
1922-1929 Pius XII.
1929-1939 Pius XII.
1939-1958 Pius XII.
1958-1963 John XXIII.
1963-1978 Paul VI.
1978-1982 John XXIII.
1982-2005 John Paul II.
2005-present Benedict XVI.
brought in an instant at the divine command. It has three divisions,—the external court, the inner court, and the Holy of Holies. It is made up of heaven and earth; but, instead of sunlight, it has the ineffable light of the Trinity, and, instead of stars, many “powers,” which have a certain independent existence. The angels consist of three eternal things,—spirit, soul, and love. It was the disturbance of the harmony between these three eternal things that caused the fall of some of the angels. Their fall was the occasion for a new step in creation. They fell into a hell of their own making; for, having broken through the band of eternal nature, the element of fire asserted itself, and enclosed them. They have a “tincture” by which they destroy human souls. As the opposite to the fallen angels’ world, God made a world of light and love, called in Scripture “paradise.” By wisdom (sophia) the first Adamic man was made out of the substance of all things. He was bisexual; but out of him, by the “female tincture,” Eve was formed.

For further information, see arts. Bromley, Leade, Philadelphia Society; Wood: Athenae Oxonienses; H. Hochhuth: Heinrich Horche u. d. philadelphiaischen Gemeinden in Hesse, Göttersohl, 1879. Pordage’s writings embrace Theologia mystica, 1850; Mystical Divinity, 1853; Metaphysica vera et divina, 1858.

PORITOPPIDAN, Erik Ludvigsen, b. at Aarhus, Denmark, Aug. 24, 1809; d. in Copenhagen, Dec. 20, 1764. He studied theology in Copenhagen, visited Holland and England, and was appointed professor of theology in Copenhagen, 1738, bishop of Bergen in Norway, 1744, and chancellor of the university of Copenhagen in 1755. While tutor in the house of the Duke of Holstein-Ploen, he came in contact with the pietist movement of Halle; and he represents that movement in the history of the Danish Church. He wrote an explanation of Luther’s Catechism, which was generally used as a text-book in Denmark and Norway till the second decade of the present century: Mendosa, a theological romance in 3 vols., 1742-43; Annales ecclesiae danicae, 4 vols. in quarto, 1741-53, etc. He also wrote, and not without success, on history, geography, natural science, and political economy.

PORPHYRY. See Neo-Platonism.

PORTER, Ebenezer, D.D., Congregationalist; b. at Cornwall, Conn., Oct. 5, 1772; d. at Andover, April 8, 1834. He was graduated at Dartmouth College, 1792; ordained, Sept. 6, 1796, pastor in Washington, Conn.; and Bartlett, professor of sacred rhetoric in the Andover Theological Seminary, from April 1, 1812, until 1832. During this period, so popular and honored was he, that he received calls to the presidency of the universities of Vermont (1810) and of Georgia (1817), and to Hamilton (1817), Middlebury (1817), and Dartmouth (1821) colleges. He received the professorship of divinity at Yale College (1817). All these calls he respectfully but firmly declined. In 1827 he accepted the newly formed office of president of the Andover Theological Seminary. For the last twenty years of his life he was more or less an invalid. He published Young Preacher’s Manual, or, A Collection of Treatises on Preaching, and Dartmouth (1821) colleges, besides to the chancellor of the university of Copenhagen in 1698. H. Hochhuth.

PORTIUNCULA INDULGENCE, ever since 1847, has been obtained in the Portiuncula Church, near Assisi, and in every other church belonging to the Franciscan order; but originally it was granted only in the Portiuncula Church (Notre Signora degli Angeli: see Francis of Assisi); for there, says the legend, Christ assured Francis that he would grant plenary indulgence to every one who should confess in this church, provided Francis obtained the consent of the Pope (Honorius III.). By advice of the cardinals, Pope Urban II. limited the time of obtaining this indulgence to one day,—from the evening of Aug. 1 to the evening of Aug. 2; but Innocent XII., in 1695, extended the indulgence to every day in the year; Gregory XV., to every convent of the Franciscan order; and the papal Congregation on Indulgences, in 1847, to every Franciscan Church.

PORT ROYAL, the most celebrated nunnery of France, and famous on account of the influence which in the seventeenth century it exercised on French society and on the Roman-Catholic Church in general, was founded in 1204 by Mathilde de Garlande, in commemoration of the happy return of her husband from the fourth crusade. It was situated in the swampy and unhealthy valley of the Yvette, in the department of Seine, between Versailles and Chartres, and belonged to the Cistercian order. The neighboring Bernardine monastery, Vaux de Cernay, exercised a kind of control over it, and provided it with confessors. The abbots of Citeaux held visitations in it from time to time, and the protocols of some of those visitations are still extant. It was exempted from the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Paris; and Honorius III. granted it several great privileges,—to have administered the Lord’s Supper even in times when an interdict was laid upon the country; to give refuge to such laymen as wished to retire from the world, and do penance without taking the monastic vows, etc. With such advantages, the institution soon became prosperous. In 1293 it numbered sixty inmates. In course of time it acquired rich estates, and its abbesses belonged to the most distinguished families in France. Its great ecclesiastical importance, however, dates from its connection with the family of Arnault.

Jacqueline Marie Arnauld, generally known under the name of Mère Angélique (b. 1591; d. 1691), became abbess of Port Royal in 1602, eleven years old. For some time she led a quiet and dignified though not strictly religious life. But in 1608 she was converted, and the immediate result of her conversion was a severe contest with her nuns and with her family. Jacqueline Marie, however, was thoroughly reformed, and transplanted from the valley of the Yvette to the street of...
St. Jacques in Paris; and of her family a great number of its members — sisters and brothers — joined the institution. After the death of St. Francis of Sales, Zamet, Bishop of Langres, became the spiritual adviser of Mère Angélique; but the course which the institution took under his direction was not satisfactory. The discipline became still more austere, but at the same time the spirit of toleration and of magnificence and lofty reserve which was ill suited to its purpose. In 1633, however, a complete change took place in this respect. Agnes Arnauld published her Chapelle secret du St. Sacrement; and the book, which made a great sensation, was condemned by the Sorbonne. Among its defenders was not only Zamet, but also St. Cyran; and from gratitude the former introduced the latter to the nuns of Port Royal. St. Cyran (b. 1581; d. 1643) was an intimate friend and zealous adherent of Jansen; and, as he soon became the true spiritual director of the institution, he made Port Royal the home of Jansenism. The number of nuns soon increased so much, that the country-seat of the institution, Port Royal des Champs, had to be restored and re-occupied. A number of male recluses, the so-called anchorites of Port Royal, — among whom were Antoine Lemaître, Simon de Sericourt, Arnauld d'Andilly, Lancelot, Palla, Fontaine, the Duke de Luynes, and others, — settled there, or in the neighborhood. As most of those recluses belonged to the higher walks of society, and were men of note in science and literature, they threw a great lustre over the institution, and even gave it a kind of magnificence. In 1637 the nuns began to teach the children of their relatives and acquaintances. In 1646 regular schools were established in Paris, and in 1653 in the country. The total number of pupils educated by the institution does not, probably, exceed one thousand. But, as the teacher had only a few pupils at a time, he could bestow so much more attention on each of them. The educational principle of Port Royal was moral, rather than intellectual; though the latter element of education was by no means neglected. Racine was educated there. The last object was, in strong opposition to the machine-training of the Jesuits, to develop each individual soul according to its powers; and no encouragement was ever given to enter monastic life. See Comparé: Histoire critique des doctrines de l'éducation en France, Paris, 1879, 2 vols.; Dufossé: Mémo. pour servir à l'histoire de R., Cologne, 1878, 2 vols.; Fontaine: Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de P., Cologne, 1879, Vie des religieuses de P., best edition by Mesnard, Paris, 1865; Guebert: Mémoires sur P. R. des Champs, 1755-56, 7 vols.; Racine: Abrégé de l'histoire de P. R., best edition by Mesnard, Paris, 1865; Gregoire: Les ruines de P. R., Paris, 1869; Reuchlin: Geschichte von P. R., Hamburg, 1839-44, 2 vols.; Saincte-Beuve: Port Royal, Paris, 1840-56, 5 vols.; Beard: Port Royal, London, 1801, 2 vols.; Th. Schott.

PORTUGAL. The Kingdom of, comprises an area of 34,502 square miles, with 4,550,899 ind...
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habitants, according to the census of 1878. The state religion is Roman Catholic; and other denominations are not allowed to worship in public, though they are tolerated. Hierarchically the country is divided into four provinces,—the archbishopric of Braga, with six bishoprics; the patriarchate of Lisbon, with nine bishoprics; the archbishopric of Evora, with three bishoprics; and the archbishopric of Goa, with eight bishoprics. The clergy is paid partly by the state, partly by the congregations, and partly from ecclesiastical funds. Each ecclesiastical province has its own priest seminary, besides the theological faculty of the state university in Lisbon. During the union with Spain, in the sixteenth century, the Jews were expelled; and only a few returned, when, in 1820, the country was again opened to them. The Jesuits were expelled in 1759, and have not been allowed to return. A law of Nov. 28, 1878, makes it possible for Protestants to contract legally valid marriages in the country. Under the authority of the Episcopal Church of England, several evangelical congregations have been formed in Lisbon and Porto. Distribution of the Bible in the vernacular tongue is not prohibited, and practically a considerable amount of toleration is exercised.

F. FLIEDNER.

PÖSCHL, Thomas, b. at Horets, in Bohemia, March 2, 1769; d. in a lunatic-asylum in Vienna, Nov. 15, 1837; the founder of an enthusiastic sect, the Pöschians. He was by nature sour, and addicted to mysticism and melancholy. As chaplain of Ampfelwang in Upper Austria, he began to preach strange doctrines,—that women could attain of Ampfelwang in Upper Austria, he began to preach strange doctrines,—that women could

POTTER, Alonzo, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of the Protestant-Episcopal Church in the diocese of Pennsylvania; b. on the sixth day of July, 1800, in La Grange, Dutchess County, N.Y.; d. on board ship, in the harbor of San Francisco, July 4, 1866. He was the sixth child of Joseph Potter, whose ancestors emigrated from England in 1640, and settled in Rhode Island. Though his parents were members of the Society of Friends, yet two of Joseph Potter's sons, Alonzo and Horatio, became, respectively, bishops of the two largest dioceses in the United States,—Pennsylvania and New York. When but fifteen years old Alonzo Potter entered the college at Schenectady, then under the presidency of the Rev. Ephraim Nott; and all through his connection with Union College, till he graduated with the honors of his class, in 1818, he took the first rank in scholarship.

Immediately after his graduation he visited Philadelphia; and while in that city he was baptized in St. Peter's Church by Bishop White, and shortly after was confirmed in Christ Church by the same bishop. Here he began his studies for the sacred ministry, under the direction of Bishop White and the Rev. Samuel H. Turner, D.D.; but he was soon recalled to Union College as a tutor, and in about a year later he was chosen professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in the same college. Thus, like Edward Everett, he became a professor the same year that he came of age,—instinctively, not imitatively, but by nature. He was a man of superior gifts, and matured, and successfully sustained through life.

On the 1st of May, 1822, he was ordained deacon by Bishop Hobart, and two years later was advanced to the priesthood by Bishop Brownell. That same year he married Sarah Maria, only daughter of President Nott, "a lady of superior
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mind, exceeding loveliness of character, and elegant accomplishments."

The relations into which, by his college duties and domestic ties, he was brought with Dr. Nott, were of great service to him in shaping his mind and studies, and, indeed, his whole future life.

In 1825, when Hobart College, Geneva, needed a president, Professor Potter was chosen, but declined to accept the office.

The next year he was elected rector of St. Paul's, Boston, Mass.; and such were the peculiar circumstances of the case, that he felt constrained to accept the call, though at a great sacrifice of personal and domestic comfort. Under his wise administration the parish soon took the first rank among the churches, and the young pastor became a moral and intellectual power in that city.

Ill health compelled him to resign his place in 1831; and he returned to the quiet of the professor's chair in Union College, and was shortly after chosen vice-president of the college. In 1838 he was elected with great unanimity, by the Convention of the Diocese of Massachusetts, assistant bishop. He was in Europe at the time, but declined the high honor, as he had previously refused to allow his name to be used as a candidate for the episcopate of Western New York; and, later still, he declined a similar overture from the new diocese of Rhode Island. Seven years later, during which time his reputation rose higher and higher above his college horizon, he was chosen bishop of the diocese of Pennsylvania; and he was consecrated in Christ Church, Philadelphia, on the 23d of September, 1845. The whole State of Pennsylvania soon began to feel the influence of his unremitting zeal and labors. He was so generous in his sympathies, so practical in his plans, so wise in administering his high office, so skillful in calling around him the best elements, both lay and clerical, as co-workers with him, and so really great in his mental and moral character, that the church rapidly rose into prominence and power. In the second year of his episcopate he inaugurated the convocation system, which did so much to unify the clergy, and concentrate their funds and efforts. In his fifth annual address he brought forward his project for a "church hospital," the result of which is seen in the best appointed hospital-building in the whole State, and which is now one of the noblest institutions in Philadelphia.

Shortly after, he urged upon the convention the subject of a "training-college;" and out of this has grown that beautiful building known as "The Philadelphia Divinity School," with its corps of able professors, and a long list of distinguished alumni, occupying some of the highest places in the church.

He was one of the foremost to establish "young men's lyceums," and "popular lectures," and "workingmen's institutes." To perfecting these important agents for healthful public instruction to the industrial classes, he devoted much time and thought; and their success was largely due to his wise counsel, educational plans and methods. He also took a deep interest in the temperance question; and by his personal example, and brave but judicious words, he ever upheld that cause, and backed it up with all his weighty counsel and influence. In the cause of education he was one of the foremost minds. His long experience, and breadth of view, gave much strength to his counsels; and in the University of Pennsylvania, and all over the State, and, indeed, in the country at large, he was felt as an educational power. His active energies were ever on the outlook for wholesome and needful work; and hence he was constantly called upon by various bodies of his fellow-men, and by various charitable and religious organizations, to act with them on boards and committees and platforms; and everywhere he was welcomed as one wise in council, and earnest in action, and thorough in whatever he did. As a lecturer, Bishop Potter was unrivalled. This was shown by the wonderful ability which he displayed during the several years (1845-53) in which he was engaged in delivering his sixty "Lowell Lectures" in Boston. These lectures, compassing almost the whole circle of philosophy, were delivered within the written page, and with but occasional use of a few brief notes; yet, by common consent of the best thinkers who heard them, they were regarded as masterly, both in the grasp and treatment of the various topics which he handled.

He was also very prominent in all philanthropic and missionary work, both at home and abroad. As a patriot, he stood unflinching amidst the most trying ordeals,— a staunch Union man, laboring with voice and pen for his whole country; and, in all his utterances during the civil war, he blended the breadth of the statesman, the heart of the philanthropist, and the faith of the Christian.

In 1858 he suddenly broke down, and was obliged to spend a year and more abroad. In 1858 the convention elected the Rev. Dr. Bowman as assistant bishop, which relieved Bishop Potter of many duties. For a time, and under the stirring events and stimulus of the civil war, he seemed to rally; but, after the death of his second wife, he was again suddenly stricken down. The assistant bishop, on whom he leaned, was also suddenly taken away by death; and though another assistant bishop was elected in 1861 (the Rev. William Bacon Stevens, D.D.), yet it was evident that the good bishop's work was nearly done. In March, 1865, he sailed for California, via Brazil and the Straits of Magellan, having for fellow-passengers to Rio Janeiro Professor Agassiz and a party of scientists en route to Brazil. At Panama the bishop went on shore to consecrate a church at Aspinwall, on the east side of the Isthmus, and there contracted a fever, of which he died, on board the steamship "Colorado," in the harbor of San Francisco, on the morning of the 4th of July, 1865.

His character was noted for its massive quietness and its thorough solidity. His life was as clear and honest as the day. His words were always sound and potential. He was a man of large domestic affections and sympathies; and his Christian character was that of a humble but strong believer in Jesus, ever seeking to know and do the Master's will.
POTTS, George, D.D., Presbyterian; b. in Philadelphia, Penn., March 15, 1802; d. in New-York City, Sept. 15, 1864. He was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania, 1819, and from Princeton Theological Seminary, 1823. He was pastor in Natchez, Miss., 1823-35, and in New-York City from 1836 till his death (Duane-street Church, 1836-44; University-place Church, 1845-64). He was an eminent preacher, a leader in religion and philanthropy, a beloved pastor and friend. He had a memorable controversy with Bishop Wainwright, on the claims of Episcopacy (No Church without a Bishop, New York, 1844, published a number of sermons and addresses. See Allibone: Dictionary of British and American Authors, e. v. 

POULAIN, Nicolas, b. at Menils, in the department of Seine-Inferieure, Jan. 13, 1807; d. at Geneva, April 3, 1868. He was successively pastor of Nanteuil-les-Meaux (1832-33), Havre (1833-36), Lausanne (1837-62), and L.uneray (1862-66). He is the author of Qu'est ce qu'un christianisme sans dogmes et sans miracles? (1863) and L'eucre sans dogmes et sans miracles? (1867). See Allibone, Dictionary of British and American Authors.

POURING. The pouring of water on the head is the usual act of baptism in the Church of Rome and the Protestant communions. Sometimes, especially in Protestant circles, a mere sprinkling is used, or a simple touching of the forehead with the moistened finger. What is the origin of the custom?

In the Apostolic Church the regular baptism was by immersion. The oldest undisputed mention of pouring is found in the Epistle of Cyprian to Magnus, about 250 A.D. Certain ones converted in sickness, when immersion was out of the question, had received merely a pouring (non loti, sed permeavit), and it was denied that they were Christians in good and regular standing (legitimi Christiani). Cyprian, after referring to certain Old-Testament sprinklings, gives his opinion, that, "in a case of strict necessity," pouring or sprinkling may be accepted as valid baptism. He speaks, however, very diffidently. His language is, "So far as my poor ability comprehends the matter, I consider," etc.; and "I have answered so far as my poor and small ability is capable of doing." He declares that he does not wish to prescribe to other ecclesiastics what they shall do about recognizing the validity of pouring, and he suggests that those who are not satisfied with their affusion shall, on their recovery from sickness, be immersed. This epistle shows, that, in his day, pouring or sprinkling was uncommon, and was used only when immersion was impracticable.

For a long time pouring was considered as of doubtful and suspect character. It was termed clinics, as having received only an irregular, or sick-bed baptism; and they were denied admission to the higher offices of the church. Yet there were exceptions. Novatian, who had received only clinical baptism, was ordained presbyter in Rome and was venerated by a party to the papal chair. Immersion still remains the usage of the Greek Church; and, says Stanley, "the most illustrious and venerable portion of it, that of the Byzantine Empire, absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid." It long remained the ordinary usage of the Church of Rome. Referring to baptism, Jerome, in the fourth century, says, mergimur; and Ambrose, meristi. In the fifth century Augustine says, demersimus, Leo the Great, demersio; and Maximus of Turin, mergitur. Gregory the Great, in the sixth century, says, mergat: Alcuin, in the eighth, submersio; Hincmar of Rheims, in the ninth, mergitur; and Lanfranc of Canterbury, in the eleventh, immersio. In the twelfth century Abelard says, mergere; Anselm, mergitur; and Bernard of Clairvaux, merisio. And Thomas Aquinas, as late as the middle of the thirteenth century, deems immersion still to be the older and better usage, but allows pouring and sprinkling as valid. But, when pouring had for many centuries been permitted in cases of necessity, its superior convenience furnished a temptation to a free construction of the term "necessity," and to the substitution of affusion for immersion in cases where the strict necessity did not exist. The existence of this inclination is revealed by laws which condemned it. For example, the Council of Chelsea, in 816, decrees as follows: "And let the presbyters know, that, when they administer holy baptism, they may not pour water on the heads of the infants, but the infants must always be immersed." But, by the beginning of the fourteenth century (the time varying in different countries), the practice of immersion had, throughout most of Western Europe, fallen into disuse, and affusion had come to be employed, not only in cases of necessity, but as the ordinary usage.

Against the idea that the disuse of immersion resulted from the extension of the gospel into colder regions, it may be remarked that it was in the countries farther north that immersion was longest practised. It remained the prevailing usage in England down to the reign of Elizabeth. And it may be noticed, that the baptismal rubric of the Church of England still directs that the priest, taking the child, "shall dip him in the water," adding, however, "If they shall certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it." In other words, pouring has no sanction in the case of a healthy child. And in the Prayer-Book of the Protestant-Episcopal Church of the United States, the direction, "Shall dip him in the water, or pour water upon him," which permits pouring, but by prior mention gives the preference to immersion, is a trifle of the ancient Anglican usage. NORMAN FOX.

POWELL, Baden, mathematician; b. in Lon., 1786; d. there June 11, 1800. He was educated at Oxford; entered holy orders, but had no charge; was Savilian professor of geometry in his alma mater, 1827-54, when he removed to London. His writings are upon strictly scientific topics, or upon the connection between
science and theology. Among the latter may be mentioned Connection of Natural and Divine Truth, London, 1838; Tradition Unveiled, 1839 (Supplement, 1840); The Unity of Worlds and of Nature; Three Essays, on the Spirit of Inductive Philosophy, the Unity of Worlds, and the Philosophy of Creation, 1855, 2d ed., 1856; Christianity without Judaism, 1857; The Order of Nature considered in reference to the Claims of Revelation, 1859 (the three vols. form a series). But his views obtained widest currency in the famous Essays and Reviews (London, 1860), to which he contributed an essay On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity. His position was in the main rationalistic. He rejected miracles on the ground that they were out of harmony with the methods of God's government; and, moreover, an examination of evidence for those said to have happened shows that they are insufficiently attested.

**PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.** In the widest sense (as used by German divines), includes Homiletics, Catechetics, Liturgics, Pastoral Theology (Poimematics), and Theory of Church Government. See the Study of the Evidences of Christianity.

**PRADES, Jean Martin de,** Abbé; b. at Castelsarrasin about 1720; d. at Glogau, 1782. He studied theology, but belonged to the circle of the encyclopedists, and made a great sensation with the Duke de Broglie. He recanted, and was made archdeacon of Glogau. He published an Abrégé de l'histoire ecclésiastique de Fleury, Berlin, 1767, 2 vols.; to which Friedrich II. wrote the preface.

**PRADET, Dominique Dufour de,** Abbé; b. at Allanches in Auvergne, April 23, 1759; d. in Paris, March 18, 1837. Elected a deputy to the States-General in 1789, he sided with the king, and emigrated in 1791, but returned in 1801, and was successively appointed almoner to the emperor, bishop of Foïers, and archbishop of Malines. Sent as ambassador to Warsaw in 1812, he failed in his mission; was recalled; joined the Bourbons on the fall of Napoleon, but was coldly received, and was even bereft of his archbishopric. Under Louis XVIII. he joined the opposition; but, after the revolution of July, he again became a staunch royalist. Besides a number of brilliant but rather superficial polemical treatises, he wrote Histoire de l'ambassade dans le grand-duché de Varsovie, Paris, 1815; Quatre Concordats, Paris, 1818, etc.

**PREMUNIRE** (literally, to defend in front of, the opening word of the writ), a term of English canon law, meant to prevent certain offences, to wrat granted upon it, and its punishment. It was originally used by Edward III. to check the arrogant encroachments of the papal power. He forbade (27 st. 1, c. 1), upon certain penalties, any of his subjects, i.e., particularly the clergy, to go to Rome there to answer to things properly belonging to the king's court; and also the gift by the Pope of English ecclesiastical preferments of all grades. By these statutes Edward endeavored to remove a crying evil, but in vain. Richard II. issued similar statutes, particularly one called the Indulgence of the Statute of Premunire, assigning the following as the punishment for the offence: that they [the offenders] should be out of the king's protection, attached by their bodies, i.e., imprisoned during life, and lose their lands, goods, and chattels. Henry IV. and later sovereigns have given the same name and penalty (known as a Premunire) to different offences, which have only this in common, that they involve more or less insubordination to royal authority, e.g., denial a second time of the king's supremacy, assertion of the Pope's authority, refusal to take the oath of allegiance, questioning the right of the present royal family to the throne, affirming the king to be a heretic, refusal by a chapter of the bishop nominated by the sovereign.

**PRETORIUS is the name of two Lutheran theologians from the sixteenth century in Germany. — Abdias Pretorius, b. in Mark Brandenburg, 1524; d. at Wittenberg, 1576; was first preacher in Magdeburg, then courant, in Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and finally professor of philosophy in Wittenberg. He is noted from his controversy with Musculus concerning the necessity of good works. — Stephan Pretorius wrote in last decades of the sixteenth century a number of works, of which a collected edition by Joh. Arndt appeared in 1622, and again in 1692. Martin Statius, dean of Danzig (d. in 1565), published some extracts from his works under the name of Gesichtsches Schatzkammer.

**PRAYER.** Speaking generically, prayer may be described as the expression of our requests to God; and, in the New Testament usage of the word, no better definition of it can be given than that of the Westminster Shorter Catechism: "Prayer is the offering up of our desires unto God, in the name of Christ, for things agreeable to his will, with confidence of his sirs, and thankful acknowledgment of his mercies." Jesus commanded his disciples to pray, and taught them how to pray, by giving them that model which is called among us "The Lord's Prayer." Paul, also, exhorted the Thessalonians to "pray without ceasing," and the Philippians to "be anxious for nothing, but in every thing, by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, to make their requests known unto God," while by their own example the apostles generally illustrated their precepts, and called upon God in every emergency. In the same way, the saints, under the Old-Testament dispensation, cried unto the Lord, who heard them, and delivered them out of their distresses; and the examples of Abraham's servant, of Jacob, of Moses, of David, of Solomon, of Elijah, of Hezekiah, of Isaiah, and all the prophets, may be cited as confirming and authenticating the duty.

But, while all this is true, objections more or less serious have been made to the assertion that "men ought always to pray, and not to faint." These may be reduced to two classes,—the theological and the philosophical. The theological is to the effect, that, as God is unchangeable in his purposes, it is a waste of prayer. The appeal of men can avail to alter his determination. To meet that, some have alleged that the
only effect of prayer is to be looked for in the heart of the suppliant. It avails, they assert, not to secure objective benefits, but simply to bring the spirit of the petitioner into harmony with God. Now it cannot be denied that true prayer has such an effect upon the soul; but then, it has so only in the souls of those who believe that God is able and willing to give them that which is best for them. Men will not continue to ask blessings if they suppose that the only good they are to derive is that they shall be brought to resignation and to peace; and so the experience of the subjective benefits of prayer depends on the belief in its objective power. The true answer, therefore, to the objection which we are now considering, must be sought elsewhere; and it is to be found in the fact, that the prayer of the suppliant enters into the purpose of God in connection with the bestowment of his blessings. It is his will to give benefits to his people as answers to their prayers; and along with every promise there is the implied condition, “I will yet for this be inquired of by the house of Israel to them.” This principle is based on the uniformity of the operations of what are called the laws of nature; and the allegation is, that no answer to prayer can be made, except by miracle, which it would be absurd to expect. To this it might be enough to reply, that the impulse of the human breast to pray is invariable, rather than to the universe as obeying, or, as believing in a personal God, we prefer to put it, they are the classification of men’s observations which the term “law” is used by good and reputable writers; but for our present purpose it will be enough to speak only of one. In its physical sense, a law is the formulated expression of an observed invariable sequence of certain consequences from certain antecedents. In this sense, a law is a human inference from the observation of the operations of nature, and, as Sir John Herschel has said, “has relation to us as understanding, rather than to the universe as obeying, certain rules.” They are not enactments which nature is bound to obey, but rather the generalized formulae of the observations which men have made of what they call the operations of nature; or, as believing in a personal God, we prefer to put it, they are the classifications of men’s observations of God’s methods of operation in the universe. They are thus limited to the sphere that is within the range of human investigation, and they tell us absolutely nothing of God’s method of working in that region that is beyond the observation of man. Now, it is quite conceivable, that, in that upper region, God may so work upon the lower, as through the ordinary operations of thunders, and without any miracle, to answer prayer. This is substantially the answer given by Chalmers to the objection now before us. McCosh, however, prefers to say that God has so adjusted the laws of nature, that he can, through them, and not in contradiction of them, answer prayer. Within a limited sphere, the man may not the request of another in this way, through the operation of natural laws; and what is possible to the creature within a certain area is surely possible to the Creator throughout his own universe. How this is done we may be unable to determine. But we must acknowledge the truth of Isaac Taylor’s words, “This is indeed the great miracle of Providence, that no miracles are needed to accomplish its purposes.” (See on this subject the second chapter of the second book of The Method of the Divine Government. Physical and Moral, by James McCosh, D.D., L.L.D.) We must distinguish between law and force. Force is the energy which produces the effects, but law is the observed manner in which force works in the production of these effects. If, therefore, in the last resort, that force be the volition or power of a personal, omnipotent Being, whom we call God, where is the impossibility, or even difficulty, involved in the supposition that he may exert that force through his own appointed modes of operation for the hearing of prayer? When God created the world, he certainly did not shut himself out of it; and he who gave the universe its laws, or rather, whose method of operation these laws are based on, can surely so employ them as to answer the entreaties of his children through them. Thus the whole question about the possibility of the answering of prayer resolves itself into one as to the existence of a personal God. If there be no God, or if, as seems to be the case with many in these days, God be nothing else than “a fine name for the universe,” then there is an end of the matter. But if there be one omnipotent and gracious Being, who is God over all, and to whom men can come as to a father, then prayer to him is as appropriate as are children’s requests to their father; and he is as able to answer petitions as the human parent is to give good gifts to the prattler that sits upon his knee. Moreover, as is evident from many instances of answers to prayer which are recorded in the Scripture, God has fulfilled the desires of his people, without having resort to that which we call an miracle. Thus, taking the case of Elijah’s prayer for rain, on the summit of Mount Carmel, we can see that there was nothing in the coming of the storm on that occasion, different from what is observed to this day in the eastern portion of the Mediterranean. It was a purely natural occurrence, but its coming at that time was not a mere coincidence. If, indeed, we had nothing more before us than the fact that a man prayed for rain, and the other fact that rain came just after he had prayed, we might say that there was only a coincidence. But when we take in the other facts, that the Lord had promised to hear Elijah’s prayer, and that Elijah offered his prayer in the faith of that promise, it is impossible to rest for a moment in that conclusion. What we see here, then, is that God, through the common operations of nature, answered the earnest entreaty of his servant. But an answer, it may seem, is somewhat plainer. There is an inland city in the State of New York which is supplied with water from a river that flows near it. The method is as follows: in a small house on the bank of the river there is an engine which goes night and day, pumping water from the main pipe which leads to the city. The demand in the city regulates the motion of the engine; so
that, the more water is drawn off, the faster the engine goes. But when a fire occurs, some one in the city touches a spring, which rings a bell in the engine-room; on hearing which, the engineer, by the turning of a lever, causes the engine to move with such rapidity as to charge the mains to their greatest capacity, so that when the hose is attached to the plugs, water is sent to the top of the loftiest building in the place. Thus an extraordinary demand is met through the ordinary channel. And, if this can be accomplished by human skill in a single instance, who shall say that the all-wise God has not adjusted the usual operations of his universe so as to admit of his meeting unusual emergencies through them?

But it is needful now to look at some of the statements of the word of God upon the subject of prayer in general. The "charter" of a Christian's liberty regarding it may be found in the words of Christ himself, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." (Matthew 7:8.) But this is an extraordinary promise, for, on the one hand, there are some who say, "We have asked, and we have not received;" and, on the other, there are some who insist that the terms shall be interpreted in the largest sense, and must be held as meaning that God has promised to give whatever his people choose to ask. Now, if these were the only words bearing on the subject which the Bible contains, there might be some ground for the despondency of the first class of objectors and for the fanaticism of the second. But we must interpret them in harmony with other declarations; and, when we do that, we get the full teaching of the Scriptures on the point. Now, it is said by James, "Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it on your lusts." And the Lord himself has put the condition thus: "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." (John 15:7.)
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We have left ourselves little space for the consideration of the constituent parts of which prayer is composed; but that is the less to be regretted, as the controversies of the present time have left them, for the most part, severely alone. They are, Adoration, or the ascription of praise to God, of which the best Liturgy of direction is to be found in the Book of Psalms; Thanksgiving for mercies received, an act which recognizes the goodness of God in our daily lives, alike in the bestowment of temporal things and the granting of spiritual blessings; Confession of sins, or the acknowledgment of our guilt as before God, not because he is not already well acquainted with it, but in order, that, by bringing it out before him, we ourselves may see how great it is, and may hate sin with a perfect hatred; Petition, wherein we make known our requests unto God for spiritual and temporal things for ourselves and for others. In reference to all these the grand indispensable things are, that the supplicant be sincere, not using words to which he attaches no meaning, or confessing sins of which he does not feel the guilt, or asking things which he really does not wish to receive; and that he approach God through Jesus Christ, the great and only Mediator. He who so pours out his heart before the Lord—observe, it is the heart that he is to bring, not the lip, and the heart is to be poured out, so that nothing of burden or of gratitude is left unspoken—will surely be blessed; for the whole matter of duty and promise is comprised in the words of Paul, "Be anxious for nothing; but in every thing, by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God." And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."

Prayer, Book of Common. Although the service-books of the English Church before the Reformation were mostly in Latin, English prayer-books, originating, probably, in still simpler manuals of great antiquity, were in use at the beginning of the fifteenth century. The Portiforium secundum usum Sarum, i.e., the Breviary, is clearly the Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian lover of the aforesaid contents, and adds to the rest of the Kalendar, the Injunction, the Salutation of the Saints, the Psalms, the Prophets, and the Gospels, in the Prayer-Book of 1549. Were thereunto, so that nothing should be read but "the very pure word of God,—the holy Scriptures,—or that which is evidently grounded upon the same," and "in the English tongue." The Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, in the Prayer-Book of 1549, were almost identical with those in the Salvebury Hours, but much of the necessary instruction was taken from Hermann's Consultation. The regulations with regard to dress were, that priests should wear the surplice in parish churches, adding the robe during the sermon; and in cathedrals, that the bishop, at the communion, should wear a surplice or albe, plain, with a vestment or cope, and the Comfortable Words are derived. It was a tremendous step in the direction of reform; for it ordered the communion to be solemnized in English, and to be "be to the flock of Christ a shepherd." The archbishop laid the Bible on the bishop's neck.

The office of 1549, slightly changed, was adopted in The Second Liturgy of Edward VI., published June 8, 1549, differed from the Prayer-Book now in use (in England), as follows: Matins and Evensong began with the Lord's Prayer, and omitted all prayers after the third collect. The Litany stood after the communion office, was not ordered to be used on Sundays, and contained a petition for deliverance from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, while it omitted a hundred and sixteen addresses to the apostles, the Virgin, and the saints. The Communion Office began with an introit, and omitted the Decalogue; the Virgin was mentioned by name in the praise given for the saints; the sign of the cross was used twice in the consecration of the elements, and the formula of their presentation contained only the first clause of that now in use; water was mixed with the wine. In the Baptismal Office, forms for exorcism, anointing, and true immersion, were provided. In the offices for Confirmation, Matrimony, and the Visitation of the Sick, the sign of the cross was retained; in the first, the catechumen made no promise, in the second, money was given to the bride, and, in the third, the sick might be anointed: the Burial-Service contained a prayer for the person deceased, and a special service for communion.

In the Preface the compilers state that the book was designed to establish uniformity of worship for the whole realm, to simplify it, to provide for the use of the whole Psalter, and the reading of "the whole Bible, or the greatest part thereof," so that nothing should be read but "the very pure word of God,—the holy Scriptures,—or that which is evidently grounded upon the same," and "in the English tongue." The Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, in the Prayer-Book of 1549, were almost identical with those in the Salvebury Hours, but much of the necessary instruction was taken from Hermann's Consultation. The regulations with regard to dress were, that priests should wear the surplice in parish churches, adding the robe during the sermon; and in cathedrals, that the bishop, at the communion, should wear a surplice or albe, with a cope or vestment, besides his rochet, and carry a pastoral staff himself, and it bore by a chaplain, and the officiating priest wear a white albe, plain, with a vestment or cope, the assisting ministers to appear in albes and tunicles. The ordinal, entitled The Forme and Manner of Making and Consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons (4to, 1549), was published separately, and differed from the present office on these chief points: it began with an introit, required deacons to wear albes, and the one reading the gospel a tunicle; the bishop, at the communion, should wear a white albe, plain, with a vestment or cope, the assisting ministers to appear in albes and tunicles. The ordinal, entitled The Forme and Manner of Making and Consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons (4to, 1549), was published separately, and differed from the present office on these chief points: it began with an introit, required deacons to wear albes, and the one reading the gospel a tunicle; the bread and chalice, as well as the Bible, to be placed in the priests' hands, and the pastoral staff to be committed to the bishop, and the priest to be committed to his flock. The Church-Serice, published March 8, 1548, as a first installment, The Order of the Communion, framed in its new portions on Hermann's Consultation, from which the Exhortation, the Confession, and the Comfortable Words are derived. It was a tremendous step in the direction of reform; for it ordered the communion to be solemnized in English, and to be "be to the flock of Christ a shepherd." The archbishop laid the Bible on the bishop's neck.

The office of 1549, slightly changed, was adopted in The Second Liturgy of Edward VI.,
The revised book of 1552 brought the following most important changes: (1) the sentences, exhortation, confession, and absolution, at the opening of the service; (2) the Decalogue, in the communion-office; (3) the use of the Litany on Sundays. Of these, 1 and 2 are thought to have been taken from Vallerandus Polianus. It omitted, (1) In the Communion-Service, the Introit, the name of the Virgin, the Thanksgiving for the Saints, the Sign of the Cross in consecration, the Invocation of the Word and the Holy Spirit, the Admixture of water with wine, and the first clause of the present form at the delivery of the elements; (2) In Baptism, the form of exorcism, the anointing, the use of chrism, and the trine immersion; (3) In Confirmation, the sign of the cross; (4) In Matrimony, the sign of the cross and the giving of money; (5) In the Visitation of the Sick, the allusion to Tobias and Sarah, the anointing, and the directions about Private Communion; (6) In the Burial-Service, the prayers for the dead and the Eucharist. The rubric concerning vestments forbade the use of albe, vestments, and cope, and required the Bishop to wear only a rochet; the deacons, a surplice. The most important change was doctrinal, and referred to the presence of Christ in the consecrated elements as not differing from his presence to the prayers of believers. As the influence of Luther's Service of 1533 colored the first Liturgy of 1549, so that of Bucer, Peter Martyr, Pollan dus, and John a Lasco, may be traced in the second Liturgy of 1552.

The Liturgy of Elizabeth (1560) agreed substantially with the book of Edward VI., 1552, except * with one alteration, or addition of certain Lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the communicants, and none other or otherwise; and " that such ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use as was in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of King Edward VI., until other order shall be therein taken, etc." (1 Eliz. c. 2, April 28, 1559). The prayers for the queen, and for the clergy and people, and the collect, " O God, whose nature," etc., were introduced, but placed at the end of the Litany; and one of two collects for the time of death was omitted. A series of editions of the Puritan Book of Common Prayer was published from 1578 to 1640. That of 1578 is remarkable for omissions, not only of rubrics, but of entire services, e.g., those for the Private Celebration of Sacraments, of Confirmation, and the Churcheing of Women, and for the uniform use of Morning, Evening, and Minister, in place of Maitens, Evensong, and Priest. In that of 1599, most of the omissions and alterations were restored. A Full and Plain Declaration of Ecclesiastical Discipline (1574), A Brief and Plain Book of Common Prayer (presented to Parliament, 1589), and A Booke of the Forme of Common Prayers, etc. (1584, 1585), were Puritan substitutes for the Liturgy; but the last did not obtain the sanction of the law. Knox's Book of Common Prayer (1564) has been reprinted by Dr. Cumming, London, 1840.

Certain alterations in the Liturgy, made during the reign of James I. (1604), are of doubtful legality. Among the most important were the insertion of the term "lawful minister" in the rubrics of the office of Private Baptism, restricting the administration of the minister of the parish, or some other lawful minister; the addition to the Catechism of the Explanation of the Sacraments (attributed to Dr. John Overall), and, to the Occasional Prayers, certain Forms of Thanksgiving answering to the Prayers for Rain, etc. The charge brought against Archbishop Laud, of having corrupted the text of the Liturgy, is utterly unfounded (Lathbury: History of the Book of Common Prayer, pp. 225-227).

In 1645 (Jan. 3) Parliament took away the Book of Common Prayer, and established The Directory, which rejected the Apocrypha, discontinued private baptism, sponsors, the sign of the cross, the wedding-ring, and private communion, removed the communion-table into the body of the church, abolished saints' days and vestments, the burial-service, and the public recitation of the Decalogue and of the creeds, though the Decalogue and the Apostles' Creed were subsequently supplied. It is reprinted in Relig. Liturg., iii., and in Clay, Book of Common Prayer illustrated, App. ix.-xi.)

The Last Revision of the Liturgy was made in 1662. Among the important changes were, (1) The extracts from the Bible — except the Psalter (which is Coverdale's text of 1539), the Decalogue, and the Sentences in the communion-service — give the text of the Authorized Version; (2) The separate printing of the Order for Morning and Evening Service, with the introduction of the last five prayers from the Litany, and of the Occasional Prayers, augmented by a second prayer for fair weather, the two prayers for the Ember weeks, the prayers for Parliament and All Conditions of Men, as well as by the General Thanksgiving, and a Thanksgiving for restoring public peace at home; (3) Some new collects, epistles, and gospels were supplied, and verbal changes made; such as "church" for "congregation," and "bishops, priests, and deacons," for "bishops, priests, and ministers;" (4) The exhortations in the communion-service were altered; the rubrics relating to the offertory, the placing of the bread and wine on the table, and their disposition, directing the form of consecrating additional bread and wine, and the covering of the elements, were added; the last clause respecting departed saints was added to the Prayer for the Church Militant; and in the Order in Council (1562), at the end of the office, the phrase "corporal presence" was substituted for "real and essential presence;" (5) Among the more important additions in the rest of the book are the Office for the Baptism of those of Riper Years, the Form of Prayer to be used at Sea, new psalms in the Churching Service, and the last five prayers in the Visitation of the Sick.

There have been four Acts of Uniformity, — 1548, 2 and 3 Edw. VI., c. i.; 1552, 5 and 7 do., repealed in 1559; 1559, 1 Eliz. c. ii., not repealed; and 1662, 14 Carol. ii. The last two are often printed in the beginning of the Prayer-Book. The four services, until 1599 annexed to the Book of Common Prayer, known as the State Services, by the authority of an order from the sovereign in council, repeated at the beginning of
every reign, with the exception of the last about to be named, have been removed by the authority of a royal warrant, dated Jan. 17, 1859. They consist of forms of prayer for, (1) The 5th of November, the Gunpowder Treason; (2) The 80th of January, the Martyrdom of Charles I.; (3) The 30th of May, the Restoration; and (4) On the Day of the Sovereign's Accession. The Articles of Religion were first published in English and Latin, A.D. 1532, when they numbered forty-two, attributed to Cranmer, aided by Ridley and others. A new body of Articles, presented in 1552 by Archbishop Parker to convocation, numbered thirty-eight, and were printed the next year in English and Latin. They were again revised in 1571, when Art. 29 was re-introduced, so that they numbered thirty-nine. The Rationfication, still subjoined to them, was added in 1572; and the thirty-sixth article, the Irish Parliament, in January, 1500, passed an Act of Uniformity, authorizing the Prayer-Book set forth in England, and the Latin version (made by Haddon) for the benefit of ministers unable to use English, and because there was no Irish printing-press, and few could read Irish (Stephens: Manuscript Book of Common Prayer for Ireland, Int. p. viii.). The use of the Book of 1552, approved by the Irish Convocation (August–November, 1562), was enjoined by the Irish Parliament in 1566. An Irish version of the Prayer-Book was printed in 1568. In Scotland the Prayer-Book had been in general use in the time of Elizabeth (between 1557 and 1564); but the Scottish bishops being averse to the adoption of the English Book, urged by James I., in the next reign framed a book of their own on the English model, with certain variations, which, though sanctioned by royal authority, and printed, never came into general use. The English Book, except the Book of Common Prayer Office Book of 1549), is now used by three-fourths of the ministers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland; but even the use of the Communion Office are far from uniform.

The American Prayer-Book is framed closely upon the model of the English book, and was the work of three successive General Conventions (1785, 1786, 1789). It was adopted substantially in its present form by the General Convention of 1789, with many variations from the English book, of which the following are the most important: it entirely omits the Athanasian Creed, the Absolution in the Visitation Office, the Magnificat and the Song of Symeon, the Commination, the Lord's Prayer, and the Versicles after the Creed; it leaves optional the use of the cross in baptism, of the words "He descended into hell" in the Creed, of the Gloria Patri between the Psalms, and altogether considerably enlarges the discretionary power of the minister. Selected portions of the Psalms may be used in place of those in the Daily Order; and of late years, since the Revision of the Lectionary, both in the Church of England and the Protestant-Episcopal Church in the United States, similar discretion has been allowed by the setting forth of alternative lessons. It adds to the number of the Occasional Prayers also a form of prayers for the Visitation of Prisoners, a form of prayer, etc., for the Fruits of the Earth, a form of Family Prayers. A form for Consecrating Churches (resembling that published by Bishop Andrewes) was introduced in the last revision, authorized by royal warrant, dated Jan. 17, 1859. The change of "Absolution" into "Declaration of Absolution," of "verily and indeed taken" into "spiritually taken" (Catechism), and the permission of using an alternative formula instead of "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc. (Ordo), are as significant as the introduction of the prayers of invocation and oblation in the Communion Office. The changes rendered necessary by political and local causes need not be mentioned: in the Thirty-nine Articles, the eighth does not mention the Athanasian Creed, the twenty-first is omitted, and the thirty-fifth printed with a proviso.

Standard Editions of the Book of Common Prayer: (1) In the Church of England, the Sealed Book of 1662; (2) In the Irish Church, the Manuscript Book attached to the Irish Act of Uniformity, 1608; (3) In the Protestant-Episcopal Church in the United States, the octavo edition set forth by the General Convention of 1844, published New York, 1845.


Prayer for the Dead was offered among the later Jews (2 Mac. xii. 43-45), and from them passed into the Christian Church; but at present only a small portion of the Protestant Church, the ritualists, continue the practice. In a certain form, that of repetition of the names of deceased believers before General prayer, the practice — though of doubtful utility, and inclining toward superstition — is not in itself sinful; but as it exists in the Church of Rome it is coupled with the doctrine of purgatory, and in any case savors of the doctrine of
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proclamation after death. Such prayers are first among Christian writings referred to by Tertullian (d. 220) and as a long-established custom (De exhortatione Castitatis, c. 11; De monog., c. 10; cf. De corona, c. 3, De anima, c. 58). "St. Augustine (d. 430) often alludes (e.g., De Cura pro Mort., i. 17) to the universal usage of the church to pray for all regenerates, in general (i.e., the baptized), or for the dead, or for what they see, prayer would be profitable and availing, depending upon the present life. And St. Cyprian (d. 407) says (Com. in Philipp. hom., 3) that "it was not in vain enjoined as a law by the apostles that a memorial of the dead should be made in the solemn mysteries, as knowing that great gain resulted to them, and great assistance." (Blunt.)

But, with these writers, prayer for the dead was the natural result of the idea of the unbroken connection between all the members of Christ's body, living and dead, and probably, also, of the idea of Hades. (See ART. 3.) The practice was the result, but the cause, of the doctrine of purgatory. (See PURGATORY.) Such prayers are found in their least objectionable form in the ancient liturgies; e.g., Divine Liturgy (1) of James (Clark's translation, pp. 23, 26, 34, 38), (2) of Mark (p. 60), and (3) of the Holy Apostles (pp. 82, 83). In the mass, prayer for the dead is an integral part. (See MASS.)

In the Edward VI. Prayer-Book (1509), burial-service, there were several such prayers; e.g., "We commend into the hands of our most merciful Father, the soul of this our brother departed . . . that when the judgment shall come, which thou hast committed to thy well-beloved Son, both this our sister and we may be found acceptable in thy sight, and receive thy blessing." But the Protestant Church now well-nigh unaninmously rejects the ancient usage, holding that such prayer is at best superfluous respecting the blessed dead, and utterly unavailing for the lost. On behalf of the practice, see F. G. Lee: Christian Doctrine of Prayer for the Departed, London, 1872, new ed., 1874; H. M. Luckock: After Death, London, 1879, 3d ed., 1881.

PRAYER. The Lord's. See LORD'S PRAYER.

PRAYERS, THE. See LOCAL PRAYERS.

PREACHING. The discourses recorded in Acts differ widely from modern sermons. They have no text, contain no exposition, and do not constitute part of a formal service. Scripture is quoted at length, but either by way of example, or as fulfilled prophecy. The discourse of our Lord in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke iv. 18) is no exception. For exegesis the Jewish mind was unadapted, because it could not keep strictly apart different periods. Yet the synagogue discourses were the pattern for the first Christian preaching, which, like them, consisted of free speech preceded by the Scripture, and so evident that at first the Scripture read was exclusively the Old Testament. Justin Martyr thus describes the Christian preaching of the second century: "On the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles, or the writings of the prophets, are read, and whatever is most useful and to the benefit of the time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things." (Apol. maj., c. 67). Tertullian (d. 220), writes: "We assemble to read the sacred writings, to draw from them lessons pertinent to the times, either of forewarning or reminiscence. However it be in that respect, with the sacred words we nourish our faith, animate our hope, strengthen our confidence, and, no less through the inculcations of the precepts, we come by good habits. In the same place, also, exhortations are made, rebukes and sacred censures administered" (Apolog., c. 38). In the Apostolical Constitutions, ii. 57 (see art.) mention is made of Scripture-reading, followed by discourses from a body of presbyters, each speaking in turn, and finally a speech from the bishop (the presiding officer). The instances quoted prove that in the second century there were not, properly speaking, any sermons, only exhortations. The first preacher in the modern sense was Origen (d. 254). His method was the allegorical; but so rich is his exposition, that each of his sermons is a sort of plot for other sermons. It was his learning, joined to great natural gifts, which made him so inspiring a preacher; and the fact is of interest as proving that the true sermon is the response to the church's desire to hear Bible exposition, and at the same time exhortations based directly upon Scripture. After Origen, comes that grand succession of preachers whose learning has commanded the respect even of their severest critics, and whose eloquence has stirred the feelings even of the dullest.

In the instance already quoted from Justin Martyr, "the president" delivered the discourse; and so it remained, for a long time, in the church the especial duty of the bishop to preach. There is no instance of a bishop being deposed because he could not preach, but there are several instances of presbyters being elected bishops because they could. A non-preaching bishop was somewhat disreputable. Yet even in the so-called Apostolical Constitutions (l.c.) mention is made of presbyterial preaching: indeed, many instances are recorded of deacons, such as Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373) and Ephrem Syrus (d. 379), preaching original discourses. But the theory was, that the bishop was the preacher: if a presbyter or deacon preached, it was as the bishop's substitute. As the church grew, the demand for preaching was far more than any one man in the local church or neighborhood could meet; and therefore presbyters and deacons were more and more pressed into service, and preached regularly in places where the bishop came only occasionally. Still, the theory was kept up; and the bishop was answerable for what the presbyter or deacon said, as is clearly proved by the case of Nestorius (see art.). Did laymen ever preach in the early church? As a general rule, no. But yet there were a few exceptions. Thus Origen preached before his ordination, and when still, Constantine preached frequently to large assemblies; and one of his sermons has come down to us (Euseb. : De vita Con., iv. c. 29-34 ; Opp., ed. Zimmerm. "Constant. Imp. Oratio," pp. 1047-1117). Monks were not allowed to preach, because they were not allowed until the eighth age, when regular preaching monastic orders were organized. (See DOMINIC; FRANCIS.) Preaching by women was strongly forbidden in the Catholic Church, according to Paul's explicit direction...
The great day for preaching was naturally Sunday; but upon many other days, as upon holy days, every day during Lent, upon every Saturday, and at festivals, it was the practice in the early church to have sermons, and that not only in the morning. As was to be expected, the sermons were generally simple and brief, especially in the West. Those of Augustine and Chrysostom were probably as exceptional in length as they were in matter. It is probable, although there is no direct statement of it, that the clepsydra (water-clock) was used; for the usual length of the Latin homilies which have been preserved is a quarter-hour, which would indicate some way of measuring time.

Sermons were almost invariably given in churches, and as part of a service. The preacher sat upon the throne (cathedra); or sometimes, if presbyter, stood before the altar, if deacon or monk, by the reading-desk. In the fourth century the sermons were more oratorical, and then the usual place for the preacher was by the desk. The congregation stood around him, and expressed their pleasure by stamping of feet, and clapping of hands,—a practice Chrysostom vigorously deprecated in a sermon which was loudly applauded. He also complains of the talking going on during preaching.

The sermons of such preachers as Ambrose, Augustine, and Chrysostom, were delivered to large audiences, and regularly taken down by short-hand reporters. But other preachers were by no means so popular: indeed, the same complaints of long sermons, poor sermons, or no sermons, and the same exhortations to be more regular in attendance, which are now made, can be read in the Fathers.

In regard to the delivery of sermons, there was the same diversity as at present. Some sermons were read (but these were especially those of admired preachers, and they were read by deacons, instead of original discourses); some were recited from memory; others were extemporaneous, although usually after careful preparation. This last was probably the commonest mode. Immediately before the sermon a short free prayer was offered; then came the salutation, "Peace be unto you," and the response by the people," And to thy spirit;" and after carefull preparation. This last was probably the commonest mode. Immediately before the sermon a short free prayer was offered; then came the salutation, "Peace be unto you," and the response by the people, "And to thy spirit," the text was given out, the sermon delivered, followed by the doxology.

It is a remarkable fact, that preaching was little, if at all, cultivated in the church at Rome (Sozomen: Hist., vii. 19; Cassiodorus: Hist. tripartita). There exist no sermons of any Roman bishop prefixed to his Life, or to his works. The example of this church was, therefore, not favorable to the practice. After the ninth century, preaching generally declined. During the middle age, in place of the sermon in the service, came, usually, a short address at the conclusion of mass. The schoolmen were not preachers for the people. The resuscitation of the Gospels of the thirteenth century was often upon trijes. But the age was not lacking in preachers. They belonged, for the most part, to the Dominicans and Franciscans, and either preached in monasteries, or went from place to place now preying a crowd in a field, now in a church. Their sermons were usually popular, full of quotation from the Bible, and of allusion to it; full of stories, fables, and parables. Many of these preachers were deeply spiritual, and earnestly desirous of benefiting their hearers. Prominent among the medieval preachers are Anselm of Bec, Peter Lombard, of Paris, and John of Siena. The overflowing of fishes; Bernard of Clairvaux, who converted many to monasticism, and roused all Europe to the second crusade; Bonaventura, who, when asked by Thomas Aquinas for the source of his power, pointed to the crucifix hanging in his cell, and said, "It is that image which dictates all my words to me;" Francis Coster (1581-1619), whose stories are so striking; Berthold the Franciscan of Regensburg, the greatest of the popular preachers of the time, whose audiences numbered thousands; John of Monte Corvino, the apostle to the Mongols; Savonarola, preacher and prophet, priest and politician, saint and martyr; and perhaps, as one of the best specimens of mediæval pulpit eloquence and unction, John Tauler of Strassburg. The latter is wonderfully tender and searching. Quaint, even grotesque, in style, it is easy to understand how profitable his preaching was. Very strange stories are told about these preachers,—how bold they were in their attacks; and how they were obeyed, even when their demands were most strenuous, as, for instance, when they exhorted their hearers to give up their jewels and ornaments; how they were reverence by king and people; how they interpreted the Scriptures correctly through their spiritual insight; and how they led holy lives,—in the world, yet not of it. But the preachers whose names have come down to us were probably exceptional, not only in ability and learning, but in grace. The generality of those who assayed to preach were probably lacking in all three; for the barrenness, the conceit, the ignorance, or the pedantry of preachers, is frequently complained of in this period. The so-called Life of Tauler, always prefixed to his Sermons, throws a flood of light upon the shortcomings of his contemporaries.

The "Reformers before the Reformation," the men who prepared the way for Luther’s work, were all preachers. John Wiclif, in England, sent out his “Poor Priests,” who filled the land with his doctrines. He himself preached in a learned and scholastic manner for the university of Oxford, and in a popular and hortatory manner for his congregation at Lutterworth. Johann Wessel, in Germany, was a preacher learned and popular. Peter Waldo in France, and Hus in Bohemia, spread their doctrines by preaching. The Reformers, therefore, used a familiar weapon, but they handled it with distinguished success. Unlike many of their contemporaries, they utilized preaching primarily for edification. Luther, Zwingli, Melanchthon, Calvin, Butzer, aimed to save men and comfort them. To this end they opened to them the Scriptures. But it was not long before the Protestant ministers degenerated into disputants. The Lutheran Church was split into the rival casus. Their theological dissensions divided the Lutherans; the English-speaking Protestants were divided into Presbyterians and Independent Churches; and even the Roman Church was divided. It is a remarkable fact, that preaching was little, if at all, cultivated in the church at Rome (Sozomen: Hist., vii. 19; Cassiodorus: Hist. tripartita). There exist no sermons of any Roman bishop prefixed to his Life, or to his works. The example of this church was, therefore, not favorable to the practice. After the ninth century, preaching generally declined. During the middle age, in place of the sermon in the service, came, usually, a short address at the conclusion of mass. The schoolmen were not preachers for the people. The resuscitation of the Gospels of the thirteenth century was often upon trijes. But the age was not lacking in preachers. They belonged, for the most part, to the Dominicans and Franciscans, and either preached in monasteries, or went from place to place now preying a crowd in a field, now in a church. Their sermons were usually popular, full of quotation from the Bible, and of allusion to it; full of stories, fables, and parables. Many of these preachers were deeply spiritual, and earnestly desirous of benefiting their hearers. Prominent among the medieval preachers are Anselm of Bec, Peter Lombard, of Paris, and John of Siena. The overflowing of fishes; Bernard of Clairvaux, who converted many to monasticism, and roused all Europe to the second crusade; Bonaventura, who, when asked by Thomas Aquinas for the source of his power, pointed to the crucifix hanging in his cell, and said, "It is that image which dictates all my words to me;" Francis Coster (1581-1619), whose stories are so striking; Berthold the Franciscan of Regensburg, the greatest of the popular preachers of the time, whose audiences numbered thousands; John of Monte Corvino, the apostle to the Mongols; Savonarola, preacher and prophet, priest and politician, saint and martyr; and perhaps, as one of the best specimens of mediæval pulpit eloquence and unction, John Tauler of Strassburg. The latter is wonderfully tender and searching. Quaint, even grotesque, in style, it is easy to understand how profitable his preaching was. Very strange stories are told about these preachers,—how bold they were in their attacks; and how they were obeyed, even when their demands were most strenuous, as, for instance, when they exhorted their hearers to give up their jewels and ornaments; how they were reverence by king and people; how they interpreted the Scriptures correctly through their spiritual insight; and how they led holy lives,—in the world, yet not of it. But the preachers whose names have come down to us were probably exceptional, not only in ability and learning, but in grace. The generality of those who assayed to preach were probably lacking in all three; for the barrenness, the conceit, the ignorance, or the pedantry of preachers, is frequently complained of in this period. The so-called Life of Tauler, always prefixed to his Sermons, throws a flood of light upon the shortcomings of his contemporaries.

The “Reformers before the Reformation,” the men who prepared the way for Luther’s work, were all preachers. John Wiclif, in England, sent out his “Poor Priests,” who filled the land with his doctrines. He himself preached in a learned and scholastic manner for the university of Oxford, and in a popular and hortatory manner for his congregation at Lutterworth. Johann Wessel, in Germany, was a preacher learned and popular. Peter Waldo in France, and Hus in Bohemia, spread their doctrines by preaching. The Reformers, therefore, used a familiar weapon, but they handled it with distinguished success. Unlike many of their contemporaries, they utilized preaching primarily for edification. Luther, Zwingli, Melanchthon, Calvin, Butzer, aimed to save men and comfort them. To this end they opened to them the Scriptures. But it was not long before the Protestant ministers degenerated into disputants. The Lutheran Church was split into the rival casus. Their theological dissensions divided the Lutherans; the English-speaking Protestants were divided into Presbyterians and Independent Churches; and even the Roman Church was divided.
Pulpit was used for sectarian purposes. Sermons were written, not to expound the Scriptures, but theological abstractions and subtleties. Preachers neglected the spiritual needs of their hearers, to show up the falsity of their opponents’ position, and also the ignorable character of their own. A cut-and-dried Protestant scholasticism corrupted the Continental pulpit of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. There was no preaching of the necessity of repentance. Then came Rationalism as a reaction. But piety cannot exist where every sentence of God is punctuated with a question-mark. The Rationalists preached finished sermons, but they failed to start the new life. While discoursing eloquently upon morals, they forgot to expound the word of God; and in consequence they preached the churches empty, and they have not since been filled. But it must not be supposed that there was not earnest preaching of the fundamental doctrines of sin and salvation. In the coldest times of formal orthodoxy, there were congregations whose hearts burned within them while their preachers were with spiritual insight opening to them the Scriptures. Spinoza and the Pietists were living sermons against the deadness and dry rot. And, while the Continental Protestants seemed to have fallen asleep, the Protestants of Great Britain and America were awake. Such preachers of the seventeenth century as Jeremy Taylor, Robert South, Richard Baxter, John Owen, and John Bunyan in England, have never been excelled anywhere; and while, in the eighteenth century, the Established Church of England relapsed into torpor, John Wesley and George Whitefield, with Jonathan Edwards and Samuel Davies in America, and others like them in fervor and grace, gave powerful impetus to religion. A revival followed these efforts; and the nineteenth century saw in Great Britain and the United States the pulpit on the side of the most wonderful philanthropy. Foreign missions, Bible societies, abolition of slavery, civil-service reform, temperance, have had some of their ablest advocates in the pulpit.

In the Roman-Catholic Church, preaching has never been honored as among Protestants; but under the spur of the latter it has greatly improved since the Reformation. The palmiest days of this church’s pulpit eloquence were in France, in the seventeenth century, when opposition to Protestantism was sharpest. Bossuet, Massillon, Bourdaloue, and Fenelon are the greatest names. In England and the United States, Romanism has lately striven to equal Protestantism in preaching. It conducts revival-meetings called “missions.” It cultivates eloquence and rhetoric, and provides churches with seats, unknown in the old Roman-Catholic countries. It is said that the Paulist Fathers in New-York City, and other missionary orders elsewhere, preach with a vigor and sternness equal to that of the medieval preachers.

**PREDICATING.** Theological abstractions and subtilties. Preachers neglected the spiritual needs of their hearers, to show up the falsity of their opponents’ position, and also the ignorable character of their own. A cut-and-dried Protestant scholasticism corrupted the Continental pulpit of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. There was no preaching of the necessity of repentance. Then came Rationalism as a reaction. But piety cannot exist where every sentence of God is punctuated with a question-mark. The Rationalists preached finished sermons, but they failed to start the new life. While discoursing eloquently upon morals, they forgot to expound the word of God; and in consequence they preached the churches empty, and they have not since been filled. But it must not be supposed that there was not earnest preaching of the fundamental doctrines of sin and salvation. In the coldest times of formal orthodoxy, there were congregations whose hearts burned within them while their preachers were with spiritual insight opening to them the Scriptures. Spinoza and the Pietists were living sermons against the deadness and dry rot. And, while the Continental Protestants seemed to have fallen asleep, the Protestants of Great Britain and America were awake. Such preachers of the seventeenth century as Jeremy Taylor, Robert South, Richard Baxter, John Owen, and John Bunyan in England, have never been excelled anywhere; and while, in the eighteenth century, the Established Church of England relapsed into torpor, John Wesley and George Whitefield, with Jonathan Edwards and Samuel Davies in America, and others like them in fervor and grace, gave powerful impetus to religion. A revival followed these efforts; and the nineteenth century saw in Great Britain and the United States the pulpit on the side of the most wonderful philanthropy. Foreign missions, Bible societies, abolition of slavery, civil-service reform, temperance, have had some of their ablest advocates in the pulpit.

In the Roman-Catholic Church, preaching has never been honored as among Protestants; but under the spur of the latter it has greatly improved since the Reformation. The palmiest days of this church’s pulpit eloquence were in France, in the seventeenth century, when opposition to Protestantism was sharpest. Bossuet, Massillon, Bourdaloue, and Fenelon are the greatest names. In England and the United States, Romanism has lately striven to equal Protestantism in preaching. It conducts revival-meetings called “missions.” It cultivates eloquence and rhetoric, and provides churches with seats, unknown in the old Roman-Catholic countries. It is said that the Paulist Fathers in New-York City, and other missionary orders elsewhere, preach with a vigor and sternness equal to that of the medieval preachers.

**Homiletics.** See Dominick.

**PREGEND** (probenda, “allowance”) meant, originally, the provision or food which each monk or cleric received from the common table; and in that sense the term continued to be used, even after the common life had generally been dissolved, and the revenues of the institution divided among the members. The fixed income thus formed was then called a prebend, or beneficium probenda, or beneficium probendale. With respect to the recipient, prebends were called probenda capitulaires, or probenda domicellares, according as they were given to a regular member of the chapter, or to some domicellaris, or junior. With respect to their size, they were divided into majores, media, minores, and semi probenda. The recipient of a prebend is a prebendar. MEJEIR.

**PRECIOUS STONES.** are often referred to in the Bible. The Hebrews were well acquainted with their value, and had countries as near as Arabia (1 Kings x. 2) and Egypt, or carried on commerce with countries such as India and Cyprus, where precious stones were found. Solomon’s wealth and commercial enterprise brought many precious stones to Palestine (1 Kings x. 10 sqq.). The oldest market for them was Babylon. The Hebrews, at a very early period, understood the art of cutting and engraving gems, and attributed it to the influence of God’s spirit (Exod. xxxi. 5, xxxv. 33). They used them for seals and rings (Song of Songs, v. 14; Ezek. xxviii. 13), and in other ways for personal adornment. The high priest’s shoulder pieces were adorned with two precious stones, and his breastplate with twelve, upon which the names of the twelve tribes were engraved (Exod. xxviii. 9 sqq.). The earthly temple was ornamented with them (1 Chron. xix. 2; 2 Chron. iii. 6); and so was the heavenly temple as seen in the visions of the seer (Exod. xlv. 10; Ezek. i. 26; Dan. x. 6; Rev. iv. 3). The foundations of the walls of the new Jerusalem will be garnished with twelve precious stones (Rev. xxi. 11, 18 sqq.), which seem to be chosen with reference to Exod. xxviii. 17-26. The following precious stones are mentioned by name in the Bible. We are helped in our interpretation of the Hebrew and Greek names by the ancient versions, Josephus (Ant., III. 7, 5; Bell. Jud., V. 5, 7), and book xxxvii. of Pliny’s Natural History. We can arrive only at the probable truth about some of them.

(1) **טַרְשָׁשׁ** the sardius, or sardonyx, called because first found near Sardis, of a reddish color, was very much esteemed and used. The finest specimens came from Babylon. (2) רְצִיזַת, the yellow topaz, which is also mentioned by Job (xxviii. 19), came from Ethiopia, and especially from an island in the Persian Gulf [some writers identify this stone with the chrysolite]. (3) **רֶםֶל, the emerald ("the glittering." Rev. iv. 3), was found especially in Egypt. (4) **תַּרְשָׁשְׁתָּלֶת, the car-
buckle, was the name of several stones with a glowing red color, as of the African and Indian ruby, and the garnet; which latter is probably referred to in the Bible. (5) מִזְבֶּכֶל, the sapphire (Job xxviii. 6, 15). Pliny calls it the lapis-lazuli, which, however, does not seem to be meant in the Old Testament. (6) מָזְלָט, translated by Luther, "diamond." It is probably the onyx or the opal (Pliny). (7) מִזְבַּכַּל, the figure, probably means the hyacinth, which is found in Ethiopia, but, according to some, amber. (8) שעַרְיָה, the agate, found in Cyprus, Syria, Egypt, etc. (9) מִצְלֶשׁ, the amethyst, which was much esteemed, came from India, Arabia, and Egypt. (10) נִצְבָּרְיָה, (Ezek. i. 18; Dan. x. 6, etc.), translated beryl, is probably the chrysolite. Rosenmüller translates the word, "topaz." (11) מִזְבַּכָּל, the onyx, which came from the land of Havilah (Gen. ii. 12). (12) מַשְׁבַּט, the much-discussed jasper (Rev. iv. 3, xxii. 11, 19), the best varieties of which came from India. (13) מִצְלָבָר, translated carbuncle (Isa. liv. 12) and agate (Ezek. xxviii. 16). (14) בָּרִי, the diamond, an apt illustration of Israel's obstinacy (Ezek. iii. 9; Zech. vii. 12), translated in the English version "adamant." See GESSNER: De omn. rerum fossil. genere, Zürich, 1586; BRAUN: De vestitu sacerdotum Hebros, Amsterdam, 1680, 2d ed., 1688; BELLERMANN: D. Urim u. Thummim, d. neuesten Gemmen, Berlin, 1824; [A. H. CHURCH: Precious Stones in their Scientific and Artistic Relations, London, 1888].
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PREDESTINATION. The pagan idea of fate is, generally speaking, that of an inevitable necessity, to which the will and wants of man have no other relation than that of absolute submission. It is simply a caricature of the Christian idea of predestination, lacking all true intercommunication between God and man. God is dead to man, and man is dead to God; or, still worse, the arbitrariness of man corresponds the arbitrariness of the gods; and as man is under the yoke of his own senses and of the demons, so the gods themselves are in the grip of a dark destiny. It must not, however, be overlooked that there are great differences between the different historical forms of paganism, and that there is no form of paganism which is absolutely pagan, that is, completely devoid of light. Wherever, in paganism, dualism prevails, as, for instance, in Parseeism, the idea of fate produces a distinction between good and bad men, between good and bad genii, nay, even between good and bad souls in the same body. The fatality of life is ascribed to the principle of evil; but, under the shield of the good genius, man can extricate himself from the meshes of fate by asceticism, by mortification of the flesh, by deadening his senses. In the pantheistic forms of paganism, fate is part and parcel of life itself. What man does is done in him by the deity, and the freedom of the will only a phenomenon form of the necessity of life. In polytheism, finally, fate gradually becomes divided, multiform, subordinate. The Greek Moira, the goddess of destiny, is with Homer a blind, dark power, against which Zeus strains his forces in vain. But with Hesiod she has already become the Moirai, the three goddesses, Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos; and the Moirai are under the control of Zeus, like the Parcae under that of Jupiter, and the Norns under that of Odin.

The Old Testament containing not only the germs of the doctrine of election in the contraposition of Abraham and the world, Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, Judah and his brethren, but also the germs of the doctrine of decrees in the lives of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and others, not to speak of the Book of Ruth and the Book of Job, those grand, representative exemplifications of divine fore-ordination, it was quite natural that the idea of divine predestination should be founded upon and active among the Jews, though it was very differently developed in the different systems of Judaism. The Sadducees openly asserted that each man was the master of his own destiny; while the Pharisees, with their mechanical separation of the effects of divine blessing from the effects of human righteousness, made human destiny depend partly on divine ordination, and partly on human actions. The Essenes, finally, representing that form of Judaism which was most mixed up with paganism, considered destiny as an inevitable fate; the whole idea, however, being peculiarly mitigated by the religious quietism which characterized the sect. In this point, as in so many others, the Essenes were true Gnostics, and so are the Mohammedans, for Gnosticism is simply a blending of Christian with pagan and national elements. The Persian Gnosticism of Manes begins, and the Arabian Gnostic of Mohammedan consummated, the revolt against Christ. The fate of Islam is the absolute, arbitrary despotism of Allah; and when the Koran in one place teaches the inevitableness of destiny, and in another the possibility of warding off divine punishment, it simply contradicts itself. The Gnosticism of Mohammed referred, probably, only to the infidels; and when to the faithful he preached absolute necessity with respect to the hour of death, he had probably only a practical purpose in view,—to make them good fighters for his religion.

The principal passage of the New Testament concerning the subject is Rom. viii. 29–30. It is full and comprehensive, articulating with great precision, and in their natural sequence, the single elements of the idea; and it is corroborated not only by parallel passages, as for instance, Ephes. i., but by the whole scriptural teaching, as well as the divine scheme of salvation. Nevertheless, though the doctrine of predestination, in its immeasurable compass, in its infinite depth, has never lacked the testimony of the religious consciousness of the living church, its theological development has been long and laborious. As with the first stage of the decline which preceded the Ebonite and Judaising assertions on the one side, and the Gnostic and Manichean dreams on the other, both contradicted and rejected by the practical experience of the church,
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though not yet refuted by any scientific exposition from the orthodox side. Such an exposition was first given by Augustine, and rejected by the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians, who made reprobation an element of predestination, and thereby, as well as by his general treatment of the subject, he caused a controversy, in which Prudentius, Ratramnus, Servatus Lupus, John Scotus, Remigius, and others, took part, and which was brought to a conclusion in a rather violent manner by the synods of Chierisy (553) and Valance (555). During the middle age the views of Augustine suffered considerable restrictions from the Thomists, and were altogether abandoned by the Scotists. His infralapsarian tenet, that God elects whom he will out of the whole mass of ruined humanity, though retained by Anselm and Peter Lombard, gradually died away, and had to be revived by Thomas Bradwardine, Wiclif, Hus, and the other precursors of the Reformation. With the Reformers, however,—Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin,—Augustinianism, and generally the whole question of predestination, entered into full light, and received its confessional statement; though from that very period a striking difference becomes apparent between the Lutheran doctrine, formed by Melanchthon, represented in the Formula Concordia, and further developed by Schleiermacher and Martensen, and the Reformed doctrine in all its different forms,—infralapsarianism, supralapsarianism, hypothetical universalism, etc.

The two great stumbling-stones which embarrassed the theological development of the doctrine of predestination were, on the one side, a singular misconception of the divine predestination, and, on the other, inability to harmonize the idea of absolute fore-ordination with the idea of divine justice. With respect to the former point, it is evident, that when the reformers admit the fore-knowledge of God, but deny the fore-ordination, making election and reprobation depend upon faith and repentance, their conception of the fore-knowledge of God is untenable; for divine pre-science is something more than the prophet's knowledge of the future. With God, to know and to do are identical. The pre-science of God is creative. There is, consequently, between pre-science and predestination the necessary relation of a general to a specific term. With respect to the latter point, the difficulty has been solved in various ways, of which the so-called theory of natural and revealed missions are the most remarkable. The theory of national election confines election to communities and nations; that is, only communities and nations are by God predestinated to have the knowledge of the true religion and the external privileges of the gospel granted or denied to them. To the Church universal, that Christ will come to reward all men according to their works, they claim that the Scriptures also include therein all manner of administrations of kingly rule; all which shall be in order to the establishment on earth of the everlasting kingdom of God and the promised "restoration of all things." This Church universalism extends predestination to individual man, but without making it absolute with respect to election or reprobation: it is still confined to the outward church and the means of grace. Both these theories represent infralapsarianism, and are, consequently, implicitly present in the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination such as it was formed by Calvin, and set forth in the Confess. Gall. and Confess. Belg., and, in a somewhat mitigated form, in the Confess. Helvet. and the Heidelberg Catechism.

LIT. — The enormously rich literature belonging to the subject may be found in Winer: Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, i. 442, and Appen. p. 72, and in this work under the separate heads. See A. Schweizer: Die protestantischen Centraaldogmen in ihrer Entwicklung innerhalb der reformirten Kirche, Zürich, 1864-65. 2 vols.; and Luthardt: Die Lehre vom freiem Willen, Leipzig, 1863; [J. Forbes: Predestination and Freewill, Edinburgh, 1878].

PREMILLENNIALISM (Millenarianism, Christian Chiliasm), in all its forms, makes two affirmations; viz., (1) That the Scriptures teach us to expect an age on earth of universal righteousness, called the "millennium," from Rev. xx. 1-5; (2) That this millennial age will be introduced by the personal, visible return of the Lord Jesus, to establish over the whole world a theocratic kingdom. This Christian chiliasm is to be distinguished, (1) from all forms of pseudo-chiliasm among Christians, such as teach that the saints — whether by means of material force, as the Anabaptists and Fifth-Monarchy Men, or by moral and spiritual forces, as very many moderns — shall come to rule the world before the resurrection; — this all premillennialists join the Augsburg Confession in denying; (2) from the Jewish chiliasm, as opposed to which it is held, (a) That the inheritance of the kingdom is conditioned, not by race or ritual observance, but by regeneration only; (b) That the delights and occupations of the risen saints will not be sensual, but suited to the nature of a perfectly sanctified spirit, and of a body spiritual and incorruptible; (c) That the millennial kingdom will not be final, but transitional. As to the time of the advent, premillennialists hold that it is unknown. However individuals sometimes have presumed to calculate the date, the great majority of premillennialists have deprecated such attempts as utterly unscriptural, and of mischievous tendency. It is agreed, again, that the advent is conditioned, in the purpose of God, by the preaching of the gospel sufficiently to serve the purpose of a witness among all nations: "Then shall the end come." As to the resurrection, it is believed that the resurrection of the righteous will precede that of the wicked by a period called, in Rev. xx., "a thousand years;" during which, as most understand, many not attaining the first resurrection will remain in the flesh upon the earth. As to the judgment, while prescission of ecclesiastical individualism is the most remarkable. The theory of national election confines election to communities and nations; that is, only communities and nations are by God predestinated to have the knowledge of the true religion and the external privileges of the gospel granted or denied to them. To the Church universal, that Christ will come to reward all men according to their works, they claim that the Scriptures also include therein all manner of administrations of kingly rule; all which shall be in order to the establishment on earth of the everlasting kingdom of God and the promised "restoration of all things." This Church universalism extends predestination to individual man, but without making it absolute with respect to
and ending with the resurrection and judgment of the wicked, and the establishment of the "new heavens and the new earth." In this judgment-period, most agree that the Scriptures teach us to expect the following events:—First of all, immediately upon the advent of the Lord takes place "the first resurrection," or exanastasis (Phil. iii.11), of the righteous dead, and the translation of the living saints through "clouds," "catched up together... to meet the Lord in the air," who will then be rewarded according to their works; also, with the advent, begins upon earth the last great tribulation, wherein the Lord and his risen people with him "rule the nations with a rod of iron, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel" (Rev. ii.27; Ps. ii.9). As the final issue, Israel, previously restored, in part or wholly, — in unbelief, as most think,—to their own land, looking upon Him whom they have pierced, shall be brought to true repentance, and own the Crucified as their Messiah (Zech. xii.10; Rev. i.7), the hosts of antichrist be destroyed, Satan bound, and the theocratic kingdom of the Son of man established over the remnant of Israel and the escaped of the Gentiles. To the dispensation of Pentecost, in which we now live, shall then succeed the dispensation of ingathering. The Holy Ghost will be poured out as never before: as now individuals, so then whole nations, shall be saved. Yet, during this transitional millennial age, it is commonly understood that sin shall still remain on earth, as hinted in Isa. lxv.20, though in subordination to everywhere prevailing righteousness. When that age shall end, Satan released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, but in vain; for he, his angels, and all of men who from the beginning had rebelled with him, raised from the dead, shall then be rewarded according to their works; also, when that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel (Rev. ii.27; Ps. ii.9). As the final issue, Israel, previously restored, in part or wholly, — in unbelief, as most think,—to their own land, looking upon Him whom they have pierced, shall be brought to true repentance, and own the Crucified as their Messiah (Zech. xii.10; Rev. i.7), the hosts of antichrist be destroyed, Satan bound, and the theocratic kingdom of the Son of man established over the remnant of Israel and the escaped of the Gentiles. To the dispensation of Pentecost, in which we now live, shall then succeed the dispensation of ingathering. The Holy Ghost will be poured out as never before: as now individuals, so then whole nations, shall be saved. Yet, during this transitional millennial age, it is commonly understood that sin shall still remain on earth, as hinted in Isa. lxv.20, though in subordination to everywhere prevailing righteousness. When that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, but in vain; for he, his angels, and all of men who from the beginning had rebelled with him, raised from the dead, shall then be rewarded according to their works; also, when that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel (Rev. ii.27; Ps. ii.9). As the final issue, Israel, previously restored, in part or wholly, — in unbelief, as most think,—to their own land, looking upon Him whom they have pierced, shall be brought to true repentance, and own the Crucified as their Messiah (Zech. xii.10; Rev. i.7), the hosts of antichrist be destroyed, Satan bound, and the theocratic kingdom of the Son of man established over the remnant of Israel and the escaped of the Gentiles. To the dispensation of Pentecost, in which we now live, shall then succeed the dispensation of ingathering. The Holy Ghost will be poured out as never before: as now individuals, so then whole nations, shall be saved. Yet, during this transitional millennial age, it is commonly understood that sin shall still remain on earth, as hinted in Isa. lxv.20, though in subordination to everywhere prevailing righteousness. When that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, but in vain; for he, his angels, and all of men who from the beginning had rebelled with him, raised from the dead, shall then be rewarded according to their works; also, when that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel (Rev. ii.27; Ps. ii.9). As the final issue, Israel, previously restored, in part or wholly, — in unbelief, as most think,—to their own land, looking upon Him whom they have pierced, shall be brought to true repentance, and own the Crucified as their Messiah (Zech. xii.10; Rev. i.7), the hosts of antichrist be destroyed, Satan bound, and the theocratic kingdom of the Son of man established over the remnant of Israel and the escaped of the Gentiles. To the dispensation of Pentecost, in which we now live, shall then succeed the dispensation of ingathering. The Holy Ghost will be poured out as never before: as now individuals, so then whole nations, shall be saved. Yet, during this transitional millennial age, it is commonly understood that sin shall still remain on earth, as hinted in Isa. lxv.20, though in subordination to everywhere prevailing righteousness. When that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, but in vain; for he, his angels, and all of men who from the beginning had rebelled with him, raised from the dead, shall then be rewarded according to their works; also, when that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel (Rev. ii.27; Ps. ii.9). As the final issue, Israel, previously restored, in part or wholly, — in unbelief, as most think,—to their own land, looking upon Him whom they have pierced, shall be brought to true repentance, and own the Crucified as their Messiah (Zech. xii.10; Rev. i.7), the hosts of antichrist be destroyed, Satan bound, and the theocratic kingdom of the Son of man established over the remnant of Israel and the escaped of the Gentiles. To the dispensation of Pentecost, in which we now live, shall then succeed the dispensation of ingathering. The Holy Ghost will be poured out as never before: as now individuals, so then whole nations, shall be saved. Yet, during this transitional millennial age, it is commonly understood that sin shall still remain on earth, as hinted in Isa. lxv.20, though in subordination to everywhere prevailing righteousness. When that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, but in vain; for he, his angels, and all of men who from the beginning had rebelled with him, raised from the dead, shall then be rewarded according to their works; also, when that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel (Rev. ii.27; Ps. ii.9). As the final issue, Israel, previously restored, in part or wholly, — in unbelief, as most think,—to their own land, looking upon Him whom they have pierced, shall be brought to true repentance, and own the Crucified as their Messiah (Zech. xii.10; Rev. i.7), the hosts of antichrist be destroyed, Satan bound, and the theocratic kingdom of the Son of man established over the remnant of Israel and the escaped of the Gentiles. To the dispensation of Pentecost, in which we now live, shall then succeed the dispensation of ingathering. The Holy Ghost will be poured out as never before: as now individuals, so then whole nations, shall be saved. Yet, during this transitional millennial age, it is commonly understood that sin shall still remain on earth, as hinted in Isa. lxv.20, though in subordination to everywhere prevailing righteousness. When that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, but in vain; for he, his angels, and all of men who from the beginning had rebelled with him, raised from the dead, shall then be rewarded according to their works; also, when that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel (Rev. ii.27; Ps. ii.9). As the final issue, Israel, previously restored, in part or wholly, — in unbelief, as most think,—to their own land, looking upon Him whom they have pierced, shall be brought to true repentance, and own the Crucified as their Messiah (Zech. xii.10; Rev. i.7), the hosts of antichrist be destroyed, Satan bound, and the theocratic kingdom of the Son of man established over the remnant of Israel and the escaped of the Gentiles. To the dispensation of Pentecost, in which we now live, shall then succeed the dispensation of ingathering. The Holy Ghost will be poured out as never before: as now individuals, so then whole nations, shall be saved. Yet, during this transitional millennial age, it is commonly understood that sin shall still remain on earth, as hinted in Isa. lxv.20, though in subordination to everywhere prevai
and standing in the church than at any time since the second century. The names of Professors Delitzsch, Von Osterzee, Von Hofmann, Auberlen, Nitzsch, Ebrard, Rothe, Lange, Christlieb, Luthardt, Gaussen, Gedet, with many others, illustrate this fact. In 1870 the Free Christian Church in Basel held a convention, the first of its kind, to express its confession of Faith. In the United Kingdom, among dissenters, the Plymouth Brethren, as elsewhere, and a few prominent individuals in other bodies, — as, e.g., Drs. H. and A. A. Bonar, Drs. George Gillfillan, Jamieson, Fausset, and Cumming, — have advocated premillennialism; but the most in the non-episcopal communions reject it. In the Episcopal Church, however, a large proportion — according to some, the majority of the clergy — are on the premillennialist side. The doctrine is taught more or less fully in the writings of Archbishop Trench, Bishopse Lillicott, Ryle, Canons Birch, Hoare, Dr. H. Bonar, Prebendary Auriol, Tregelles, the late Dean Alford, and many others. In America, until lately, the doctrine has been held by only a few, among whom may be named the late Dr. N. Lord, Joel Jones, LL.D., Drs. R. J. Breckenridge and Lillie. Recently, however, through the influence, no doubt, of the writings of Lange, Van Osterzee, Alford, and others, and the popular teaching of Mr. Moody and other premillennialist evangelists, belief in the doctrine has been spreading. In October, 1878, a public conference of premillennialists was held in New York, similar to one convened in February, 1878, in London, by Canon Fremantle, the Canon Hoare, Dr. H. Bonar, Prebendary Auriol, and others. Ten denominations were represented in the hundred and twenty-two names appended to the call for the convention, of which forty-nine belonged to various Presbyterian bodies, twenty-three to the Baptists, the remainder to the Episcopalians, Lutherans, etc. The large church of the Holy Trinity (Dr. S. H. Tyng’s) was well filled throughout the three-days sessions; and in theauthorized report of the proceedings. In the Church of Rome, premillennialism has never maintained itself; though a very few individuals, as, notably, the Jesuit Lacunza and Pere Lamber, in the beginning of this century, have written on that side. The same remark may be made of the Greek Church also, though even in Russia are a few individuals and sects who make the premillennial advent a part of their creed. Occasionally, some holding this doctrine have gone to fanatical excesses; as in the case of some of the followers of Edward Irving in Scotland, and many disciples of Mr. W. Miller in America, led astray by his calculation of the time of the advent in 1843. More recent developments of the same kind may be instance in the so-called “Overcomers” of America and the Hofmannite German movement, which has been observed, is not only based on the idea of the “Adventists” have departed from the Catholic faith in denying the conscious life of the soul between death and the resurrection, and teaching the total annihilation of the impenitent. A few others have connected with chiliasm the doctrine of universal restoration, as Jukes (Restitution of all Things, London, 1877). But premillennialists generally differ in nothing from other evangelical Christians as to the fundamentals of faith or practice. In the work of home and foreign evan- gelism they appear to be specially active.
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PREMONSTRANTS, or PREMONSTRATENSIS, is the name of a monastic order founded by Norbert in the first half of the twelfth century. Its name is derived from Prémontré (Premonstratum), a place between Rheims and Luton, where its first monastery was founded in 1121. It spread through all countries, and had at one time a thousand male and five hundred female abbeys. It was then divided into thirty provinces, or "circaria," with a circator at the head of each. The abbot of Prémontré, St. Martin, Florest, and Cuissy, the four oldest monasteries, enjoyed the highest authority: they exercised a general right of visitation. The abbots of Prémontré stood at the head of the whole order as a kind of general. The province of Saxony held a prominent position in the order. It, including all of Magdeburg, had thirteen abbeys and the cathedral chapters of Magdeburg, Brandenburg, Havelberg, and Ratzeburg, under his authority: the four latter episcopal sees were consequently almost exclusively occupied by Premonstrants. The rules were those of Augustine. The religious practices were severe. Flesh was altogether forbidden. Fasts were frequent, also scourgings.

Norbert of Gennep was born at Xanten, on the left bank of the Rhine, in the duchy of Cleve, and died at Magdeburg, June 6, 1134. He was a relative of the emperor, Henry V., held several rich benefices, and led a gay life until 1116, when he was converted. He left his court costume in the cathedral of Cologne, dressed himself in plain sheepskins, and walked about barefooted among the poor people, preaching and teaching. In 1118 he renounced his benefices, and distributed all his property among the poor, and, having associated himself in 1119 with Hugo des Fosses, he determined to found a new order, and select the site of the first monastery. Honorius II. confirmed the order by a bull of Feb. 16, 1126; and in the same year Norbert was appointed archbishop of Magdeburg; in which position, however, his severity brought him into manifold conflicts with his chapter, the Wendish missionaries, and the people's chosen representatives and governors, because of their years (Exod. iii. 16, xii. 21; Num. xi. 16 sq.; Josh. vii. 6; 1 Sam. viii.4); and from their double office arose the eldership. There were severe Fasts, also scourgings. The seven were both elders and deacons; for they are never called deacons in the Acts, and their duties were much more multifarious and independent than the latter's. The seven were chosen by the Jerusalem Church, at the suggestion of the apostles (Acts vi. 1 sqq.) It is a mistake to follow, as is commonly done, the error of Cyprian (Ep. III.3), and assert that the seven had no other office than that of the so-called diaconate; for they are never called deacons (Acta App., XIV. p. 115, ed. Montf.); and the diaconate is in Acts xi. 30, in connection with the

Hand became successively pastor and theological professor. In 1858 she accompanied him abroad, and spent two years there, mostly in Switzerland. Between 1858, when her most popular juvenile work (Little's System of Anatomy) was published, and 1878, the year of her death, more than twenty different volumes appeared from her pen, among them two other Suzy books, The Flower of the Family, Henry and Bessee, The Percys, Fred and Maria and Me, Little Lou's Sayings and Doings, Stepping Heavenward, Aunt Jane's Hero, The Home at Greylock, The Story Lizzie told, Urban and his Friends, Nidworth, and Golden Hours, or Hymns and Songs of the Christian Life. It is estimated that more than two hundred thousand copies of these works have been sold in America. Many of them were republished in Great Britain, and had a wide circulation there. The Flower of the Family, Stepping Heavenward, and several others, were translated into French and German, and passed through successive editions.

Of all Mrs. Prentiss's writings, Stepping Heavenward has made the strongest impression. More than seventy thousand copies of it were first printed in the United States, and some thousand in America. It was reprinted in England by fifty different houses. It was issued by Tauchnitz, in his Collection of British Authors; and the German translation is now in its fourth edition. For further notices of Mrs. Prentiss's books, see The Life and Letters of Elizabeth Prentiss, edited by her husband (New York, 1882, eighth thousand, June, 1883), pp. 281, 282, also pp. 568-573; and for a characterization of her writings, as also a vivid sketch of her personal and religious traits, see Dr. Vincent's Memorial Discourse, pp. 559-568 of the same work.

PRESBYTER AND THE PRESBYTERATE.

Age should always bring experience, and command respect and influence. The Synecdoche of the Spartans, and the Senatus of the Romans, derived their names, original membership, and political import, from the age of their members. So, under Moses and afterwards, the "elders" of Israel were the people's chosen representatives and governors because of their years (Exod. iii. 16, xii. 21; Num. xi. 16 sq.; Josh. vii. 6; 1 Sam. viii. 4; Jer. xxix. 1, etc.). The members of the Sanhedrin and of the local courts among the Jews were "elders." From the Old-Testament to the New-Testament church the eldership was naturally introduced. The subsequent history of the eldership may be divided into three divisions: I. Apostolic, II. Reformed upon Calvinistic principles, III. Modern.

I. APOSTOLIC. — Elder and bishop were different names for the same office. The origin of it was when the seven were chosen by the Jerusalem Church, at the suggestion of the apostles (Acts vi. 1 sqq.). It is a mistake to follow, as is commonly done, the error of Cyprian (Ep. III.3), and assert that the seven had no other office than that of the so-called diaconate; for they are never called deacons (Acta App., XIV. p. 115, ed. Montf.); and from their double office arose the eldership and the diaconate. The first mention of elders as such is in Acts xi. 30, in connection with the
church at Antioch, whose elders sent the money collected for the relief of the Judean brethren — precisely the sort of work committed to the seven. It was the apostles and the elders in Jerusalem who debated the great question of Christian liberty, whether the Gentiles were to be subject to the Mosaic law or not. Paul proved that the latter had care of spiritual no less than of temporal concerns. Again: the elders were present when Paul made his report in Jerusalem concerning his last missionary journey (Acts xxii. 18 sqq.). Further: it was the elders who were commissioned by James (v. 14 sqq.) to pray over the sick, and anoint them with oil. In the Gentile Christian world, also, elders were prominent persons. Paul ordained such as Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch (Acts xiv. 23); tenderly addressed and earnestly counselled those of the Ephesian Church (xx. 17 sqq.); and in his epistles, by wise and minute directions, showed these officers how they were to fulfil their duties, both governmental and directly spiritual, in a word, pastoral (1 Thess. v. 12; 1 Tim. iii. 1 sqq.; Tit. i. 6 sqq.). Peter gives similar directions (1 Pet. v. 1-4). But Paul’s remark, “Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor” (1 Tim. v. 17), does not imply two classes of elders, the “teaching” and the “ruling,” for there was only one class, but rather that each elder, according to his aptitude and training, was to give himself to his special work, whether teaching or ruling, and also, that although teaching was part of the office, every elder was not called upon to teach. In similar strain, Heb. xiii. 7, 17 speaks of the teaching of the elders, and their care for the souls of their constituency.

From these passages a clear idea of the nature of the duties of the primitive elders can be formed. They taught publicly; but this was not the whole of their work. They governed, as well as instructed. They were neither merely representatives of the congregation, nor merely preachers and teachers, nor pre-eminently organs of ecclesiastical discipline; but they held the reins of authority in the congregation, watching over and leading each and every soul. They were not identical with preachers, because every male member could preach. They were not lay-elders, because the distinction between laity and clergy had not yet been made. They stood as the same time over the congregation; is it, because they belonged originally and constantly to it; or, it, because they exercised the right and duty of oversight and guidance. They were, as a rule, chosen by the congregation, as were the seven (Acts vi., cf. xiv. 23), under divine direction (xx. 28). Even if they were appointed by the apostles, or at their command (Tit. i. 5), there was presumably co-action on the congregations’ part.

A crisis in the development of the presbyterial office and the constitution of the congregation came about 97 A.D., when Clement of Rome, in the Epistle to the Corinthians (which appeals to the Old-Testament distinction between clergy and laity (chap. xii. sqq.) as a valid reason for the existence of the same distinction in the Christian Church, and, on the ground of it, calls the rebellion against the elders, which had broken out in the Corinthian Church, an attack upon divinely constituted authority. The epistle proves that already the primitive idea of the eldership had undergone a change, and that elders would speedily be a class distinct from the laity, having exclusive spiritual jurisdiction. Neither Clement nor Polycarp (Epist., chap. vi.) has any thing to say about teaching-elders. Indeed, from their time may be dated the beginning of the transformation of the eldership into a hierarchy.

II. REFORMED ELDERSHIP UPON CALVINISTIC PRINCIPLES. — All the Reformers desired to restore to the congregations their primitive rights; but they differed very much as to methods. Luther taught the priesthood of all believers, and the people’s right to call, install, dismiss, and direct their ministers. The power of the keys was also theirs. Yet neither Luther nor Melancthon, nor any other Wittenberg Reformer, restored the eldership. Indeed, Luther maintained, that, besides preaching, there was only the care of the poor to be provided for through an ecclesiastical office. (See art. LUTHERAN CHURCH.) The restoration of the eldership came from the Calvinistic principles. Not Calvin himself, but his idea in a thoroughly practical form. This was in Geneva (1541). He was not able, it is true, to carry his ideas upon this subject to their full development, because politics interfered; but he accomplished this organization — the elders came next to the pastors and teachers, and constituted the third official rank; the deacons, the fourth. The elders were elected by the Council of State, with the advice of the ministers, and the list was presented to the Council of Two Hundred for its approval. The elders were to be twelve in number, — two to belong to the Little Council; four, to the Council of Sixty; and six, to the Council of Two Hundred. Each elder was given a section of the city to inspect as to its moral conduct; and the body, with the six ministers, constituted the consistory, which dealt with all cases of ecclesiastical discipline.

Calvin’s idea of the eldership was adopted in France and Scotland, and sporadically in Germany. In Paris the first consistory, composed of the minister and several elders and deacons, was formed 1555, and afterwards a number of congregations took up the plan. At first the consistories had unlimited authority; but their power was curtailed by the synod of 1559. In Geneva the elders were chosen for life; in France, for much shorter times. Their duties were to govern and conduct the congregation: the direct care of souls was relegated to deacons. In Scotland the presbyterate was set up in 1560, and declared to be of scriptural authority, and with the minister to stand on the level of the ruling elders, as a spiritual office. The elders, with the minister, visited the sick, and examined intendant communicants, constituted with him and under his presidency the kirksession, and finally elected their own successors.

The eldership of the sixteenth century was not apostolic, although its defenders appealed directly to Scripture, and thought to copy the primitive church, for the reason, that, in the apostolic church, the elders had the entire government of the congregation, and the preachers were not next to them or above them, but simply members...
of the congregations,—perhaps elders, perhaps not; for as yet the order of preacher had not been developed.

The presbyterian polity spread from Scotland into Ireland, and in Germany was adopted, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by many Lutheran churches on the Lower Rhine and in Westphalia, and received the cordial approval and advocacy of Spener.

III. Modern.—The presbyterian polity has in this century spread very widely. In Prussia it was introduced in many hundred congregations (June 29, 1850, and Sept. 10, 1873); and the same is the case with Bavaria, Braunschweig, and other provinces of the empire. The polity is to be distinguished from that of Independency or Congregationalism, and from lay-government pure and simple (Erastianism). The true elderships have these marks: (1) Distinction between and separation of the civil and ecclesiastical affairs in reference to the congregation and its officers; (2) Organization of the congregation, so that certain members be set apart for the performance of certain duties and the enjoyment of certain privileges; (3) The elders are intrusted, along with the minister, with the spiritual care, the temporal affairs, and the legal representation of the congregation. See Presbyterianism.

G. V. Lechler.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES. I. In Scotland.

(1) CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. The following article will be dedicated to some account of, (1) the history, (2) the constitution, and (3) the present condition, of the Scottish Church.

1. History.—The Church of Scotland came into existence in the year 1560. It can hardly be said, certainly, to have been legally established in that year. The formal ratification of Presbyterian church government in Scotland did not take place until 1562, when the celebrated act of the Scots Parliament was passed, which has been commonly known as the Magna Charta of the Church of Scotland. In 1560, however, the foundations of the church were practically laid. It was on the seventeenth day of August of that year, that "the Scots Confession," drawn up at their request, and read aloud, clause by clause, in their hearing, was solemnly ratified by the Three Estates of the realm. Its ratification was carried by an overwhelming majority. "Of the temporal estate," says Knox, in his History of the Reformation, "only voted in the contrary the Earl of Atholl and the Lords Somerville and Borthwick; and yet for their dissenting they produced no better reason, but we will believe as our fathers believed." He goes on, "The bishops (papistical, I mean) spoke nothing. The rest of the whole Three Estates by their public votes affirmed the doctrine."

It has sometimes been maintained that the Reformed Church of Scotland may claim even an earlier commencement than the year 1560, and many, indeed, assert that the right use of the Lord's supper was introduced into the country of Christianity itself; the early Celtic Church, the Church of St. Ninian and St. Columba, being, as is alleged, essentially Presbyterian. The early Celtic Church certainly was not episcopalian; nor, above all, had that church any subordination to the Roman pontiff. But the resemblances to the church of John Knox, found in the monastic establishments over which the abbot-prebry of Iona so long ruled, are by no means complete; the Celtic ecclesiastical system being, as Dean Stanley has said (Church of Scotland, p. 29), "as presbyteriam as it is unlike episcopacy." And especially when we consider that a strictly Romanist Church, as introduced by David I., had interrupted for four hundred years the doctrine and practice of the earliest forms of Scottish Christianity, the theory of what is called the continuity of the Church of Scotland must, upon the whole, be set aside as untenable.

The new church, though succeeding a religious establishment very differently situated, entered on its career with miserably inadequate provisions for its material support. The endowments of the Roman-Catholic Church had been enormous. It has been estimated, that, previous to the Reformation, not less than one-half of the entire landed property of Scotland was in the hands of ecclesiastics; and that, including all sources of income, the actual revenues of the Romish Church in that country must have exceeded two hundred and fifty thousand pounds a year. The proposal of John Knox and the other leaders of the Protestant party, as to the disposal of property admitted on all hands to be ecclesiastical property, will be found in the First Book of Discipline, chap. v. That scheme was not only, as regards its originators, remarkably disinterested, but, both in its general conception and in its details, wise and statesmanlike. It was to the effect that the revenues of the church should be devoted to three objects, all of them more or less contemplated by the original donors of church property in Scotland; namely, (1) the sustentation of the ministry, (2) the education of the people in schools and universities—the education to be of the most liberal description, and (3) the relief of the poor. Patriotism as was this great scheme, it met with nothing but ridicule from the members of the Scottish Parliament. Maitland of Leithington called it "a devout imagination." The result is well known. Eventually the lion's share of the spoil fell to the crown and to the nobles and landowners of Scotland, whose votes determined the matter, and many of whom had from the first favored the Reformation less, it must be feared, from religious principle than from personal interest. A third of the old Papal revenues was, it is true, nominally assigned to the church; but of this sum only a very small portion appears to have been paid, and that very irregularly. The consequences were serious, not only to the ministers, but to the church. Thirty-six years after the Reformation, i.e., in 1596, the General Assembly complained that four hundred parish churches, "in addition to the churches of Argyll and the isles," were still destitute of ministers, "for lack of provision of sufficient stipends;" so that "the land overflowed with atheism and all kinds of vice" (Caldwell, Hist. Edinb., v. 411). At the meeting of the year 1584, James Melville gives the following account of the state of matters. "By the insatiable avarice of the earls, lords, and gentlemen of Scotland," he says, "the ministers, schools, and poor were spoiled of that which should sustain them; ... whereas came fruitful darkness of ignorance, superstition, and idolat-
try, with innumerable filthy and execrable sins" (Diary, 129). Knox speaks in terms of scathing indignation. "Some [of the laity] were licentious," he says; "some had greedily gripped the possessions of the church; and others thought they would not lose their part of Christ's coat. ... These bold, gross, and uncomely sins which had been committed against Christ Jesus, and refused to subscribe the Book of Discipline, was the Lord Erskine; and no wonder! for ... if the poor, the schools, and the ministry of the church, had their own, his kitchen had lacked two parts of that which he now unjustly possessed." (History, vol. ii. p. 128). The same narrowness of means, hampering all her operations, has characterized the Church of Scotland from first to last.

Nor has the Church of Scotland had, upon the whole, otherwise than a troubled career. Robert Wodrow calls his history, which extends from the Restoration to the Revolution, a History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland; and the same description might, without violence, be applied to a much more extended period of Scottish church history. Her motto, Nee tamen consumeatur, itself, indeed, implies that she has always been exposed to, no less than that she has always survived, trial and suffering.

Notwithstanding all the disadvantages under which she has thus labored, through the limitation of her resources and other hinderances, the Church of Scotland has not throughout her history been behind other churches in the work which she has accomplished. She has been, no doubt, excelled by the Church of England, and also by the Church of Rome, in her labors for the promotion of learning, at least in its highest departments, and especially as regards the number of men occupying a pre-eminent position in arts and literature, who have belonged to her communion, and been fostered by her institutions. But, even with relation to the encouragement of learning, she has not been altogether unentitled to honorable recognition; numbering, as she has done, among her sons, from the first,—that is, even in the sixteenth century itself,—men like George Buchanan, David Lindsay, Buchanan, Alexander Alesius, Andrew Melville, and others of the most accurate and elegant scholars of their age, as tried, too, not by Scottish standards, but by the standard of those foreign universities in which most of them prosecuted a great part of their studies. In the seventeenth century, again, Dr. Alexander Carlyle of Inveresk, "Jupiter Carlyle,"—speaking of his own contemporaries, boasts, not without reason, that there were few branches of literature in which ministers of the Scottish Church did not excel (Autobiography, p. 561).

So it has been always. Nor, when referring to her services to learning, must we forget the proposals of the Reformed Church of Scotland in The First Book of Discipline, already referred to, for a scheme of national education, which is now, in the nineteenth century, only beginning to be thoroughly appreciated; or the system of parish schools, introduced by the Privy Council, and at the suggestion of Andrew Melville, laden with scholastic honors, returned from the Continent (where he had during the last ten years been completing his university education) in the year 1574, and at the suggestion of the Church, as well as carried out under her superintendence, and which has had so much to do with the high character and the remarkable success in life for which, for so long a period, Scotchmen have been distinguished in all parts of the world. The Church of Scotland, however, has done still greater work. A Christian church mainly exists for the religious instruction, comfort, and edification of the people, and for the extension beyond her own bounds of the blessings of the gospel of Christ. And, judging especially from statistics professedly compiled by the Church of Scotland, not only, like John Knox, as inexpedient, but as, in its own nature, contrary to the Scriptures. In 1580, under Melville's influence, the General Assembly "found and declared the pretended office of a bishop to be unlawful, having
It would be impossible, with our limited space, to go into all the details of the history of the Scottish Church in the eighteenth and the early part of the nineteenth centuries.

Within the latter period, incomparably the most important event was the "Disruption," as it has sometimes been called; of 1843, a large number of the ministers, and also of the laity, of the Established Church of Scotland, withdrew from the church, and formed a body of dissenters, under the name of the "Free Church." The occasion of the step thus taken by the most considerable, at least in numbers, of all the seceders who have left the Church of Scotland, was complicated, and cannot be explained without going into details for which this is not the place.

The question related chiefly to the independent jurisdiction of the church; but it originated in a proposal, on the part of the church, to modify by ecclesiastical authority the law, "martyr by mistake;" and that the result of their action has been, not unfavorable, but mischievous, to the cause which they had at heart.

Among the more recent incidents in connection with the history of the Church are the resolution passed by the General Assembly in 1686, to the effect that the use of instrumental music, and other innovations in the forms of public worship, should not be opposed, unless they interfered with the peace of the church or the harmony of congregations; and the passing, in 1874, of an act of Parliament to repeal the act of Queen Anne enacted in 1690, re-establishing the Episcopal Church.

2. Constitution. — (a) The doctrine of the Scottish Church as established by law is to be found in the Confession of Faith drawn up in the time of the Commonwealth (originally as a common confession for the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, — a scheme which came to nothing) by the Westminster Assembly of Divines (1642-49), and known as the "Westminster Confession." The original Scots Confession, prepared chiefly by John Knox, and approved by the Three Estates of the Scottish Parliament in 1560, was formally superseded in part, and became the symbol, first by an act of the General Assembly, passed in 1647, and afterwards by the act of the Parliament of William and Mary of 1680, re-establishing the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. In this act of 1680 the articles of the Westminster Confession are. "Another section of the law of Scotland. Substantially the two confessions maintain — with, perhaps, in the case of the latter, a tendency to the more extreme form of Calvinistic theology — the same general type of doctrine. Upon the whole, too, the doctrine
is in harmony with that of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England and of the other confessions of the church of Christ.

(b) As regards church government, the Church of Scotland is, as already said, presbyterian. In some respects, indeed, it is more strictly presbyterian than the early French and Swiss churches, though to these, upon the whole, it is in harmony with what they held, both as to their supreme rule and their mode of government. The Reformation, when the deficiency of qualified pastors to supply the vacant parishes required a special temporary arrangement, it has never, like the Continental presbyterian churches, been raised to a high degree of strictness in the sense of the term. At the same time, the Scottish Church does not now, and as far as her legal standards are concerned, not at any time, hold extreme views on the subject of presbyterianism. It does not hold presbytery so much as Christianity to be the fundamental principle of its religious polity. In the Scots Confession of 1560, and in the Westminster Confession of 1647, it alike subordinates forms of church government to the Catholic and undenominational doctrines which are common to all Christian churches. In the Scots Confession the first article is “of God,” and in the Westminster Confession the same place is assigned to “the Holy Scriptures.” Nor has there been the hypothesis of a jus divinum for presbytery—a divine institution of presbyterian church government—ever been authoritatively accepted by the Church of Scotland. So far from professing to believe that presbytery, as a system of church government perpetually and universally binding upon the Christian Church, is prescribed in the New Testament, it freely acknowledges that “it does not think that any policy . . . can be appointed for all ages, times, and places” (Scots Confession, chap. xx.); and it holds that “there are various circumstances concerning . . . the government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence according to the general rules of the Word” (Westminster Confession, chap. i.). The view on the subject of church government, which, judging from its standards and the works of its most learned and judicious constitutional writers, is maintained by the Scottish Church, is, that while other forms of church government are not to be condemned as necessarily anti-scriptural, or all other churches being formed on different models unchurched, presbytery, besides being on other grounds defensible (and especially on grounds of experience) is, if not exclusively laid down in the New Testament, yet in entire harmony with the general principles of that supreme rule of faith and practice. The terms of the formula required to be signed by the ministers of the Church at this point, go beyond such a general approval of the presbyterian polity. The terms are these: “I do own the presbyterial government and discipline now so happily established in [this church]; which . . . government, I am persuaded, [is] founded and the word of God, and I am convinced, to be the fundamental principles of the Church of Scotland.”

Dr. Edmund Calamy of London tells in his Autobiography a ridiculous story of a visit paid to him, when he happened to be in Edinburgh, by an old lady whose son had recently gone to the English metropolis. She told him she was anxious about his spiritual welfare in a place so benighted as London. “Why,” said Calamy, “what is your fear? We in England have the same Scriptures as you have, we believe in the same Saviour, and we insist as much as you do upon all holy living.” The old lady replied, “All that may be very true; but you have no kirk.” The hypothesis that a “kirk,” whether lay or clerical, exercise their authority as alike church rulers, are four in number; the initial court being the Kirk Session. The Kirk Session is, with anomalous exceptions in some large towns where there is what is called a “General Session,” parochial, and consists of the parish minister, and not fewer than two lay elders as his assessors; its function being to exercise discipline, and to provide for the administration of religious ordinances within its bounds. The next court is the Presbytery, consisting of the ministers and representatives from the elders of a limited district. The Presbytery is a court of appeal from the Kirk Session, and exercises otherwise a higher jurisdiction than that court. The next higher ecclesiastical judicatory is the Synod. It embraces a number of presbyteries within what is called a “Province,” and is consequently known by the name of a “Provincial Assembly.” It has the supervision over the work of the presbyteries within its province, and includes the whole of the members of the subordinate courts. The highest court is the General Assembly. The General Assembly is a representative court; a certain number of ministers and elders being chosen by the whole presbyteries of the church, and also by the Scottish universities and the royal burghs, or ancient municipalities, to attend its meetings, which are held annually, and last for ten days. The General Assembly is the supreme court of the Church. It has not only administrative and judicial, but also, as regards ecclesiastical matters, legislative powers; these powers, however, being only exercised with the express concurrence of a majority of the presbyters of the church, and in conformity with a constitutional law known as the “Barrier Act.”

The General Assembly is always jealous of its privileges as an ecclesiastical court, and especially of any encroachments by the State on its spiritual independence. It is dignified, however, in all its meetings by the presence of a representative of the crown; this practice being followed in conformity with a provision of the celebrated Act of the Scottish Parliament of 1562. The “Commissioner,” who represents the crown on these occasions, is also, in obedience to the same act, required to appoint by royal authority the time and place.
Institutes, says, "The lapse of time and the change of circumstances have introduced various alterations." In the present day the tendency is to increased decorum and reverence in the worship of God, perhaps with some sympathy with the ritualistic spirit which has been so widely manifested in the sister-kingdom.

(c) With respect to ritual, the Church of Scotland does not, any more than in the case of church government, profess, except as regards general principles, and such positive institutions as the sacraments and Christian prayer, to have the explicit direction of Holy Scripture. It holds that order in ceremonies is not expressly prescribed in the New Testament; in most of the details of public worship little more being authoritatively laid down by Christ or his apostles than that God should be worshipped in spirit and in truth, that all things should be done decently and in order, and that all things should be done to edification (comp. Scots Confession, chap. xx.; Westminster Confession, chap. i.). It professes, however, to lean to simplicity, and to the imitation, as far as possible, of the example of Christ and his apostles. It has always shown a strong objection to idolatrous or superstitious observances in the worship of God. It must be added that there are no liturgical forms of prayer in the Church of Scotland. At the time of the Reformation, that church, it is true, adopted, as a prayer-book the Book of Common Order,—a formulary which had been introduced in the church of Geneva when John Knox was its minister. The Book of Common Order is, accordingly, commonly known as Knox's Liturgy. But this prayer-book differs from other liturgies as being rather an optional than a compulsory form of public service, and admitting, to a considerable extent, of extemporary prayer. The rubric in every case is, that the service shall be "either in these words following, or to the like effect." The Book of Common Order appears to have continued in force, and (though there is some difference of opinion on the subject) to have been more or less regularly used in the Church till the time of the Commonwealth. At that period it was, like the old Scots Confession, formally superseded by an act of the General Assembly. The rule substituted was The Directory. The full title of this new formulary is, The Directory of the Public Worship of God, agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, approved by an act of the General Assembly and an act of the Scottish Parliament, both passed in Anno 1645. This Directory is, as its name imports, not a form of prayer, but rather an aid to prayer. It was intended to be a help to uniformity of worship. "Our meaning," to quote the words of the preface, "is that the general heads, the sense and the scope of the prayers, and other parts of public worship, being known to all, there may be a consent of all the churches in those things that contain the substance and form of public worship." For a very long time, neither the Book of Common Order nor the Directory of Public Worship has been practically enforced in the services of the Church of Scotland. As to its substance, however, the Directory fairly represents the usual practice since the period of the Revolution settlement of 1690. But as Dr. George Hill, in his

The relation of the Church to the State in Scotland are clear and simple. The principle of a church establishment has always been maintained in theory. In practice there have been times when the Church was left without support or countenance by the State; but, though thus virtually disestablished, it has not ceased to assert its own rights and the duties of the State. As we have seen, it was formally accepted as the Established Church in 1692, and again, by the Revolution settlement, in 1890. Establishment has never been held, by the Church of Scotland, to imply subjection to the State in matters spiritual. It has always maintained, and now maintains, the doctrine of the headship of Christ over the Church. No church has asserted more distinctly or more steadfastly than the Church of Scotland the headship of Christ in the most absolute sense of the term. As to the spiritual independence of the Church itself,—a somewhat difficult question,—the Scottish Church, though not disputing the authority of the civil magistrate within his own jurisdiction, has always protested against the interference of the civil magistrate with functions which are spiritual. And it has from first to last appeared to the Church of Scotland that there is no necessary conflict between the principles of spiritual independence and the principle of a national establishment of religion, which it holds to be the duty of the State and of the Church alike to recognize. On this vital question the civil law sustains the claims of the ecclesiastical courts, in all ecclesiastical causes, and matters purely
The paper from which these statistics are taken also contains some particulars as to the work of the church.

The church supports 77 unmended churches and 51 mission-stations. During the last eight years 110 additional churches have been built, at an estimated cost of upwards of £300,000, and providing accommodation for upwards of 80,000 sitters. The home mission committee of the church expends on objects such as these a large annual revenue. In 1880 the sum was £15,983, the whole amount drawn from the voluntary liberality of the church. Again: under the auspices of the endowment committee, the church is at this moment widely extending its old parochial organization by providing permanent endowments for unmended churches. By the jealous labors of the committee in question, and the liberality of members of the Established Church, no fewer than the large number of 312 new parishes, with regular endowments, have been created since the year 1845, the expense amounting to at least £22,000,000 sterling. In 1880 the revenue of the endowment committee was £15,983.

Of the foreign missions of the church the like details might be given. The church maintains missions in India, Africa, and China, with 86 European and 98 native agents, and at an expenditure of nearly £20,000 in 1880, or £25,000, if the closely allied Jewish mission be included. Then, in addition to these enterprises, the church undertakes partially the maintenance of religious ordinances in the colonies, more especially in Canada; and also the support of Continental mission-stations on behalf of Scotchmen who are resident temporarily or permanently abroad.

Under the heading of the voluntary liberality of the church, the following sums are noticed as raised during the nine years ending Dec. 31, 1880:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congregational and charitable purposes</td>
<td>£2,688,702 19s. 11d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of ordinances, and supplement of stipends (exclusive of £2,482,453 17s. 10d. raised by seat-rents)</td>
<td>£131,458 12 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (exclusive of sums raised in connection with training colleges)</td>
<td>£123,909 2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home mission work</td>
<td>£345,295 17 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church building</td>
<td>£89,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment of new parishes</td>
<td>£27,017 16 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign mission work</td>
<td>£25,353 13 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | £2,588,702 19s. 1d. |

Giving an average annual amount of | £287,638 12s. 5d. |

The amount for 1880 was | £131,458 12 10 |

These amounts do not include a princely donation of £50,000 for church purposes from the late Mr. James Baird of Cambusdoon.


WILLIAM LEE.
of Auchterarder in spite of the opposition of the election of ministers was placed on a comparatively popular basis. But in 1711, in the reign of Queen Anne, soon after the Scottish Parliament ceased to have a separate existence, an Act was passed by the British Parliament, hurriedly if not surreptitiously, restoring the system of lay-patronage; that is, conferring the right of nominating ministers to vacant charges. It had been maintained from the earliest times, that “no minister should be intruded upon a congregation contrary to their will;” and the Legislature at various times had passed acts acknowledging this principle. At the settlement of the affairs of the Presbyterian Church under William III., in 1690, the election of ministers was placed on a comparatively popular basis. But in 1711, in the reign of Queen Anne, soon after the Scottish Parliament ceased to have a separate existence, an Act was passed by the British Parliament, hurriedly if not surreptitiously, restoring the system of lay-patronage; that is, conferring the right of nominating ministers to certain landed proprietors connected with the several parishes. The General Assembly of the Church protested for many years against this enactment; and, in the settlement of ministers, presbyteries were required to see, that, in addition to his presentation by the patron, the minister-to-be had a “call” from the people. By and by the church became more favorable to patronage; and some of the early secessions took place in consequence of certain ministers being cast out for refusing to take the “forced settlements.” In 1834, under the guidance of Dr. Chalmers, the Assembly passed the Veto Act, with a view to define and settle the rights of the people in the “call” to the minister, without over-turning the rights of the patrons. This Act provided, that if a majority of male heads of families, being communicants, objected to the person nominated by the lay-patron, the presbytery were to take no steps for his ordination, but intimate to the patron that the parish was still vacant. Lord Kinnoul, patron of the parish of Auchterarder, and Mr. Robert Young, his presentee, who had been vetoed almost unanimously by the people, feeling aggrieved by the operation of the Veto Act, went to the civil courts to insist on what they termed their patrimonial rights. The civil courts decided in favor of the patron and his presentee. But, besides deciding that the emoluments of the parish belonged to the minister-to-be, the presbytery must take Mr. Young on trial, and, if found qualified, ordain him to the ministry. The event of May, 1843, shook Scotland to its roots, and the vibrations of the movement were felt over the civilized globe. Sympathy and aid flowed in from innumerable quarters, while the people were in many instances more decided than the members of the church. The number of congregations rapidly increased from four hundred and seventy-five to a small proportion of the landed gentry, and a much larger proportion of the lower, middle, and professional classes. In the Northern Highlands the people
forsook the Establishment in a mass, having often had bitter experience of the kind of ministers whom the patrons gave them. Parochial schoolmasters adhering to the Free Church were ejected from their schools. It was attempted to drive out professors who adhered to the Free Church from their chairs in the Universities; and a process for this purpose was the Rev. David Brewster, Principal of the United College of St. Andrews; but this attempt was not successful.

The Free Church determined to organize itself over the whole of Scotland, and, by means of a general fund and local funds, proceeded to build plain churches for the congregations, although in many places great hardship had to be endured from the stern refusal of some of the great landed proprietors to grant sites. In a short time a plan for the erection of manses was organized, and, through the great exertions of Dr. Guthrie, carried to a successful issue. Another plan, for the erection of five hundred schools, also proved successful. The various foreign missions were retained, and in lieu of the old buildings, which were claimed by the Established Church, new structures were reared. Among the chief aids in the maintenance of ordinances in the disestablished Church was the Sustentation Fund. The idea of this fund was due to Dr. Chalmers. At an early period he propounded his plan, and affirmed it as certain, that, if collectors were appointed for every district to gather in the contributions to this fund by periodical visits to the people, enough would be raised to provide a stipend of £130 sterling to each minister. The proposal was received with great incredulity at first. It turned out, however, that Dr. Chalmers was right. For several years a minimum stipend from this fund of £160 has been paid to double the number of ministers originally on the fund, while many have received a further sum in the form of surplus. In addition to what is provided from this fund, the abler congregations add local supplements to the minister's salary. The payment of £160 includes an annual contribution of £7 from each minister to a Widow's and Orphan's Fund. This fund now gives to every minister's widow an annuity of £46 a year, and to every minister's orphan (up to the age of eighteen), a yearly allowance of £24 where the mother is alive, and £36 where the mother is dead.

It would be out of place in this brief sketch to enter into detail on the work in which the Free Church has been engaged since 1843. Some of the most characteristic of her labors may be briefly referred to.

1. Home Evangelization. — This work was followed out in two departments. First, when the disruption occurred, it was the endeavor of the church to secure that the gospel should be preached and its known and distinguished as evangelical. A great amount of ignorance and spiritual deadness prevailed in these districts. Now that the way was open, the Free Church endeavored to plant men in such districts of a more distinctively evangelical and earnest type. It was attempted to make the gospel known in all quarters by means of a settled ministry, when practicable, or by means of occasional visits from ministers, and others of evangelical gifts and character.

The other department of home-mission work was among the largest towns and other populous places. Before the disruption, Dr. Chalmers and his friends had had their attention turned very earnestly to the vast number of persons in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other large towns, who had been suffered to fall into a state of complete neglect of Christian ordinances. As soon as the hurry of the disruption was over, Dr. Chalmers set himself to show what could be done in the way of reclaiming a neglected district, by organizing what he called a territorial mission, and thereafter a territorial ministerial charge, in the West Port of Edinburgh. His plan was to select a limited territory of about two thousand souls, and divide it among a number of visitors, each of whom was to take care of a small number of the people, and try to get them to connect themselves with the mission. A missionary minister and a schoolmaster were appointed for the whole, and by God's blessing the scheme was a great success. Many churches in the poorer districts of our cities have been erected on the same principle. All along, the Free Church has been prominent in home evangelical work. Revival movements under suitable men have been greatly promoted by the Free Church. The late Mr. Brownlow North was recognized as an evangelist by the General Assembly; and movements like that of Messrs. Moody and Sankey have had many of their most energetic supporters and helpers from among her ministers and people.

2. Theological Education. — From the beginning, it was the earnest desire of Dr. Chalmers, principal and professor of divinity at Edinburgh, to extend and improve the system of theological training. On his death, in 1847, his successor, Dr. Cunningham, addressed himself vigorously to the same cause. It was thought by many that the policy of the church ought first to be to complete the equipment of each of its theological halls; but this influence was strong at Aberdeen and at Glasgow, and now there are three theological institutions. These are all furnished with ample buildings and libraries; and a large sum has been accumulated for endowment. The "New College" of Edinburgh has seven professors and one lecturer. The chairs are, (1) Apologetics and Ecclesiastical theology; (2) Systematic theology; (3) Church history; (4) Hebrew, and Old-Testament exegesis; (5) New-Testament exegesis; (6) Evangelistic theology, or missions; (7) Natural science. The lecturership is for election. The other halls have each four professors; the professor of evangelical theology at Edinburgh being connected likewise with them. The curriculum of study extends over four sessions of five months each. All students of divinity must have passed through an undergraduate course at one of the universities. The total number of students in session 1880-1 was 327. The New College at Edinburgh has usually a large number of students from other countries and churches. The following countries and colonies have sent students: Canada, United
3. Foreign Missions. — The adherence of all the missionaries to the Free Church, as well as the influence of the current of evangelical life which fell so peculiarly on that church, led to a prominent place being given to foreign missions. The church felt the loss of its newly formed auxiliary, the Free Presbyterian Church, in South America, very congeial. The Free Church and the majority of the Reformed, or Calvinists, of the latter church were sent out to the colonial churches. In other ways the church was vigorously prosecuted. The rearing of native laborers in well-equipped Christian schools of Western learning has always been a chief aim of the church. It must be owned, that, in this field, the efforts of the church have not yet equalled the greatness of the enterprise. Besides missions in India, there are missions in Caffraria, Natal, and at Lake Nyassa in Africa, in the New Hebrides Islands, and in Syria. The Free Church is also associated with the English Presbyterian Church in a vigorous mission to China. The institution of a chair of missionary theology in 1867 was designed to call the attention of theological students to missions, and to quicken their zeal for the foreign field; but it can hardly be said that as yet the results have come up to the hopes of the founders.

4. Colonial Churches. — A committee for promoting the welfare of colonial churches was in operation before the disruption: this department of work, however, has been prosecuted with more vigor since that event. One thing that has given additional interest to the colonies is the fact that not a few ministers have gone to them as their fields of labor. Though England does not fall under this category, yet it is worthy of note that the ranks of the Presbyterian Church there were largely recruited by Free-Church ministers; so that a new vigor was communicated, by the disruption, to Presbyterianism in England. The church in Canada, as well as the church in Australia and the church in New Zealand, profited by the same event. Several professors of divinity were sent out to the colonial churches. In other cases, ministers were furnished for important charges. The plan of a sustentation fund has been tried, with no small success, in several of these colonial churches. In other ways the influence of the Free Church has been evinced in the increased life and energy which many of them have shown.

5. Evangelization in the European Continent. — The energies of the Free Church have found a very congenial field on the continent of Europe. The ostensible object has been to look after Scotchmen settled in Continental cities, or residing there for a time; but the stations thus established have served as evangelical centres, from which, in various ways, light has emanated to enlighten the surrounding darkness. In many of the towns of Italy the stations of the Free Church have been specially active of late. A committee, appointed by the General Assembly, for the “welfare of youth,” prescribes certain books and subjects for competition every year: members of Bible-classes are encouraged to compete. In 1880-81 the total number who obtained prizes or certificates (their examination-papers showing a value of not less than fifty per cent) was 958.

6. Church Union and Co-operation. — Soon after the disruption, the Free Church received into her communion one of the smaller sections of the secession, — that with which the late Dr. McCrie was connected. For ten years negotiations were carried on between the Reformed, the Free, and the English Presbyterian churches, with a view to union. The great majority of the Free Church favored this union; but a determined minority opposed it, and threatened to secede if it were carried out. In consequence of this, the negotiations came to an end; but a union was effected between the Free Church and the English Presbyterian churches, and the Free Church, with the minority of the Reformed, or Cameroonian. The Free Church in her Assembly has always welcomed ministers from other evangelical churches, and given them opportunities of being heard. Her connection has been peculiarly intimate, in times of trial, with the colonial churches and with the English and Irish Presbyterian churches. The Free Church has always encouraged union among the different Presbyterian bodies in the colonies, although minorities have sometimes been against such movements.

7. Care of the Young. — The Free Church felt specially called on to take up, as a legacy from the founders of the Reformed Church of Scotland, “the godly upbringing of the young.” The scheme for five hundred day schools, already referred to, was designed, partly to provide for the ejected schoolmasters, and partly to secure more attention to the religious element in education. For many years, under the convenership of Dr. Candlish, the Free Church was very zealous in promoting primary education. Three normal colleges were established for the training of teachers, — at Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen: these are still in full and efficient operation. The education scheme was never very popular. The church always expressed her readiness to merge her own scheme in a general system for national education, and a few years ago this was actually done. Most of her school-buildings were given up to school-boards for national education. A large establishment of Sabbath schools is connected with the Free Church, all under the kirk-sessions of the various congregations. In 1880-81 the number of teachers was 16,296, and the number of scholars, 152,101. Of Bible or senior classes, mostly taught by the ministers, there were reported 1,205, and scholars, 44,508.

8. Financial Administration. — The Free Church has gained no little notice for the systematic thoroughness of her financial administration and the large sums of money which she has raised for her various objects. The total raised during the year...
The Free Church has had not a little connection with the State. It was trying to enslave her, and not on the ground that such connection in itself was wrong. The general belief now is, that the existing alliance of the Established church, was as follows:

---

Since 1843 the entire sum raised by the Free Church, for all purposes, up to March, 1881, amounted to £14,347,317 10s. 2d. The present number of ministerial charges is 1,005. The present number of ministers is 1,070. The present number of separate home-mission stations (in addition to Congregational missions) is 22. The present number of communicants is 304,000.

The Free Church, throughout her career, has aimed to combine the spirit and convictions of the old Reformers and Covenanters with adaptation to modern wants and a progressive attitude, wherever progress is lawful. The conservative element has in practice had no little influence in checking progressive tendencies. For the most part, the Calvinistic creed has been held and preached as the true faith both by ministers and people. When the Free Church gave up connection with the State, it was on the ground that the State was trying to enslave her, and not on the ground that such connection in itself was wrong. The course of events has tended to show that the old connection with the State is inadvisable, and not to be desired. The general belief now is, that the existing alliance of the Established Church with the State ought to be dissolved, so that all the Presbyterian churches of Scotland might be on a common brotherly level.

The Free Church has had not a little internal agitation and discussion. The last of her agitations was in the Robertson Smith case. On the one side, it was contended that the Church ought not to lay a violent arrest on the fullest discussion of certain critical questions raised by Mr. Smith, connected with the origin and date of Old Testament books. On the other side, it was contended that any toleration of Mr. Smith's views was tantamount to giving up the authority and inspiration of Scriptures, and by others, that whatever might ultimately be found to be true on the disputed questions, the Church ought not to take the responsibility of Mr. Smith's views, as she would be doing if she were to continue him in his chair. It was this last view that obtained.

The Free Church, throughout her career, has aimed to combine the spirit and convictions of the old Reformers and Covenanters with adaptation to modern wants and a progressive attitude, wherever progress is lawful. The conservative element has in practice had no little influence in checking progressive tendencies. For the most part, the Calvinistic creed has been held and preached as the true faith both by ministers and people. When the Free Church gave up connection with the State, it was on the ground that the State was trying to enslave her, and not on the ground that such connection in itself was wrong. The course of events has tended to show that the old connection with the State is inadvisable, and not to be desired. The general belief now is, that the existing alliance of the Established Church with the State ought to be dissolved, so that all the Presbyterian churches of Scotland might be on a common brotherly level.

The Free Church has had not a little internal agitation and discussion. The last of her agitations was in the Robertson Smith case. On the one side, it was contended that the Church ought not to lay a violent arrest on the fullest discussion of certain critical questions raised by Mr. Smith, connected with the origin and date of Old Testament books. On the other side, it was contended that any toleration of Mr. Smith's views was tantamount to giving up the authority and inspiration of Scriptures, and by others, that whatever might ultimately be found to be true on the disputed questions, the Church ought not to take the responsibility of Mr. Smith's views, as she would be doing if she were to continue him in his chair. It was this last view that obtained.
Synod, commonly called “Antiburghers.” These two denominations grew up side by side for more than seventy years, their members and ministers having no ecclesiastical fellowship with each other, and their history marked by little that is noteworthy, until near the beginning of this century, when the question of the civil magistrate’s power in religious concerns, arose. From this time small minorities broke off from each, prefixing the word “original” to their distinctive name. (See Thomas McCrie.) This was the result of what in Scotland is still known as “The Old-Light Controversy.” But at length the “breach” between the two main branches was healed. The members of both the Burgher and Antiburgher churches were, in the first two decades of the century, frequently brought together for the furtherance of the great objects of the Bible and missionary societies, and were led to hold meetings for united prayer. The outcome was a desire for reunion simultaneously in many quarters, and that led in September, 1820, to the formation of the United Secession Church, which continued under this name till 1847. At the division, as we have seen, the number of congregations was 40; at the reunion it had risen to 292, of which 138 were connected with the Burghers, and 123 with the Antiburghers; and within twenty years a hundred new congregations were added to the aggregate. From 1840 to 1845 the peace of the church was disturbed by a controversy on the atonement, which though attended at the time with some acrimonious things, and resulting in the expulsion from its fellowship of James Morison, now well known as an admirable exegetical scholar, did much to clarify the theological atmosphere, not only of the denomination, but of Scotland. Meanwhile other matters were not lost sight of, for, at the time of its junction to the Relief Church, the United Secession was raising annually for all purposes above £70,000. It had a band of 60 missionaries and teachers in foreign lands, a theological seminary with four professors and 95 students, and 65 licentiates.

Relief Church. — But we must now go back, and trace the history of the Relief Church, which had been running its course parallel to those of the other seceding communities for now nearly a hundred years. It had its origin in 1752, in the form of a small body of men, led by Thomas Gillespie, minister of Car-nock, for refusing to take part in the installation of a pastor whom it was determined to thrust into the parish of Inverkeithing against the will of the people. To this sentence, Gillespie meekly bowed, and removed to Dunfermline, where he gathered round him a congregation, and where for six years he stood alone, having ecclesiastical connection with none of the existing denominations. At the end of that time he was joined by Thomas Boston of Oxnam, son of the famous author of The Fourfold State; and in 1761 the first Relief Presbytery was formed, taking the name of “Relief,” because its purpose was to follow those principles which were expressed by patronage. In 1794 the presbytery, now swelled into a synod, sanctioned a hymn-book, for congregational praise; and in 1823 it established a theological seminary, for the education of its ministers, who had up till that time been required to attend the Divinity Hall in the National Church. Its polity, as well as that of the Secession Church, was Presbyterian; its creed, Calvinistic; and its spirit, catholic. Indeed, in this last respect it was ahead of all its Presbyterian contemporaries, for Gillespie had been trained by Flichfeus in both. From him the principle of Christian communion; so that, at his first dispensation of the Lord’s Supper, after his deposition, he could say, “I hold communion with all that visibly hold the Head, and with such only”; and he invited all such to unite with him in the observance of the ordinance. He was thus in advance of those who restricted their fellowship only to such as agreed with them in matters of covenanting, and the like, and could not conscientiously occupy a platform so narrow as that of either of the branches of the Secession. But in 1847 the Secession herself had come up to that same standard, and the union was effected with great enthusiasm, and has resulted in the richest blessing. The Relief Church numbered at that time 7 presbyteries, 114 congregations, and 45,000 members.

Since 1847 the course of the United Church has been one of almost uninterrupted progress. Negotiations for union with the Free Church were begun in 1862, and continued for ten years; but they were ultimately abandoned, without any other issue than the adoption of a Mutual Eligibility Scheme, which permitted a congregation in either denomination to call a minister from the other. Beyond Scotland, however, a union was effected; for in Liverpool, on the 13th June, 1876, ninety-eight congregations of the United Presbyterian Synod, whose location was in England, were formally joined to the English Presbyterian Church, making together “The Presbyterian Church of England.” Yet, notwithstanding that apparent diminution of strength, the statistics presented in 1882 gave the following particulars: Presbyteries, 90; congregations, 561; members in full communion, 174,557; income for congregational purposes, £250,927 3s. 6d.; for missionary and benevolent purposes, £92,561 17s. 4d.; total, £373,459 10s. 6d., which is exclusive of £50,271 7s. 6d., reported as from legacies. In addition to its home operations, the United Presbyterian Church has foreign missions in Jamaica, Old Calabar, West Africa; Japootana, India; China; and Japan; in which, according to the report of 1883, there are 71 regularly organized congregations, with an aggregate membership of 10,808 and nearly 2,000 catechumens. The total income of the Foreign Mission Fund for 1882 amounted to £37,530. In its Basis of Union it solemnly recognized the duty “to make exertions for the universal diffusion of the blessings of the gospel at home and abroad;” and it has faithfully carried out that conviction, and is probably doing more for the diffusion of the gospel throughout the world than any other denomination of its size, with the exception of the Moravians.

Doctrinal Position. — In the Basis of Union just referred to, the doctrine of the United Presbyterian Church was thus defined: —

"I. The word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only rule of faith and practice. II. The Westminster Confession..."
of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms are the sacred books of this church, and contain the authorized exposition of the sense in which we understand the Scriptures, it being always understood that we do not approve of any thing in them which is not approved by the church of Christ, which has been held by this church, a profession made with intelligence, and justified by a corresponding character and conduct; and declared ministerial and elders to be required to answer the questions prescribed in the formulary for ordination and license; and of which these, up to May, 1879, was one question which read thus:—Do you acknowledge the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms as an exhibition of the sense in which you hold the Scriptures; it being understood that you are not required to approve of any thing in these documents which teaches, or may be supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion? But at the meeting of synod of 1879 it was decided to replace the substance of the latter clause, and that it should be as follows:—This acknowledgment being made in view of the explanations contained in the declaratory act of synod there annexed. At the same meeting a declaratory act was adopted; and as its importance is great, not only intrinsically, but because it is the first attempt to widen the basis of doctrinal subscription in a Presbyterian church, we give it here entire:—

1. That in regard to the doctrine of redemption as taught in the Standards, and in consistency therewith, the love of God to all mankind, his gift of his Son to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, the free offer of this free gift to all men, without distinction, on the ground of Christ's perfect sacrifice, are matters which have been, and continue to be, regarded by this church as vital in the system of gospel truth, and to which due prominence ought ever to be given.

2. That the doctrine of the divine decrees, including the doctrine of election to eternal life, is held in connection and harmony with the truth that God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance; and that he has provided a salvation sufficient for all, adapted to all, and offered to all in the gospel; and also with the responsibility of every man for his dealing with the free and unrestricted offer of eternal life.

3. That the doctrine of man's total depravity and of his loss of all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation is not held as implying such a condition of man's nature as would affect his responsibility under the law of God and the gospel of Christ; or that he does not experience the striving and restraining influences of the Spirit of God; or that he cannot perform actions in any sense good, although actions which do not spring from a renewed heart not spiritually good or holy, such as accompany salvation.

4. That while none are saved except through the mediation of Christ and by the grace of his Holy Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how it pleaseth him; while the duty of sending the gospel to the heathen who are sunk in ignorance, sin, and misery, is clear and imperative; and while the outward and ordinary means of salvation for those capable of being called by the Lord are the ordinances of the gospel: in accepting the Standards it is not required to be held that any who die in infancy are lost, or that God may not extend his grace to those who are without the pale of ordinary means, as it may seem good in his sight.

5. That in regard to the doctrine of the civil magistrate, and his authority and duty in the sphere of religion as taught in the Standards, this church holds that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only King and Head of the church of Christ; and of Christ's church which is his body; disapproves of all compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion; and disclaimers to require approval of any thing in her Standards that teaches, or may be supposed to teach, such principles.

6. That Christ has laid it as a permanent and universal obligation upon his church at once to maintain her own ordinances, and to 'preach the gospel to every creature;' and has ordained that his people provide by their freewill offerings for the fulfillment of this obligation.

7. That in accordance with the practice hitherto observed in this church, liberty of opinion is allowed on such points in the Standards, not entering into the substance of the latter clause, and that 'six days' in the Mosaic account of the creation, the church guarding against the abuse of this liberty to the injury of its unity and peace.'

In general matters the United Presbyterian Church has been very progressive. She was the first among the Scottish Presbyterians to introduce hymns other than the paraphrases into public worship, and after many debates she conceded the liberty to use instrumental music in her services some years ago.

Government.—The government is Presbyterian. Each congregation elects its own minister and elders, who together constitute the session. The arrangement of the temporal affairs is deputed to a body of managers chosen for the purpose by the members; but these have no spiritual oversight of the church. The presbytery consists of the ministers and one elder from each session in a specified district; and the synod consists of the aggregate of the presbyteries. Mere ordination does not confer the right to a seat in presbytery or synod. The minister of a congregation, and unless in the case of a pastor-emeritus, who remains as a colleague to a junior brother, and in those of the professors of theology and mission secretaries, no minister without charge is a member, either of presbytery or synod. Frequent efforts have been made to divide the synod into provincial bodies, and make the supreme court a general assembly; but the democratic spirit of the denomination has always defeated these, although it has been felt that a synod composed of more than a thousand members is not perfectly adapted to deliberation. Still it has worked well on the whole in the past, and there seems to be at present no disposition to change.

Theological Education.—Up till 1876 the meetings of the theological seminary, or hall, were held in Edinburgh every year during the months of August and September; and students having first passed through a full liberal curriculum at one or other of the national universities, and having been examined for admission, were required to attend for five sessions, while the professors, retaining their pastoral charges, gave up these two months annually to the work of tuition; and during the other months of the year the students were required to perform certain specified exercises, and undergo certain examinations, under
the inspection of their respective presbyteries. This plan was suited to the circumstances of the church in its infancy; but a new scheme of education, bringing it more into line with other denominations, was adopted in 1876, when it was decided that the professors should be loosed from the pastorate; that the session should consist of five months, from November to April; and that the course should consist of three full sessions.

There are five theological chairs,— apologetics, pastoral training, church history, New-Testament literature and exegesis, and Hebrew with Old-Testament literature and exegesis. The men who now hold these appointments are worthy to be the successors of Lawson, the Browns (grandfather and grandson), Dick, Eadie, and others who have made the name of the Secession Church honorably known in many lands. WILLIAM M. TAYLOR.

II. In England. The Presbyterian Church of England differs in its history from that of Scotland. From Knox to Chalmers, the latter was a Reformation Church, which for three centuries was more thoroughly national than any other; whereas the other never reached the same depth or extent in its influence during any period,— its rise, its height as the National Church of England, its decay, its revival.
For twenty years Presbyterianism was the National Church. Its framework was set up chiefly in London and Lancashire, and partially over the country. It was a time of much noble work, poverty and ruin. But independence and Cromwell did not like Presbyterianism, because it adopted the intolerant principles of an Established Church, from which no church, either in England or New England, was in that age altogether free; and the old Episcopal Church waited its time.

That time soon came. Presbyterianism was disestablished, and on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1662, two thousand ministers, most of them Presbyterian, were ejected. Among them were Baxter, Howe, and Bates. Till 1688 Presbyterianism was thrust out of civil and religious rights. It did not fight in England a Drumelrig or Bothwell Bridge: it did not flee to the hills and moors, as in Scotland. It was too passive, and so became feeble.

4. But during these last forty years a new spirit revived; the old Puritan Presbyterianism lived in many native churches: was strengthened by like-minded Scotchmen coming to England; till at last the two classes of congregations—those connected with the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland and those which after the disruption in 1643 formed one English Presbyterian synod—joined together in 1876 under the name of the "Presbyterian Church of England." This union, which doubled the strength numerically of the united church, far more than doubled its moral energy and helpfulness. Since the union, its growth has been more elastic, organized, and conspicuous. Even before the union, Presbyterianism stood higher in relative increase of numbers at the last ecclesiastical census than any other denomination in England. We give the latest statistical returns, those of the year 1881: Congregations, 275, of which 75 are in the presbytery of London, an enormous increase during twenty years; 264 ministers with charges, 31 without charges, 21 probationers, 56,399 communicants, 6,216 sabbath-school teachers. In 1882 the theological college had three professors, one tutor, twenty-three students. One special department, the Student Mission Fund, has yielded to every ordained minister a minimum stipend of £200 yearly, the largest minimum amount in any English denomination; and this minimum sum will likely, and soon, be increased. Total amount collected in 1881 was £208,020; average stipend in England, £200; in London, £394; in Liverpool, £414.

One of the noblest and most vigorously prosecuted enterprises of the church is the China Mission. Its first missionary was W. C. Burns, a man of the highest heroic and saintly type, whose place has been filled by a succession of men and women of like spirit. Burns had for a time little outward success, but it increased greatly before he died; and the seed he sowed has grown into a rich harvest. In 1881 there were 27 missionaries, 64 native missionaries, 64 stations, and 2,570 members; grew...
tract of land near the mouth of the Merrimack River was selected by their agent for the Presbyterian settlement. The immigrants embarked from Scotland, and had traversed half the width of the Atlantic, but were driven back by adverse storms, and abandoned the enterprise. Presbyterianism proper was thereby put back in its American development half a century.

Many of the New-England ministers and people, at that early period, were neither Presbyterians in principle, or well disposed to such as were. The Cambridge (1648) and the Boston (1662) synods made provision for ruling elders in the churches, and favored the consociation of the churches. They were rigidly opposed to Independency, and aimed to establish "a sweet sort of temperament between rigid Presbyterianism and levelling Brownism."

When the "Heads of Agreement" between the Presbyterian and Congregational ministers were assented to at London, A.D. 1690, Cotton Mather affirmed (Magnalia, ii. 339) that the same "union hath been for many lustres, yea, many decades of years," exemplified in the churches of New England, so far that I believe it is not possible for me to give a truer description of our ecclesiastical constitution (A.D. 1718) than by transcribing thereof the articles of that union. Their platform was both Presbyterianism, that "the Presbyterian ministers of this country," Mather says, "do find it no difficulty to practise the substance of it in and with their several congregations."

Writing to Rev. Robert Wodrow, a Presbyterian minister in Scotland, Aug. 8, 1718 (Wodrow: Miscell., ii. 424), he says, "We are comforted with great numbers of our oppressed brethren coming over from the north of Ireland unto us." They were Presbyterians. "They find so very little difference in the management of our churches from theirs and yours as to count it next unto none at all. Not a few ministers of the Scotch nation coming over hither have here before been invited unto settlements with our churches."

A considerable number of Presbyterians, both ministers and people, it thus appears, emigrated from Great Britain and Ireland to New England during the troubles of the seventeenth century, and were absorbed in the Congregational churches, at that time differing but little, as they thought, from Presbyterian churches. Particularly was it so with the Connecticut churches, where Consociationism, a modified form of Presbyterianism, had generally prevailed. The Hartford North Association, in 1799, affirmed "that the constitution of the churches in the State of Connecticut is not Congregational, but contains the essentials of the government of the Church of Scotland, or Presbyterian Church in America;" and "that the churches in Connecticut are not now, and never were, from the earliest period of our settlement, Congregational churches." They were often spoken of as Presbyterian churches.

Colonies from these churches planted themselves, at an early day, on Long Island and in East Jersey; and the churches which they organized — Southampton (1640), Southold (1641), Elizabeth (1668), and Newburyport (1669) — eventually became Presbyterian, almost as soon as they had the opportunity. The church of Jamaica, on Long Island (1662), claims to have been a Presbyterian church at its organization.

The First Presbyterian Church in America. — The persecutions of the Presbyterians in Scotland and Ireland, during the later years of Charles II. (1670-85), compelled many of them to seek rest beyond the seas. The standing order in New England, both civilly and ecclesiastically, was Congregationalism. In the province of New York the Dutch were of the Holland type of Presbyterianism, and only the Church of England was tolerated among the English. In Virginia also, none but Episcopal churches were recognized by law. A more liberal policy prevailed in East and West Jersey, in Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland. Very naturally, therefore, these emigrants sought refuge where they would be free to exercise their religion; and Presbyterian settlements were formed in these sections in the latter half of the seventeenth century, few and feeble at the best.

Application for a minister was made (1680) to a presbytery in the north of Ireland by one of these companies; and in 1683 the Rev. Francis Makemie was ordained, and sent as a missionary to these scattered sheep in the great American wilderness. He settled at Rehoboth in Maryland, and gathered the people, there and in other settlements round about, into Presbyterian churches.

Other ministers were sent out, and were welcomed. Some few came to them also from New England, and took charge, here and there, of a Presbyterian church.

The First Presbytery. — At the opening of the eighteenth century these seven ministers — Makemie, Davis, Wilson, Andrews, Taylor, Mackin, and Hampton — met together (1705) in the Presbyterian church of Philadelphia, Penn., and constituted the Presbytery of Philadelphia, — the first in the New World. The American Presbyterian Church had now taken form, and entered upon a career of widely extended power and usefulness. It was destitute of patronage, and of feeble resources. It was strong only in faith and godliness.

The First Synod. — In 1710 the presbytery numbered eleven ministers. Makemie and Taylor had just died; and Smith, Anderson, Henry, and Wade had been received, in addition to Boyd, whom they had ordained in 1706, — the first Presbyterian ordination in America. They had a small congregation at Elizabeth River, Va., four in Maryland, five in Pennsylvania, and two in New Jersey. Six years later (Sept. 22, 1716), they resolved themselves into three presbyteries, — Philadelphia, Newcastle, and Long Island, and thus constituted the synod of Philadelphia. The churches had increased to seventeen. In the Province of New York they had five churches, — New York, Newtown, Jamaica, Setauket, and Southampton; in New Jersey, four churches, — Newark, New Brunswick, Freehold, and Middlesex; and in Pennsylvania, two churches, — Philadelphia and Abington; and, in the regions beyond, six churches, — Newcastle, Patuxent, Rehoboth, Snowhill, White-Clay Creek, and Appoquinimink. The two vigorous churches of Elizabethtown and Newark, N.J., with their pastorate, Jonathan Dickinson and Joseph Webb, came in soon afterwards. The ministers had increased to nineteen. During
the first ten years twenty-seven had been enrolled, of whom five had died, and three had withdrawn. 

Adoption of Doctrinal Standards.—The progress of the church from this date was steady, if not rapid. In 1728 the synod numbered twenty-seven ministers. Fifty-six had been enrolled since 1705, of whom fourteen had died, and fifteen had left the connection. No action had thus far been taken, so far as the records (of which the first leaf is lost) show, in respect to the formal adoption of any standard of doctrine or written creed. 

As the Church of Scotland had, from the days of the Westminster Assembly of Divines (1648), adopted and professed faith in their Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and as so large a portion, both of the ministers and people, were of Scotch origin, it is to be presumed that both the first presbytery and the synod had adhered to these standards of faith and worship. 

But the times called for a decided and open expression of their faith. The alarming prevalence of Arminianism, Pelagianism, Arrianism, and Socinianism, among some of the Reformed churches of Europe, and even in Scotland and Ireland, the old home of Presbyterianism, views which deistical opinions were avowed and disseminated among educated circles at home and abroad, called for some decisive action. It was accordingly resolved at the meeting of the synod in 1729, the synod, with a surprising unanimity, by an "Adopting Act," made the Westminster Confession of Faith their standard, "as being, in all the essential and necessary Articles, good forms of sound words and system of Christian doctrine;" agreeing, further, that no one should be ordained to the ministry, or received to membership, who had any scruples as to any parts of the Confession, save "only about Articles not essential and necessary to doctrine, worship, and government." It was also agreed, that, in respect to such differences, they would treat one another with all due forbearance and kindness. 

The First Disruption.—A considerable diversity of theological and ecclesiastical views was developed in these discussions and in subsequent meetings of the synod. A large proportion of the ministers were of foreign birth and education. The native ministry was, for the most part, from New England. The former obtained the appellation of the "Old Side," or the "Old Lights:" the latter were the "New Side," or the "New Lights." They differed as to the essential qualifications of candidates for the ministry, and the matter and style of pulpit ministrations. The Old Side laid the greater stress on scholarship, the New Side insisted more on experimental piety. The former were rigid in their demands for a full term of study: the latter, in the exigencies of the country and times, were ready to make large exceptions in the case of such as had considerable gifts and gifts of the grace of God in sound doctrine. 

A period of unwonted religious interest and of spiritual revival followed. Not a few of the churches in and out of New England were favored with special manifestations of divine grace. Large demands were made upon the ministry. The people were eager to hear. Popular preachers and exhorters were at a premium: they were sent for from every quarter. It was a "Great Awakening." That singularly gifted evangelist of the Church of England, George Whitefield, came to America, and traversed the Atlantic coast from Georgia to New Hampshire, preaching everywhere. Great crowds attended his ministrations. The New Side churches were opened to him, and their ministers affiliated with him. The Old Side, if not opposed to the movement, were suspicious and apprehensive, and, for the most part, stood aloof from Mr. Whitefield and the work. 

At the meeting of the synod in 1740, the two parties came into collision in respect to some alleged irregularities on the part, principally, of the Presbytery of New Brunswick, or some of its prominent members. An open rupture ensued in 1741, and the offending presbytery withdrew. After repeated but futile attempts by the more moderate brethren to allay the irritation, and to reconcile the conflicting parties, the synod itself became divided. A considerable number of ministers and churches, including the presbyteries of New York and New Brunswick and a part of that of Newcastle, withdrew in 1745, and organized the synod of New Brunswick, as the "New Side synod," in rivalry, and not in correspondence, with the Old-Side synod of Philadelphia. 

The Healing of the Breach.—The latter, at the disruption, was the larger body; but the former had the larger sympathy of the people, and rapidly increased in numbers, in resources and influence. The breach was healed in May, 1758. The New Side brought into the union seventy-two ministers and six presbyteries; the Old Side, twenty-two ministers and three presbyteries. The synod of New York and Philadelphia, as the united synod was called, had more than a hundred churches under its care. 

In the political agitations that convulsed the British Colonies in America during the next twenty-five years, resulting in the War of the Revolution and the independence of the United States, the Presbyterian Church was a unit in the assertion and defence of the principles of civil and religious liberty, and contributed largely towards the triumph of the patriots. 

The First General Assembly.—Shortly after the return of peace, measures were taken by the synod for a still further development of Presbyterian principles. The church had been greatly prospered. It was time that a general assembly, as in the Church of Scotland, should be instituted. Three years (1785-88) were given to the careful preparation and adoption of a constitution. The sixteen presbyteries of 1788 were distributed into four synods,—New York, Philadelphia, Virginia, and the Carolinas. A general assembly, composed of commissioners (ministers and elders in equal numbers), from the presbyteries, met at Philadelphia, Penn., in May, 1789. The first Congress of the United States were then holding their first session at New York. The two bodies, as well as their constitutions, are coeval. 

In 1779 four of the ministers had withdrawn, on the plea of larger liberty, from the synod, and had (1780) organized the independent presbytery of Morris County. An associated presbytery was formed in 1792, a third in 1798, and a fourth in 1807. They were known as the Associated...
Presbyteries of Morris County and Westchester, the Northern and the Saratoga Presbyteries. At the end of a single generation they had ended their course, and been absorbed by other bodies.

**PLAN OF UNION.** — Before the close of the century, the church had extended itself far to the south and west. Its missionaries went everywhere, preaching the word, and gathering churches. To prevent collision with the missionaries from New south and west. Its missionaries went everywhere, gathering churches. To prevent collision with the missionaries from New

England, the General Assembly of 1801 entered heartily into a “Plan of Union” with the con-

sociated churches of Connecticut, providing for the orderly organization of churches in settle-
ments of commingled Presbyterians and Congre-

gionalists, and the institution of pastors. The operative organization of churches in settle-
ments of commingled Presbyterians and Congre-


gionalists, and the institution of pastors. The

happy influence of this fraternal plan was felt in a large part of the new towns in the States of New York and Ohio, where the two streams of emigration flowed side by side. The church now numbered twenty-six presbyteries, three hundred ministers, and nearly five hundred congregations. The Cumberland Offshoot. — A special manifestation of divine grace marked the opening of the present century. The Assembly of 1803 testified that there was scarcely a presbytery from which came not the glad tidings of the prevalence and power of the Great Revival. In some parts of the land, particularly in Kentucky, it was characterized, to some extent, by peculiar physical effects known as “bodily exercises.” The great demand for preachers brought forward a considerable number of exhorters and evangelists, of very limited education, but of special gifts as public speakers. One of the presbyteries was censured by its synod for giving a regular license to some of these exhorters. Dissatisfied with this action, several of the ministers withdrew, and organized (Feb. 4, 1810) an independent body called the “Presbytery of Cumberland,” which has now grown to be one of the largest bodies of Presbyterian churches in America. (See Cumberland Presbyterian Church.)

**Doctrinal Disaffections.** — Soon after the second war with Great Britain (1812-15), another period of religious prosperity gave much enlargement to the church. Associations for the diffusion of religious tracts, religious newspapers, and for missions at home and abroad, were extensively patronized. The system of African slavery was condemned (1818) by the Assembly. Much fear was expressed in relation to the spread of “New Divinity,” or Hopkinsianism from New England. Gradually a New School party was developed, and was increasingly antagonized year by year by the Old School portion of the church.

These tendencies were aggravated during the revival period of 1827-33, during which the churches were greatly enlarged and multiplied. In some sections, doctrines were advanced, and measures adopted, that were widely repudiated by the Old School party. Great apprehensions were expressed of danger to the faith by the spreading of New Haven Theology. Albert Barnes at Philadelphia, and Lyman Beecher at Cincinnati, were both subject to trials and censure by their presbyteries, but were absolved from them by the General Assembly. The whole church was agitated by the controversy. Just at this time, too, the question of slavery came to the front by the organization of the American Anti-slavery Society, greatly disturbing the churches in the Southern States, and aggra-

vating the growing feeling of jealousy and opposi-
tion between the two parties in the church.

The Great Disruption. — At the meeting of the assembly in May, 1837, the Old School party, finding themselves the second time only within in seven years in the majority, took advantage of the occasion to exscind, simply by an act of power, irrespective of constitutional limitations of that power, three of the synods in Western New York, and one in Ohio, with all their churches and min-

isters. Other measures were enacted greatly obnoxious to the minority. Great excitement followed. The whole church was agitated. A convention of the aggrieved was held at Auburn (August, 1837), N.Y., and measures taken to resist the wrong. At the assembly in 1838 the New School party demanded the enrolment of the commissioners from the four exscinded syn-

ods. It was refused. The two bodies separated, and two assemblies were organized. The church was hopelessly divided. The property question, after a jury trial, was decided in favor of the New School Assembly; but the decision was overruled on some points of law by the court in bank, and a new trial granted. No further action was taken, and each body went on its separate way.

The whole American people were agitated in 1830, and for several subsequent years, by the Fugitive-slave Law enactment, and the question of the extension of slavery into the new Territo-

ries and States. The New School assemblies sympa-
thized with the opponents of these measures; and in 1856 at New York, and in 1857 at Cleve-

land, gave decided expression to these views. In consequence, several Southern presbyteries withdrew, and organized the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church, which a few years later effected a union with the Southern Presbyterian Church. (See next art.)

Early in 1851 the Southern States seceded, and the great civil war (1861-65) followed. The Old School Assembly of 1861, at Philadelphia, took ground in behalf of the government, as the New School Assembly also did. The Southern commis-

sioners in the Old School Assembly took o-

fense, and withdrew. In the following year (1862) the Southern presbyteries separated themselves wholly from the Northern churches, and formed a distinct church represented in their own General Assembly. (See next art.)

**The Reunion of the Church.** — Thus provid-
ently the disturbing element, that, more than all things else, had occasioned the disruption of 1838, was now eliminated from both branches of the church. The complete abolition of slavery, that resulted from the great Civil War, put an end to all further controversy between the two bodies on this long- vexed question. Gradually they had learned to regret their former virulence. A new generation had come to the fore. The war had united the North in a common cause. The New School had proved their soundness in the great national struggle; and the Old School Assembly also did. The Southern commis-
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The church is now, more than ever, thoroughly organized for aggressive work, having its own boards and commissions, through which it operates in advancing the work of missions at home and abroad, in the building of church-educifices, in the publication and diffusion of a religious and denominational literature, in providing for the relief of its aged poor, and in promoting the work of educating its children, and training a godly and scholarly ministry for its pulpits and missions. It has founded and built up colleges all over the land. It has planted and liberally endowed theological seminaries that have no superiors in the world.—Princeton, Union (New York), Auburn, Allegheny, Lane (Cincinnati), North-Western (Chicago), Danville, and San Francisco. It has schools for the education of German preachers at Bloomfield, N.J., and Dubuque, Iowa; and of colored preachers, at Lincoln University, Penn., and Charlotte, N.C.

The Outlook. — The union came none too soon. The people were prepared for it, had long demanded it. The old controversies had died; the prejudices of the past had been buried. Fraternity and unity had taken the place of rivalry and discord. The church has proved itself one in faith and order. The former lines of demarcation have been blotted out. New life has been put into all its activities. The progress of the denomination since 1870 has been marked and gratifying. The ministers in 1882 numbered 5,143; the churches, 5,744; and the membership, 592,128. The contributions to the work of home missions for the year 1892-93 were $504,795.61; to foreign missions, $648,303.19. Its Sunday-school force is 654,051. The average annual admission for the year 1882-83 were $504,795.61; and put the seal to the presbyteries for its adoption. New board for aiding colleges and academies, with a view to an abundant supply of candidates for the ministry, was created five years since, was cordially approved, and put the seal to their fraternity. A joint commission was at the same time appointed to consider and propose a plan of re-union.

The two assemblies met at New York in May, 1869, and each of them gave their cordial assent to a series of propositions for the merging of the two organizations into one. These proposals were carried by a large majority, the president of each presbytery being present at the adjourned meetings of the two assemblies the next November, at Pittsburgh, Penn., the returns from the presbyteries showed an overwhelming majority of each body in favor of the re-union. Thus happily the breach was healed.

The disruption had continued the lifetime of a generation. In May, 1870, the first re-united Assembly met at Philadelphia amid the thanksgivings of the whole church and the congratulations of the sister-churches of the entire world. It was an unparalleled event. The little one had become a strong nation. In 1887, the year previous to the disruption, the churches numbered 2,140; the churches, 2,865; and the membership, 220,537. In 1870 the ministers numbered 4,238; the churches, 4,526; and the membership, 446,561. A new board for aiding colleges and academies, with a view to an abundant supply of candidates for the ministry, was created five years since, was cordially approved, and put the seal to their fraternity. A joint commission was at the same time appointed to consider and propose a plan of re-union.

The last General Assembly met May 17, 1888, at Saratoga Springs, N.Y. It was the largest since the reconstruction in 1870. Its whole spirit was exceedingly hopeful and aggressive. Fraternal relations with the Southern Church, the initiative of which was taken the year before, were now fully established by the mutual interchange of delegates, whose reception gave occasion, in both assemblies, to the most hearty congratulations, and to devout thanksgiving. The Book of Discipline, revised by an able committee appointed and put the seal to the presbyteries for its adoption. A new board for aiding colleges and academies, with a view to an abundant supply of candidates for the ministry, was created with much enthusiasm. The relations of the board of home missions to the presbyteries were, at first, a source of friction, but happily adjusted. Perfect harmony pervaded the councils of the assembly, indicative of undivided counsels in doctrine and a healthful growth in church extension.
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North and South, a question upon which the most eminent statesmen had been divided in opinion from the time of the formation of the Constitution, viz., whether the ultimate sovereignty, the *jus summi imperii*, resided in the people as a mass, or in the people as they were originally formed into Colonies, and afterwards into States.

Presbyterians in the South believed that this deliverance, whether true or otherwise, was one which the Church was not authorized to make, and that, in so doing, she had transgressed her sphere, and usurped the duties of the State.

In this protest it was asserted, "that the paper adopted by the Assembly does decide the political question just stated, in our judgment is undeniable. It not only asserts the loyalty of this body to the Constitution and the Union, but it promises, in the name of all the churches and ministers whom it represents, to do all that in them lies to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government. It is, however, a notorious fact, that many of our ministers and members conscientiously believe that the allegiance of the citizens of this country is primarily due to the States to which they respectively belong, and that therefore, whenever any State renounces its connection with the United States, and its allegiance with the Constitution, the citizens of that State are bound by the laws of God to continue loyal to their State, and obedient to its laws. The paper adopted by the Assembly virtually declares, on the other hand, that the allegiance of the citizen is due to the United States, any thing in the Constitution or laws of the several States to the contrary notwithstanding. . . . . The General Assembly, in thus deciding a political question, and in making that decision practically a condition of their faith and order which they had always held, has, in our judgment, violated their constitution the standards of which their respective secretaries are *ex officio* members, all elected annually by the assembly, directly responsible to it, and acting as executive agents under its instructions."

Presbyterians in the South, coinciding in this view of the case, concluded that a separation from the General Assembly aforesaid was imperatively demanded, not in the spirit of schism, but for the sake of peace, and for the protection of the liberty with which Christ had made them free.

Accordingly, ninety-three ministers and ruling elders, who had been commissioned for that purpose, met in the city of Augusta, Ga., on the 4th of December, 1861, and integrated in one body, under the title of "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States." The General Assembly having general supervisory power. Students in 1882-83, 56; professors, 4. Measures for the endowment of a fifth professorship have been taken by a great financial trouble in 1877, but is now emerging from its embarrassments. The receipts from churches, Sabbath schools, and all other sources, for 1882-83, amounted to $14,000. (4) Education. — The whole number of students aided in 1882-83 in their preparation for the ministry was 129, in 41 presbyteries. Aggregate receipts for 1882-83, $13,000.
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adopted. The total amount of investments reported in April, 1883, was $251,000, yielding an income of $15,000.

(2) Theological Seminary at Columbia, S.C., under the care of the synods of South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama; the Assembly having a supervision, as with Union Theological Seminary, Virginia. This institution, which was closed for two years, was re-opened in September, 1882, with encouraging prospects of future prosperity.

Number of professors, 4. The venerable Dr. George Howe died in April, 1883, after having been an instructor in this seminary for fifty-two years.

(3) Institute for Training Colored Ministers. — Established in Tuscaloosa, Ala., in 1877. Professors, 2; students, 31. This institution is steadily growing in the confidence of the church and in the appreciation of the colored people.

(4) Other Institutions, not Theological, but acknowledged by the Presbyterian family, are Hampden-Sidney College, Virginia; Davidson College, North Carolina; Adger College, South Carolina; Central University, Kentucky; Westminster College, Missouri; South-Western Presbyterian University, Tennessee; King's College, Tennessee; and Austin College, Texas.

5. Church Principles. — Holding, in common with other branches of the Presbyterian family, the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, the Southern Church lays special emphasis on the following points:

(1) A Faithful Adherence to the Constitution. — While allowing a just liberty of explanation according to the well-known traditions of Presbyterian history, latitudinarianism is carefully excluded.

(2) The Spirituality of the Church. — "Synods and Councils are to handle nothing but which is ecclesiastical."

(3) Ecclesiastical Power. — "While the source of power, in all the courts alike, is Jesus, who rules in them and through them, yet the Constitution, in accordance with the word of God, assigns the courts respectively their several powers and duties, which prescribes the mode in which these powers are to be exercised. Therefore the claim by any court to exercise powers not assigned to it is a breach of the Constitutional Covenant between the several parties thereto."

7. Extent of the Church. — At the time of organization in 1801, the General Assembly included 10 synods, 47 presbyteries, about 700 ministers, 1,000 churches, and 75,000 communicants, about 10,000 of which were of the African race. It was formed out of elements which were mostly among the oldest in the history of the Presbyterian communion in this country; carrying with it nearly one-third of the whole original church. It includes now (August, 1883) 13 synods, 67 presbyteries, 1,070 ministers, 2,040 churches, and 127,000 communicants.

8. Fraternal Relations. — Reference having been made to the causes of separation between the churches North and South, it is proper, in conclusion, to state the present relations of these bodies to each other. The Southern Assembly, which met at Atlanta, Ga., in 1882, and the Northern Assembly, in session at the same time at Springfield, Ill., "in order to remove all difficulties in the way of a full and fraternal correspondence," each adopted a minute, "mutatis mutandis, for their reciprocal concurrence, as affording a basis for the exchange of delegates."

In accordance with this action, each assembly appointed delegates to attend the meeting of the other assembly, to contain "its cordial Christian salutations" and "the expression of its warm fraternal regard."

The delegates appointed performed the duty assigned to them in May, 1883; the Northern Assembly meeting at Saratoga, N.Y., and the Southern at Lexington, Ky.}

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. See art.

THE SYNOD OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN NORTH AMERICA. — Reformed Presbyterians, or Covenanters, claim to be the lineal ecclesiastical descendants of that part of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland which refused to accept of the Revolution settlement of 1688. Finding that that famous arrangement contained Erastian elements, and failed to embody many of those principles for which they had strenuously contended from the days of Knox, and in defence of which they had recently suffered a bloody persecution of twenty-eight years, the more faithful of the Covenanters refused to give their adherence to its terms.

Standing aloof from the "Establishment," they remained a small but zealous and independent body. Emigrating to North America in small numbers, they settled here and there, mostly in the Atlantic States from Vermont to South Carolina. Ministers sent out from the mother-church in Scotland travelled through these settlements, preaching, and administering the ordinances. The first Reformed Presbytery of North America was constituted in 1788 in the city of Philadelphia; and the synod was constituted in the same city in 1809. With the exception of an unfortunate division, which took place in 1833, with reference to the relations of the members of the church to the civil institutions of the country, the growth of this small Presbyterian church has been steady, although not rapid. The church in 1882 had 12 ministers, 10 presbyteries, 124 congregations, and 10,700 members. The contributions reported in 1882 were at the rate of $18 per member to all purposes, $1.50 per member to foreign missions, and $2.50 to home missions. It has a theological seminary with 3 professors and 20 students, a college with 6 professors and 100 students, a mission school and church among the Freedmen in South Carolina; that is, with explanations as to her understanding of certain portions of the Constitution concerning the power of the civil magistrate in ecclesiastical matters. Attaching
great importance to the duty of testifying against prevalent errors as a “witnessing” church, she has published a testimony (Reformation Principles Exhibited), declaring the doctrines accepted, and also the contrary errors condemned. As the name “Covenant” indicates, and in accordance with her past history, in the case of the American, the prime article of her creed, that public social covenanting is a duty obligatory upon churches and nations in New-Testament times; and that the obligations of these bonds, owing to the organic unity of the church, are binding upon all represented in the taking of them until the ends contemplated by them have been accomplished. In accordance with this principle, the bond of a covenant having been carefully prepared, and having been sent down in writing to the sessions and presbyteries, and by them with great unanimity approved, it was solemnly sworn and subscribed in the city of Edinburgh in 1587, and soon after by the various congregations throughout the country. This covenant was intended to embody the principles of the National Covenant of Scotland, and of the Solemn League and Covenant, in so far as they are applicable in this land. These subordinate standards are held as authoritative only in so far as they are agreeable unto, and founded upon, the supreme standard,—the word of God.

In point of government, this church differs in no essential element from other Presbyterian churches. More recently she has, with marked advantage, revised the rules of the restoration, which had unfortunately fallen into desuetude among the Presbyterian bodies, limiting, however, the functions of this office to the oversight of the temporalities of the church. Strictly adhering to the Reformation principle, that what is not appointed by God in his worship is forbidden, and finding no warrant for the use of instruments of music, or of hymns of human composition, Reformed Presbyterians praise God only in the use of the psalms of inspiration, and without organs, or instruments of any kind.

This church has co-operated freely with all the prominent reforms of the age. Organized at first, even in the Southern States, upon a strictly antislavery basis, and rigidly excluding all slaveholders from her communion, her ministers and people warmly espoused the cause of emancipation, and bore constant and consistent testimony against the evil of slavery. The temperance reform meets her earnest approval. The manufacture, sale, and use, as a beverage, of all intoxicating drinks, are forbidden by positive enactments. Any member indulging in any of these practices exposes himself to the censures of the church. Believing secret oath-bound associations of all descriptions to be unscriptural, and dangerous in their tendencies, she testifies against, and forbids all connection with them, as necessarily entangling, and inconsistent with the higher allegiance due to the Church of Christ.

The more special and distinctive principle of the church, which differs from all others, is her practical protest against the secular character of the United States Constitution. Holding to the universal headship of Christ, and that civil government is a divine ordinance, and one of the “all things” put under him as the Mediatorial Ruler of the universe, and that to him the allegiance of all nations is due, Reformed Presbyterians refuse close incorporation with any government which does not in some form recognize these principles, and give them effective expression in its legislation. On examination of the United States Constitution, this church holds, as this document is found to contain no recognition of God as the source of all legitimate civil authority, nor of his law as supreme above all human laws, nor of his Son as governor among the nations, nor in any form of the scriptural principle, that “the powers that be are ordained of God;” but, on the contrary, the preamble, “We the people do ordain this Constitution,” seems to arrogate to the people that which is claimed by the apostle as a prerogative of God. The Constitution does not recognize the Bible, the Christian Sabbath, Christian morality, Christian qualifications for office, and that God is their Head, and that the allegiance of all nations is due, Reformed Presbyterians refuse to take the oath to the Constitution, or perform any civil act that involves the oath; such as voting for officers who are required to swear to the Constitution as a condition of performing the functions of their office. Civil acts that do not involve the oath to the Constitution, they freely perform. Believing that the law of Christ requires them to live quiet and peaceable lives, they endeavor, in all good conscience, to conduct themselves as useful members of the Commonwealth, bearing with meekness their share of the public burdens, and doing all in their power to advance the best interests of their country. They take the deepest interest in that reform movement which has for its object the amendment of the United States Constitution in those particulars in which they consider it defective. Indeed, they feel specially called to aid in its success, at whatever cost or personal sacrifice, deeming that when these proposed amendments to the Constitution shall have been incorporated in that document, and not until then, we shall have a true Christian government, and our beloved country be indeed a kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

Lit.—The Westminster Confession of Faith (William S. Rentoul, Philadelphia, and Scotch editions); The National Covenant of Scotland; The Solemn League and Covenant, The Form of Church Government, and Directory for Worship; The Larger and Shorter Catechisms,—all these are bound together as one book. In this country and in the present century, the church has prepared the following statements of its present position: Reformation Principles exhibited as a Testimony, Book of Government and Discipline (revised in 1883), Covenant (sworn to by the synod in Philadelphia in 1871).
junction with other steps of reformation, the foundation of the Reformed Presbyterian Church was laid. At the accession of the crown of Scotland and England in the person of James VI., in 1603, this monarch claimed to be the head of the church, and alleged that "presbytery was fit only for a nation of republicans." In 1617 he attempted to impose upon the Church of Scotland the ceremonies of the English Church. Charles I. followed his predecessor in a despotism. In 1637 the Liturgy of the Service-Book was ordered to be introduced into the churches of Scotland. The result was the great moral revolution of 1638, when the "National Covenant" was renewed, with additions. To resist prescriptive innovation, and preserve and further the Reformed religion in the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, in 1643 the Solemn League and Covenant was adopted, and became part of the Constitution of Britain.

About this time the term "Covenanter" began to be applied to the Reformed Presbyterians of Scotland. In 1647-48 the Westminster Confession of Faith, and Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, were adopted by the Reformed Church of Scotland. By the passing of several supplementary acts to the first and second Books of Discipline in 1619, the General Assembly placed the cornerstone upon the work of Reformation; and the covenanted Reformed Presbyterian Church stood forth, the grand outcome of persevering struggle for the church's independence and the Mediator's headship.

The execution of Charles I. and the proclamation of Charles II. as his successor to the crown of Britain followed. After the restoration of the latter sovereign, he proceeded to restore Prelacy in Scotland. The church was divided into factions, and twenty-eight years of persecution ensued. Many succumbed to the storm. A few remained faithful, and by their fidelity became the true exponents of the church's faith as held from 1638 to 1649. Among them Richard Cameron and Donald Cargill appeared prominent. In the year 1680 they published the Sanquhar Declaration, in which the ground was taken, that when a sovereign violates his solemn engagements with his subjects, and becomes a tyrant, the people are released from their allegiance, and no longer bound to support and defend him. Although the abettors of this sentiment were accused of treason, and adjudged worthy of death, in less than ten years the entire British nation indorsed the position of William and Mary in 1688; and the same principle lay at the foundation of the American Revolution in 1778. These men might be thought to have uncomprising in their religious principles; but they understood the value of civil and religious liberty, and, far ahead of their age, they uttered the sentiment which finds to-day an echo on both sides of the Atlantic.

At the accession of William and Mary, by the terms of the revolution settlement, Episcopacy was established in England and Ireland, and Presbyterianism in Scotland. By this arrangement, royal supremacy over the church, against which the true Covenanters so long struggled, was preserved. From it, those, principally, who had suffered for refusing allegiance to the tyranny of the house of Stuart, dissented. Among other reasons of dissent, one was, that, by the settlement, the civil magistrate assumed the superintendence of the church which virtually destroyed her independence, and which was inconsistent with the sole headship of the Mediator. For more than sixteen years these people remained without a ministry, organizing themselves into praying societies, and endeavoring to adhere to the church's position during the "year without summer," in the year 1706 Rev. John McMillan acceded to their fellowship from the Established Church. In the year 1743 Rev. Mr. Nairn became identified with them. The same year two ministers, with ruling elders, constituted the Reformed Presbytery. Through this body, Reformed Presbyterians in Scotland, Ireland, British America, and the United States, have received their ministry. In 1752 Rev. Mr. Cuthbertson arrived in America from the Reformed Presbytery of Scotland. He was joined by Rev. Messrs. Lind and Dobbin of the Reformed Presbytery of Ireland. By these a presbytery was formed in 1774, and the Reformed Presbyterian Church took her position as a distinct ecclesiastical body in North America. In 1782 this presbytery was disorganized by its union with a presbytery of the Associate Church. The result was, that a portion of the Associate Church and a large number of the people of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, did not approve of the union. The existence of three distinct organizations, instead of two, was the outcome.

At various intervals within about ten years from the above period, Revs. Reid, McGarrah, King, and McKinney, were commissioned by their respective presbyteries in Scotland and Ireland to manage judicially the concerns of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States. In 1798, in the city of Philadelphia, Rev. Messrs. McKinney and Gibson, with ruling elders, constituted the Reformed Presbyterian Church of the United States of North America. At this time the church was scattered over the United States from South Carolina to Vermont, and westward as far as the State of Ohio. The presbytery was divided into three committees. In 1806 the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church was constituted in the city of Philadelphia, and the three committees of presbytery formed into presbyteries. In 1823 it was thought desirable to give the supreme judicatory a representative character. As a consequence, the General Synod was formed, the constituency of which is taken from the presbyteries according to a certain ratio. Among the members of synod, some held that the Constitution of the United States is infidel and immoral, and that Reformed Presbyterians could not consistently hold office or vote under its provisions. Others believed that it was defective, but not essentially infidel and immoral. In the synod of 1831 this matter was made a subject of discussion. But in 1833, when General Synod met, a number of ministers, with adherents, refused to discuss the subject further, and withdrew from General Synod. The synod was thus diminished in numbers.

The doctrinal principles of General Synod are embodied in the Westminster Confession of Faith, Catechisms (Larger and Shorter), and Reformation Principles exhibited. The Book of Psalms, in the
best attainable version,—prose or metrical, or both,—is the matter of praise in this church. Sealing ordinances are extended only to those who subscribe to the symbols of the church's faith, and submit to her authority.

The design of this is, not to unchurch any other denomination of Christians, but to maintain good order. Qualifications for membership, the training of children, and practical godliness, have always been reckoned matters of supreme moment in this church. The General Synod is represented in the Presbyterian Alliance, and has under its care 6 presbyteries, 40 ministers and licentiates, 48 congregations, 6,000 communicants, and about 4,000 sabbath-school scholars. To General Synod also belong one theological seminary, located in Philadelphia, and organized in 1806, and one foreign mission-station in Northern India, commenced in 1836, besides domestic mission-stations in British America and the United States.


D. STEELE.

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF NORTH AMERICA is descended from the Presbyterian churches of Scotland and Ireland. As early as 1742, petitions for a supply of ministers were sent from Lancaster and Chester Counties, Penn., to the Associate Presbytery, which the Revs. Ebenezer Erskine, Alexander Moncrieff, William Wilson, and James Fisher had organized at Garney's Bridge, Scotland, Dec. 6, 1733. These petitions were repeated until 1758, when the Associate Synod, which had been formed in the mean time, sent out the Revs. Alexander Gellatly and Andrew Arnott. These men came, and on the 2d of November, 1758, they organized, as they had been instructed to do, the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, subordinate to the Associate Synod of Scotland.

About the year 1760, and in answer to similar petitions, the Reformed Presbyterians of Scotland sent out Rev. John Cuthbertson to the same general field. He was afterwards joined by Rev. Matthew Lind and Rev. Alexander Dobbin, from Ireland, and on the 10th of March, 1774, these three ministers constituted the Reformed Presbytery of America. Eight years after, or on the 10th of June, 1782, an agreement was made by all the Reformed Presbyterian and a large part of the Associate ministers and congregations to form a union. That union was consummated on the first day of the following November, in Philadelphia, by the organization of a synod, which took the names of the uniting parties, and was styled "The Synod of the Associate Reformed Church."

Some of the Associate ministers and congregations did not enter into this union, and thus there were now the Associate and Associate Reformed churches. Each has the presbytery and a synod, but largely in common with the churches from which they had sprung abroad; and for over three-quarters of a century each pursued its own course. Often, however, it was felt that churches so nearly the same in their history, profession, and work, ought to be organically one, and might thereby accomplish far more. Accordingly, in May, 1842, delegates from the respective synods met in Phila-
In worship, it uses only the psalms of the Bible. Its principle is, that these psalms are the only divinely authorized matter of praise. It accepts the metrical version of the Church of Scotland, and has prepared a revised and amended one, with a hundred and thirty-eight new versions of a hundred and seventeen psalms, and a much larger variety of metres. Congregational singing is everywhere strictly enjoined.

Both parts of this church took steps early in their history for the training of an able ministry, and to them belongs the honor of organizing the first theological seminaries in this country. Those at Andover, Mass., and Princeton, N. J., were founded in 1808 and 1812 respectively; but in 1794 the Associate Church appointed Rev. John Anderson, D.D., professor of theology, and organized and located a theological seminary at Service Creek, Penn. Ten years afterwards, or in 1804, the Associate Reformed Synod appointed Rev. John M. Mason, D.D., its professor, and prepared a constitution and course of study for a theological seminary, which it located in the city of New York, and formally opened in November, 1805.

Others have existed for a time. Two are now in successful operation,— one, with three professors, at Xenia, O.; and the other, with four, at Allegheny, Penn. Nearly two thousand young men have studied for the ministry in the theological seminaries of this church.

This church has also six colleges more or less under its control, with nearly one thousand students.

In carrying on its work the United Presbyterian Church has seven boards; viz., home, foreign, and freedmen's missions, church extension, publica

General Assembly, in May, 1859, it had 5 synods, 42 presbyteries, 408 ministers, 55 licentiates, 55,547 communicants, and about $200,000 raised for its work. In May, 1883, it had 9 synods, 60 presbyteries, 730 ministers, 43 licentiates, 839 congregations, 85,443 communicants, and $930,125 contributed for its work.

Such is the United Presbyterian Church. In its place, and as a part of the visible body of Christ, it steadily holds on its way, bearing ever the banner that was unfurled at its organization, having inscribed on one side, "The Truth of God," and, on the other, "Forbearance in Love."
Messrs. McGrigor, Brown, Ross, and McCulloch were the evangelists of Eastern Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton, and New Brunswick, and formed congregations in each of these Provinces.

About 1785 Rev. George Henry, as chaplain to the troops, preached to a small congregation in the ancient city of Quebec; and shortly afterwards Mr. Bethune preached in Montreal and in the County of Glengarry. In 1787 the first congregation, composed of pious soldiers and a few civilians, was formed in Quebec; and about 1790 a congregation was formed in Montreal, which obtained Rev. Mr. Young of the Presbytery of Albany, N.Y., as their first minister. In 1793 the first presbytery was formed, and consisted of three ministers with their elders, and was styled "The Presbytery of Montreal," claiming connection with no other church. In 1792 St. Gabriel-street Church was built, which is probably the oldest Protestant church in Canada. In 1818 an attempt was made to unite all the Presbyterian congregations into one church. This laudable endeavor failed, as the ministers from the Kirk of Scotland stood entirely aloof from the movement. It was, however, the earnest and prelude to what has been achieved in later days. One party formed themselves into the United Synod; and the others constituted the three presbyteries, Cornwall, Perth, and Niagara, assuming next year the title of "The United Synod of Upper Canada."

In 1825 the Glasgow Colonial Society was formed, which sent out many ministers both to the Maritime Provinces and to the Canadas, so that the number of ministers in connection with the Kirk of Scotland rapidly increased; and in 1840 the United Synod, comprising 18 ministers, joined them. In 1832 three ministers—Messrs. Robertson, Proudfoot, and Christie—were sent out as missionaries of the United Secession. They were soon followed by others, and in 1834 they formed the Missionary Presbytery of the Canadas. The roll contains the names of nine ministers, of whom the venerable Dr. William Fraser, for many years, and still, an efficient clerk of the highest character; the Rev. Mr. Young; the Rev. Mr. Harvey. When the number of ministers had increased to 18, and congregations to 35, they formed the Missionary Synod of Canada. When the Secession and Relief churches united in Scotland, in 1847, they changed the name to "United Presbyterian Synod in Canada," embracing 26 ministers and 50 congregations.

In 1844, owing to the disruption of the Kirk of Scotland, a division took place in Canada, and 25 of the 91 ministers of the Church of Scotland in Canada separated, and formed the Presbyterian Church of Canada (Free Church). This church, fresh and vigorous, grew rapidly, and, from 25 ministers in 1844, increased to 189 in 1861, when a union was consummated between them and the United Presbyterian Church. This union, so happy in its results, led to a desire on the part of many for a still more comprehensive union, embracing the Free Church and the Presbyterians.

The history of Presbyterianism in the Dominion has been one of agreement and union, as well as of difference and separation. All sections of the church held as their common creed the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, and observed the same forms and order of service. Their differences chiefly arose from their association with the churches in Scotland, and from the natural tendency to adhere to the customs and practices of the old land, to which they had been accustomed. A very strong desire had ever been cherished by her ministers and members for a united church, national in the best sense of the word, that is, including all in the land holding the same faith and polity. In 1870, besides a few congregations connected with churches in the United States of America, there were four distinct Presbyterian churches in the Dominion. Measures were then inaugurated to effect a union of them all, and this was happily consummated in 1875.

The following presents a view of the different unions which led to the last, most desirable result:

In 1817 the Burgher Presbytery of Truro and the Anti-Burgher Presbytery of Pictou united, and formed the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia.

In 1840 the United Synod of Upper Canada united with the synod in connection with the Church of Scotland.

In 1860 the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia and the Free Church united, and formed one church.

In 1861 the Presbyterian Church of Canada and the United Presbyterian Church in Canada formed a union under the title "The Canada Presbyterian Church."

In 1866 a union between churches in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick formed the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces.

In 1868 the synods of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in connection with the Church of Scotland, formed one synod.

In 1875 a general union was formed of all the four churches then occupying the same field in the Provinces,—the Presbyterian Church in Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, having 141 ministers, 179 congregations, and 17 vacant charges; the Canada Presbyterian Church, having 530 ministers, 660 congregations, and 78 vacant charges; the Church of the Lower Provinces, having 124 ministers, 138 congregations, and 17 vacant charges; the Church of the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland, having 31 ministers, 41 congregations, and 9 vacant charges.

Total number of ministers, missionaries, and probationers, 771, congregations, 1,000, and elders, nearly 4,000. The union was most hearty: only about 20 ministers in all held themselves aloof from it. The church has made marked progress since, in every element of substantial prosperity. As early as 1831, ministers were sent to the Red-River settlement; and lately, as settlers have gone thither in great numbers, the church has followed them, and there are to-day in Manitoba 43 congregations, to each of which are attached from one to six preaching-stations. There are 14 settled ministers and professors, over 40 missionaries, and a college, to which will soon be added a theological seminary. At the meeting of the General Assembly in June, 1883, Rev. J. M. King, D.D., of Toronto, was appointed principal of the college, and professor of theology. This appointment he has since accepted.
PRESBYTERIANISM.

In British Columbia and Vancouver's Island the congregations which have been connected with different churches in Britain and Canada with difficulty can be a part of the one church of the Dominion.

In the Work of Home Missions the church is actively and extensively engaged. Over 100 weak congregations are aided in maintaining ordinances, and more than 200 stations are supplied with preaching; 64 ordained ministers and probationers, 84 students, and 60 catechists are employed. In 1882 more than $50,000 were raised for this work. In addition to this, an extensive work is carried on among the French population. Missions in the New Hebrides, Central India, China, and Trinidad, and among the Indians in the North-west, are all in successful operation. The contribution of the church for these missions is over $50,000 annually.

In the five theological seminaries—at Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Kingston, and Toronto—there are 12 professors and a number of lecturers, and more than 100 students. Besides commodious buildings, libraries, etc., endowments to the amount of half a million dollars have been raised. Nearly one-half of the ministers of the church have been trained in their own institutions.

With an earnest and devoted ministry, and ample facilities for training as many as may be required, an intelligent membership, who are becoming every year more able and more willing to contribute, with her generous, far-reaching plans for mission-work both at home and abroad, the Presbyterian Church in Canada, though as yet only in her teens, is a fair, healthy, helpful daughter in the great Presbyterian family of Christendom.


VII. In Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania. See those arts.

PRESBYTERIANISM is both a faith and a form, for each of which it claims scriptural precedent and sanction.

I. Principles.—1. Form of Government. Presbyterianism derives its name from its form of government, its presbyterianum (its "eldership"). The word presbyterius ("presbyter, elder"), in its several inflections, occurs in the New Testament seventy-one times. In ten or twelve instances it denoted age or social position: in all the others it indicates official position or character.

The whole Jewish people were familiar with the term. In the gospel narrative, frequent mention is made of "the elders of the Jews," "the elders of the people," "the scribes and the elders," "the chief priests and the elders," "the elders" simply. In Luke xxii. 66, το πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ ("the presbytery of the people") is spoken of. Paul speaks (Acts xxii. 5) of ἐν τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ("all the presbytery," the "eldership").

A distinct class of men—office-bearers in the Hebrew Commonwealth, in the various municipalities, and in the local churches or congregations—is thus indicated. They are spoken of everywhere in their sacred writings. Chosen ordinarily from the more mature period of life, they were called in the Hebrew tongue every, "elders," "sires," "elders." In the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, they are called presbýteroi ("presbyters"). They were the elders, aldermen "of Israel," "of the people," "of the city," "of the town," "of the congregation," chosen and appointed to bear rule over the people collectively, or in distinct localities.

Everywhere in the gospel narrative, mention is made of "the synagogue," ἡ συναγωγή, congregatio, "the gathering-place," the equivalent of ἡ εἰκονοποιοῦσα, ecclesia, "the church." It is used both of the place and of the people. From the days of the exile, it had been customary for every city and town to have its synagogue, where the people of the neighborhood were wont to meet on the sabbath and festival days for prayer, and the reading and exposition of the Divine Word. (See SYNAGOGUE.) Each of these synagogues had its presbýterion ("presbytery, eldership"), chosen by the congregation, and known as "the presbytery, the synagogue." They were ruling elders, in trust with the oversight, the watch and care, of the congregation.

It is a well-established fact, that, in every period of their history,—before the exodus, in the desert under Moses, and in the Holy Land under the judges and the kings, before and after the exile, down to the days of Herod,—the people of Israel were accustomed to a government, in the State and in the Church, of presbyters, elders. The name and the office were familiar to every generation. They might, therefore, very properly, so far as their form of government was concerned, it is claimed, be denominated Presbyterians.

Our Lord and his disciples were all of them Israelites. They had each of them, from their childhood, been attached to some synagogue, and had been trained to manhood under the watch and care of its presbytery, or elders. No other than this Presbyterian form of government was known to them. Consequently they must be regarded, it is claimed, as having personally sanctioned this system of order. It had previously been sanctioned by prophets, priests, and kings, through every period of the singular history of the Hebrew people; so that, if any form of church government can be claimed as of divine right, Presbyterianism may claim it of its own.

In the absence of information as to the organization of the Christian Church of Jerusalem, as well as of other particular churches, Presbyterianism claims that it is but fair to infer the continued prevalence of the forms to which the whole Jewish people, as well as the first converts to Christianity, had from time immemorial been accustomed. Mention is made of the occasion which gave rise to the office and work of the deacon (Acts vi. 1-6), but not of the elder. That office had long existed in connection with every worshipping congregation. It was both the most natural and the most prudent policy, in the organization of Christian churches, to conform as closely as possible to established forms and order.

In separating themselves, or in being excluded, from the Jewish synagogue, it is claimed that the converted Jews organized themselves in a Chris-
tian synagogue, as every way adapted to promote the public worship; the synagogue ("the synagogue") became ἕκκλησια ("the church"), the two words denoting the same thing. The terms were interchangeable, as in Jas. ii. 2, where a Christian church is expressly called a synagogue: "If there come (ὡς τὸν συναγωγήν ἐμὸν) unto your assembly (Gr. συναγωγή)."

Nor was preaching in the apostolic age confined to the synagogue. It was known among the Gentiles that they might worship God in any place. The apostles therefore sought to promote the preaching of the gospel in the synagogues, as the sermon and the public worship, as well as discipline, and took charge of the reading of Scripture and exhortation (i.e., of the congregation). It was to be expected that he would organize churches after the pattern of his native church.

In giving instructions as to the kind of overseers, as he had done in the case of Titus, in writing to the church at Philippi, he makes special mention of their "bishops and deacons" (Phil. i. 1); the elders among the Greek churches being commonly known as bishops, overseers. As Epaphroditus had succeeded Paul and Luke in the work of preaching at Philippi, it is claimed that the church of that place was in form a Presbyterian church.

It is further to be observed, that these elders are in no one instance spoken of as preachers, or instructed, as Timothy and Titus were specifically, in the art of preaching. The bishops, overseers, elders, whom those preachers were to ordain in every city, were not students, scholars, young men just setting out in the world; but, on the other hand, they were men of family, citizens of the place, tradesmen, mechanics, workmen, men of business, of good repute, of note and influence among their townsmen, grave seniors, if such there were among the converts, men of good judgment, capable of giving advice (Μαθητάν), good, hospitable, every church men, each of the elders was an overseer, a bishop. They were appointed to rule the church, ποιμανών τὸν ἐκκλησιαν τὸς θεόν (Acts xx. 28), the work that had belonged to the eldership among the Jews from time immemorial.

Not a few Presbyterians, therefore, claim that those elders were rulers merely, and not preachers. They affirm that the very same qualifications are now required of the ruling elders as are specified in the instructions given to Timothy and Titus relative to the bishops, the elders, of their day; that the work of preaching is nowhere assigned to them specifically or incidentally; that the words εὐαγγέλιον and σιωπηλάμαρα are used in the New Testament, each of them not less than fifty times, to denote the work or office of preaching the gospel, being applied to Christ, to his apostles, and to the evangelists of the apostolic period, but never to the preachers, elders, bishops, overseers; and that the presbyter, the bishop of that day, was not a θείον, or θεόν εὐαγγέλιον, a preacher or evangelist; "elder" and "preacher" not being convertible terms, as were "bishop" and "elder."

Others give a broader significance to the words πρεσβύτερος, preachers, "elder" and "preacher" not being convertible terms, as were "bishop" and "elder."

It is quite natural, however, to suppose that the elders, who appear always in a plurality in a congregation, were not equally gifted, and did not divide themselves among themselves according to their ability. Nor was preaching in the apostolic age confined to any ecclesiastical office.
This, then, is the claim of Presbyterianism, that the churches of the apostolic age were served by three classes of ministers, or office-bearers. At first, from the necessity of the case, a church had only two kinds of officers,—elders and deacons. Eventually the evangelist, or missionary, became a state of things, the Bishop and the Lord. The elders occupied that position; so that each church had its εὐαγγελιστής ("angel, herald, preacher"), as in the case of the seven churches of Asia (Rev. ii., iii.). As the chief overseer of the church or congregation, he came to be known distinctively as διάκονος ("the bishop"); but he was the bishop of only a single church, of only one town or city. Every town or city had its own church, its own bishop. The bishops of the early ages were as numerous as the churches, residing often not more than five or six miles apart, and counted by hundreds along the southern shores of the Mediterranean, in Italy, and in the East. They were simply what the Presbyterian pastor now is.

Such are the grounds, in general, with some possible variations, on which Presbyterianism claims to be both primitive and apostolical, as conforming more closely to the New Testament pattern than any other form of church order. It is affirmed by some, that this form of church government is authoritatively and exclusively enjoined in the Scriptures; that it is therefore of universal obligation, and that no other is of divine right. They claim to be "jure divino Presbyterians." The great body of Presbyterians, however, are content to claim simply that their views are clearly sanctioned by Scripture.

In common with all the churches of the Reformation, Presbyterianism abjures the Papacy, with its vicegerency, its infallibility, its decretales, its mariolatry, and its masses, as a monstrous innovation on the truth and simplicity of the gospel, and as treason to the Great Head of the church.

In common with Independency and Congregationalism, it maintains the purity of the gospel ministry in opposition to every form of Prelacy. It discards the High-Church dogma of "apostolical succession." It teaches that the apostles, as such, hold no such succession for the Church of the New Testament is not a priest; that the ministry of the Christian church are sacerdotal neither in name nor in authority. They are simply servants of Christ and of his people, heralds of the cross, preachers of the gospel, not lords over God's heritage, yet, in the truest sense, successors of the apostles. They are all brethren, and Christ alone is their Lord and Master.

Presbyterianism claims to be the primitive Episcopacy, and abjures the exclusive Episcopacy of Prelacy as a corruption, as a usurpation of prerogatives on the part of metropolitan and other pastors, as an abuse, as an infiltration of the presbytery into the episcopal order of men beyond or above it, for leave to be had by threeclasses of ministers, or office-bearers. At length, in the pretensions of patriarchs, and culminating in the tyrannical arrogation of the Bishop of Rome as the Vicar of Christ.

As to the Church, Presbyterianism distinguishes between the visible and the invisible Church; the latter consisting of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion," both infants and adults. This one Church, it teaches, has many parts. As the race is separated into numerous nationalities, so the Church is distributed into many families, separated by oceans and continents, and tribal barriers, and divers tongues, as also by peculiarities of faith and order. The necessities of time and place demand, that, in order to the public worship of God, these larger divisions be distributed into smaller, not as independent organizations, but as parts of the one great whole.

Presbyterianism, therefore, teaches that any number of Christian people meeting stately for public worship and the orderly celebration of the Christian sacraments, and covenanting together for these ends, is a particular church. It may be more or less scriptural in form, pure in doctrine, and spiritual in worship; yet it is a church, a distinct organization, dependent on no specific order of men beyond or above it, for leave to be and to do.

But, in the constitution and care of these particular churches, Presbyterianism avails itself of the advantages of a representative form of government. It makes orderly provision for the counsel and co-operation of neighboring ministers and churches, by fixed principles and uniform regulations, instead of leaving everything to the exigencies of time and place, and traditional usage. It provides for periodical instead of only occasional convocations, for a fixed and not a fluctuating constituency of its councils, and so for the common interests of the community.

It recognizes the Church as a great commonwealth, and, by means of well-digested formulas of faith and order, it aims to bring its detached parts into an organic union, the more effectively to give expression to church-fellowship, and to secure to the particular church its rights and privileges; to provide for them a learned and godly ministry, and so preserve them from the inroads of ignorance, immorality, superstition, and intolerance in the pulpit, and conserve the purity of doctrine; to secure a ready and appropriate redress for injuries; to maintain a uniform standard of godliness; and to combine the resources of the whole for the general good.

These salutary ends it seeks to accomplish by a regular series of church judicatories, the session or consistory of a particular church, the presbytery or classis, the synod, and the general synod or assembly. The principle of constitutional representation is maintained throughout; and opportunity is given, by a system of review, complaint, and appeal, for the righting of wrongs and the correction of errors; while, in a well organized and carefully compacted body, provision is made for the most effective aggressive movement against the combined powers of evil. It is a great church with numberless compacted parts, a great Christian republic, of which the Lord Jesus Christ alone is the sovereign.

2. Articles of Faith.—In like manner, Presbyterianism claims that its faith as well as its form is based, not on tradition or custom, not on the judgments of mere men or philosophic thought, but simply and solely on the word of God. It receives and adopts the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as being, not simply containing, a revelation of the mind and will of God, as given by inspiration of the Most High,
and as being "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." It rejects as uninspired the apocryphal books and the whole body of papal decrees and canon law.

In general, it receives and adopts Protestantism in the forms of Romanism, Trinitarianism in distinction from Arianism and Socinianism, and Calvinism in distinction from Pelagianism and Arminianism. (See these several titles.) It maintains the absolute dependence of every human being, from first to last, on the alone sufficiency of divine grace, for salvation from the guilt and power of sin unto eternal life, together with the free agency of man, and his responsibility for every thought, word, and deed. It exalts the infinite sovereignty of God, and his absolute control of all worlds and creatures. It represents God as overruling all human agency, so as, without violence, to bring about the purposes of his will in the work of redemption.

It maintains the innate depravity and want of original righteousness on the part of all the posterity of Adam, and the amazing grace of God in giving his Son to die for a sinful world, and his Spirit to renew and sanctify the sinner, thereby making salvation absolutely sure to every believer. It represents the God of the Bible as carrying forward to certain fulfilment, through all time, an eternal purpose and plan of redemption, whereby to glorify his only-begotten Son the Lord Jesus Christ, and make the blood of the atonement irresistibly efficacious in the eternal salvation and glorification of a great multitude whom no man can number.

It claims that this system of faith is revealed in the Holy Scriptures, and is "mighty through God to the pulling-down of strongholds,"—"mighty " in the widest possible diffusion of light and love through the ages, and in the effectual spread of truth and the elevation of the human race; "mighty " in the elevation of our common calling, purifying the heart, and ennobling the soul.

II. HISTORY. — The modern revival of this form of Christianity dates back to the first days of the Protestant Reformation. Unhappily, the Reformers differed essentially in relation to the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. Those who held with Luther were called "Lutherans" (see this title); those who sided with Zwingli, because of their more thorough abjuration of the Mass, became the Anabaptists. The Church and the German Reformed Church took form about 1500, at which time the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, under the leadership of John Knox, separated herself from the Papacy. Twelve years later (1572), the Presbyterian system was developed, under Cartwright, in England; while the Church of England retained (though doctrinally of the Reformed faith) the system of Prelacy. During the Commonwealth (1640-80) she became Presbyterian. The Presbyterianism of Ireland dates from the same period. The next generation witnessed the rise of Presbyterianism in the British Colonies of America, where it has taken firm root, and has obtained the most vigorous growth. More than thirty thousand churches in all the world are Presbyterian.

Its principal symbols of faith are the Canons of the Synod of Dort, A.D. 1619, and the Confession and Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, London, A.D. 1648 (see Dort and Westminster); also the Heidelberg Catechism, by Ursinus, A.D. 1563. These symbols, however, have been so modified by the Presbyterian churches of America, in particular, as to exclude the Church and State theory, and to affirm the complete independence of the Church in respect to the State.

In fine, this system claims for itself a large-hearted catholicity. It extends the right hand of fellowship to all communions that profess the faith, and hold to the headship of our Lord Jesus Christ; and as being "the only infallible rule of faith and practice," it rejects as uninspired the apocryphal books and the whole body of papal decrees and canon law.

**PRESSLY**, John Taylor, D.D., United Presbyterian; b. in Abbeville District, S.C., March 28, 1798; d. at Allegheny City, Penn., Aug. 13, 1870. He was graduated at Transylvania University, Kentucky, 1815, and from Dr. Mason's theological seminary, 1815; licensed the latter year by the Second Associate Reformed Presbyterian of South Carolina; ordained and installed, July 3, 1816, pastor of the Cedar Spring congregation, the one in which he had been brought up. There he faithfully and successfully ministered until 1830, when he came to Pittsburgh to be professor of theology in the theological seminary of his denomination. The same year the seminary was removed to Allegheny, and Pressly became pastor in that city. He took a leading part in organizing the United Presbyterian Church, which in 1858 was formed out of the Associate and Associate Reformed Presbyterian churches; and the strength of this denomination in Pittsburgh and its neighborhood is more due to him than to any other one man. As preacher, pastor, and professor, he was unusually successful, and his impress upon his denomination will not pass away. See sketch of him by Rev. Dr. Kerr, in MacCracken's *Lives of the Leaders of Our Church Universal*, pp. 778–783.

**PRESTER JOHN.** See *John the Presbyter.*

**PRESTON, John, D.D., Puritan divine; b. at Heyford, Northamptonshire, 1587; d. in that shire, July, 1628 (buried in Fawsley Church, July 20). He was admitted fellow of Queen's College, 1609; entered holy orders, but never had a charge, or married. On the nomination of the Duke of Buckingham, he was made chaplain to Prince Charles, preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and master of Emanuel College (1622). He was the chaplain-in-waiting at King James's death, and came up with the young King and the Duke of Buckingham, in a close coach, to London." In his closing years, the stanch Puritanism cost him the duke's patronage. As a preacher, he attracted great attention. He was also a vigorous defender of Calvinism. His writings were very popular. See list in Darling; also Neal: *Hist. Puritans*, Harper's ed., vol. i. pp. 275, 276, 281, 296, 297.

**PRIDEAUX, Humphrey, D.D., Church of England; b. at Padstow, Cornwall, May 3, 1648; d. at Norwich, Nov. 1, 1724. He was graduated B.A. at Christ Church, Oxford, 1672, and from Dr. [َ] 1676 published there *Marmora Oxoniensia*, or a tran-
PRIERIAS. 1922 PRIEST AND PRIESTHOOD.

The people may not themselves approach directly to God to do him homage, or to learn his will: hence arises the idea of a person of more holy character, who stands between God and man as a mediator.

REMARK. — It is a matter of debate as to the original meaning of the word "Kohen." Some claim that the Arabic indicates that it originally meant soothsayer; others, as Fleischer, affirm that it signifies to stand by a person to help him. It is probable that both meanings may be drawn legitimately from the root. (Compare Curtius's Levitical Priests, pp. 57, 56.)

Persons Eligible to the Priesthood. — This being the idea which underlies the priesthood, we have to consider what persons were eligible to the office. Modern critics, especially of the German and Dutch schools, in their radical reconstruction of the Old Testament history, utterly reject the Aaronitic priesthood as being the earliest form among the Israelites, and consider it the latest. They hold that the true principle of history is that of development, and that simpler laws and institutions must have preceded those which were more elaborate. They maintain, with reference to the object of worship, that the Israelites were originally polytheists, and that the more spiritual monotheistic conception of God was the noble fruitage of prophecy about the eighth century before Christ. They claim that the mode of worship in sacrifices, festivals, etc., was far simpler at the beginning of Israel's history than in the Priests' Code which mirrors the state of things after the exile. The legal documents in which they trace the gradual developments of the priesthood are the Book of the Covenant with its affiliated Jehovistic history (eighth century B.C.), the Book of Deuteronomy (621 B.C.) with the deuteronomic elements in Joshua, Ezekiel's Torah (x.-xxxviii., 573 B.C.), and the Priests' Code (444 B.C.) with related parts of Joshua, which is considered by the critics as forming, with the Pentateuch, a Hexateuch. Their theory involves the complete demolition of the traditional structure of Old-Testament history and the construction of an entirely new edifice. Those who adopt this critical reconstruction of the Old Testament discover the following successive steps in the priesthood:

1. According to the Jehovist, any one may serve as priest. This is illustrated by the history of the Jehovistic period, where Gideon, Manoah, Samuel (who, they say, was made a Levite by the chronicler), Saul, David, and others who were not sons of Aaron, or even Levites, offered sacrifices in direct antagonism to the Priests' Code (Num. iii. 10, xxvii. 7).

2. According to Deuteronomy (x. 8, xxxiii. 8-10; 1 Sam. ii. 28) and contemporaneous writers, there is, for the first time, a priesthood which is confined to the tribe or guild of Levi. Not all Levites are priests; but any Levite who may desire, contrary to the Priests' Code, the priestric, may become a priest by virtue of his belonging to the tribe (Deut. xvii. 6, 7).

3. A farther step in the priesthood is exhibited in Ezekiel, who first introduces the distinction between a family, that of Zadok; and the tribe of Levi. The priest in Ezekiel is limited to the family of Zadok of the tribe of Levi, because they have remained faithful in the service of Jehovah: the
rest of the Levites, because they have served as idolatrous priests of the high places, are forever deposed from the priesthood (Ezek. xliv. 10–14).

2. The last step is seen in the Priests' Code. Here it is plain that the lineages of Aaron and all other Levites are excluded from the priesthood, and the system is crowned through the institution of the high priest. While neither in the prophets nor in the earlier historical writings, do we find any trace of this highly developed hierarchy, yet in the Books of Chronicles and Ezra [Nehemiah], which were written long after the introduction of the Priests' Code, we find such a hierarchy participating in the affairs of the nation.

This representation, however, according to the critics, is not historical. Many of them hold that there was no intention to deceive on the part of the chronicler; but, in rewriting the history, he naturally treated it in the light of his own time, without being at all conscious that the Aaronitic priesthood was of comparatively modern origin.

Now, we cannot dispute, that, when we consider these arguments of the critics without regard to other facts, they carry great weight. But, in determining the question of the origin of the Aaronitic priesthood, there are several considerations which seem to render their theory very improbable.

1. According to their hypothesis, we must suppose that the Israelites were originally a horde of barbarians, and that the priesthood, as we find it in the middle books of the Pentateuch, was not developed until after the exile, or at least nine hundred years after the time of Moses. Now, there are two facts on which scholars are well agreed: (1) That Moses is an historical personage, and (2) That the Israelites came out from Egypt. It is well known, however, that, of the four principal castes in Egypt, the priests stood next to the Pharaohs. Here the priests trace their lineage back to Aaron: and (3) That the priestly system, and was, besides, the son-in-law of Pharaoh's daughter (according to tradition, was the leader of Israel, left no memorials.

2. It is sometimes further objected, that to elaborate a system could not have been devised at the beginning of the Israelitish nation. But when we remember that Joseph at the very beginning of their history was son-in-law of a priest, and that Moses, as the reputed son of an Egyptian princess, may well have been familiar with the priestly system, and was, besides, the son-in-law of the priest of Midian, and had forty years in which to digest his knowledge, we might certainly expect, that, under God's direction, he would be ready to present as elaborated a system during the forty years of his life as a leader of Israel as we find in the middle books of the Pentateuch. Hence those who hold that God chooses persons and instrumentalities that are adapted to his ends, must admit that Moses was more likely to introduce such a system than Ezra, that Egypt and Midian were more suggestive of it than Babylon.

3. The assumption that the representations in regard to the origin of the Aaronitic priesthood are essentially false to history, unless it can be proved that Hebrew literature did not arise until about the eighth century B.C., as the critics claim. But again: if Moses is an historical personage, we have reason to believe that the beginnings of Hebrew literature were contemporary with him. It does not seem possible that he could have been ignorant of the art of writing, at a time when the Egyptians, judging from the memorials that have come down to us, could hardly have been less conversant with it than when Herodotus wrote (ii. 32), "No Egyptian omits taking accurate notes of extraordinary or striking events." But Egypt was not the only nation that had a literature at that time. Chaldea, which was the birthplace of Abraham, had already written down the primitive traditions before he was born; and the Phoenicians, the most cultivated people of antiquity, in whose land Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob dwelt, undoubtedly come into possession of the art of writing. Now, when we take these facts into account, and remember that the Hebrew was really the Phoenician language, it would be passing strange if the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter (according to the Scriptures), or the priest, who, according to tradition, was the leader of Israel, left no memorials.

4. The critics maintain that the Old Testament Scriptures belong to two classes of authors,—the priests and the prophets. They find these two classes of writings represented in the Pentateuch and Joshua, and in the historical books. The Jehovistic writings are the prophetic; the Elohist, the priestly. It was once the claim of the critics that the Elohist writings were the oldest, and that the Jehovistic were younger. Since the publication of Graf's work on the historical books of the Old Testament, and especially of Wellhausen's History of Israel (1879), the majority of Old Testament scholars in Germany have reversed the relation. But here, again, if the Egyptian priesthood had any influence on that of Israel, we must believe, if there are two classes of writings in the Old Testament, that the priestly are not younger than the prophetic; for the Egyptian priesthood were the guardians of the sacred books, which they explained to the king. In the same way, the Israelitish priests are guardians of the written law of Moses (Deut. xvi. 18, xxxi. 9, 24). Hence not only that which we find in the Pentateuch, but what we can gather from the external history of the nation, points to the prominence of the priesthood at the inauguration of the nation under Moses, as well as during the return to first principles under Ezra.

5. The representations of the Old Testament books, when taken according to the age which has been assigned them by tradition, do not give a consistent account of the origin of the priesthood, and one which we might expect from the connection of Israel with Egypt; while the notices contained in the different documents discovered by the critics in the Pentateuch are highly fragmentary.

Without raising the question as to the Mosaic
It is certain that Deuteronomy does not attempt to define the different duties of the priesthood. Even according to it, there must have been a gradation in the most important service and the giving of a divine decision by Urim and Thummim (Deut. xxxiii. 8). It is certain that all the offices of the tribe, from an Aaron to a common Levite, are grouped together; and this is natural in a farewell address like Deuteronomy. If we throw the light of the Priests' Code upon the subsequent history, it explains several things. (1) A high priesthood is implied in the prominent mention of Aaron, Eleazar, and other priests, in Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges, Samuel and Kings, as well as in their use of Urim and Thummim. (2) There is nothing but the theory of the critics in the way of supposing that there were priests and Levites during the Old-Testament history. They are definitely distinguished as priests and Levites in 1 Kings viii. 4. Kuenen tries to escape from this difficulty by quoting the parallel passage in Chronicles (2 Chron. v. 9), without the connective, and assuming that in this place the chronicler exactly followed the original text of Kings. But then, if, as Kuenen assumes, the chronicler was rewriting the history from the stand-point of the Priests' Code, the omission of the connective would not escape him, and he would be likely to insert it, that he might express the difference between the priests and the Levites. It is probable, therefore, that we have here a clerical error, as the versions and a very large number of the best manuscripts insert a connective. Then, too, in Isa. lxvi. 21, the priests and Levites are mentioned according to the authority of the versions and the oldest manuscripts (see Curtiss's Levitical Priests, pp. 205 ff.). (3) The critics say that the Levitical cities existed only on paper; but there are casual references in the history to some of them, which, from their undesigned character, support the view that they really existed. This is mentioned in Judges xix. 1 ff. lived on the sides of Mount Ephraim—perhaps in Shechem, which was a Levitical city (Josh. xxx. 20, 21). So, too, the father of Samuel, who is mentioned by the chronicler as a Levite descended from the family of Kohath (1 Chron. vi. 7-13, E. V. 22-28), is spoken of as being from Mount Ephraim (1 Sam. i. 1). This coincides with the statement that the children of Kohath had Shechem with her surrounding pasturage in Mount Ephraim (Josh. xxi. 21). Another marked, but unintended, coincidence is found in the mention of Beth-shemesh in the first Book of Samuel (1 Sam. vi. 9-15). This city, according to the Book of Joshua, was given to the sons of Aaron (Josh. xxi. 10). If there is any point to the narrative at all, it is that the two new milch cows which have been selected to draw the ark of the Lord, contrary to their natural instincts, under the divine guidance, leave their calves, which had hitherto been the most menial service to the priestly city of Beth-shemesh, where the Levites, among whom were doubtless sons of Aaron, are ready to receive it. But perhaps most important of all is the twofold mention of the priestly city of Anathoth, whither Solomon dismisses Abiathar from the high priesthood (1 Kings ii. 26), and where Jeremiah's father, who was a priest, resided (Jer. i. 1).
Now, if we read the history of the priesthood according to the Priests' Code, we get the following representation: it is descended from Aaron, through the houses of Eleazar and Ithamar, since Nadab and Abihu were put to death for offering strange fire (Num. iii. 4). In the subsequent history we can trace the descent of Eleazar only as far as Phinehas, his son. This is not strange, as it was not the object of the prophetic authors of the Former Prophets (Joshua—Kings) to give a history of the priesthood. In the Book of Samuel we are introduced to Eli, who is supposed to have belonged to the house of Ithamar. Owing to the wickedness of Eli's sons, a curse falls upon this house (1 Sam. ii. 31—34). Both of his sons, Hophni and Phinehas, are slain (1 Sam. iv. 11); a terrible massacre overtakes the priestly city of Nob (1 Sam. xxii. 19); and the prophecy receives its special fulfilment in the deposition of Eli's successor from the priesthood by Solomon (1 Kings ii. 27), and in the putting of Zadok, a descendant of Eleazar, in his place. Under Jero- boam, a great misfortune befalls the priesthood. Since motives of state policy lead him to discourage the people from going to Jerusalem, he establishes the worshipful calves in Dan and Bethel (1 Kings xii. 28—29), and the priests are compelled to leave the land (1 Kings xii. 31; 2 Chron. xi. 13—15). Even in Judah, all the priests (except the sons of Zadok, and hence the sons of Ithamar) serve the people in their idolatrous practices, and hence are deposed from the priesthood, and are compelled to do the work of the ordinary Levites (2 Kings xxiii. 8, 9; Ezek. xlv. 11—14). Whether this regulation extended to the children of the priests, we do not know. During the history of the royal period, as given in the Books of Kings and by the prophets, we meet with priests who occupy positions corresponding to what we might expect from the high priest.

Now, while this is the case, it is evident that the chronicler does not attempt to conform the history to the regulations in the Priests' Code; but he is rather under the influence of the Nicetici Sacerdolii atque Thorc Elohistice Origine, he presents very decided variations from it, both in regard to the priests and the Levites. We do not, therefore, see any sufficient reason for holding that the history of the priesthood had a different origin from that which the Old Testament is commonly understood to teach.

The Duties of the priests were twofold with reference to God and man, although the idea of mediatorialship was contained in them all. The high priest was to offer sweet incense every morning and evening upon the altar of incense (Exod. xxx. 7, 8). The priests were to keep the lamps of the golden candlestick in order, and to light them every evening (Exod. xxvii. 21; Lev. xxiv. 3, 4). They were to clear away the ashes from the altar of burnt offering, and keep the fire burning constantly upon it (Lev. vi. 9—13), to offer the regular morning and evening sacrifices (Lev. xxiii. 31—35), to give the benediction upon the people (Num. vi. 24—28). They were also to set twelve fresh loaves of shewbread every sabbath on the table before the Lord (Lev. xxiv. 5—8). They were to blow the two silver trumpets, either for the calling of the assembly (as an alarm in case of war), or, in their times of gladness, at the beginning of the months, over their burnt offerings and peace offerings, and for the year of jubilee (Num. x. 2—10, xxxi. 6; Lev. xxv. 9). During the sojourn in the wilderness, they were intrusted with the immediate care of the ark of testimony and of the sacred vessels, which were to cover before they were borne by the Levites (Num. iv. 4—15).

The main part of the duties of the priests had reference to the needs of the people in the special and individual offerings which they might wish to present, as described in the sacrificial ritual (Lev. i.—vii.). Besides, the priests were to offer the fat of all animals killed for domestic purposes, and sprinkle their blood upon the altar (Lev. xvii. 3—9). They were to determine the valuation of vows (Lev. xxviii.), and to conduct the ceremonies in the consecration of a Nazarite (Num. vi. 1—21). The priests, besides their ordinary service, were authorized to make the commoners afflicted with leprosy, and leprous houses (Lev. xii. xiv.), and women suspected of adultery (Num. v. 12—31). Moreover, as the depositaries of the law, they were to teach the people the statutes of the Lord (Lev. x. 11; Deut. xxxiii. 10; 2 Chron. xv. 3).

The Dress and Manner of Life of the priesthood, as well as their physical soundness, indicate their holy, and hence mediatorial character. None who were afflicted with any bodily infirmity might serve as priests (Lev. xxvi. 17—28). The dress of the high priest has already been described (see p. 991). During the official service they wore garments of white byssus, consisting of drawers reaching to the ankles (Josephus: Antiq., III. 7, 5), and was gathered about the hips with a girdle; while upon the head they seem to have worn a white cap (Exod. xxxvii. 40—42). During their service in the tabernacle or temple they were not allowed to drink wine or strong drink (Lev. x. 9; Ezek. xlv. 21). They might not incur defilement on the death of relatives, except for Deuteronomy, a father, a son, a daughter, a brother, or a sister within whom (Lev. xxi. 1—3; Ezek. xlv. 25). The regulations respecting the high priest on the death of relatives were still more strict (see p. 991.) They were prohibited from forming any impure marriage connection (Lev. xxvi. 7), and could only wed a virgin or a priest's widow (Ezek. xlv. 29); although it was not allowed the high priest to marry a widow (Lev. xxvi. 13—14).

The Income and Possessions of the priests depended upon the religiousness of the people. In striking contrast with the revenues of the Egyptian priests, and never at any time excessive, as Ewald has remarked, they must have been entirely inadequate in times of religious declension, and have led to suffering and crime. Instead of owning a third of the land, they were told that they had no inheritance like their brethren; that the Lord was their inheritance. They were assigned to the thirteen cities by lot, the benefit of residence, the fields that were consecrated to the service of the Lord and not redeemed (Lev. xxvi. 21), a tenth of the tithe which belonged to the Levites (Num. xviii. 26—28), the redemption-money for the first-born of man or beast...
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(Num. xviii. 14–19), and their share in the fiftieth of half the booty which was given to the Levites in the time of war (Num. xxx. 47). They were to receive also the wave offering (Lev. xxii. 19, 20), the shew-bread (Exod. xxv. 30; Lev. xxiv. 5–9), the heave offering, the meat offering, the sin offering, and the trespass offering (Num. xviii. 8–14), the best of the oil, of the wine, and wheat, as first-fruits, etc.

The situation of the priests was especially indicative of their sacred character. It is a mooted question whether the service of induction described in Lev. viii. was repeated on the appointment of the successors of Aaron and his sons. However this may be, these were solemnly set apart to the service of God, as mediators between him and his people, in the presence of the congregation of Israel. After they had been washed, and had put on their priestly garments, they were anointed with a precious oil, which might not be used for any common purpose. This oil was poured on the head of the high priest, while his sons in their turn had only their foreheads anointed with the finger. After this, the sacrificial rites took place, consisting in a sin offering, in a burnt offering, and a peace offering. In connection with this sacrifice, Moses touched the tip of the right ear, of the right thumb, and of the great toe of the right foot, of Aaron and his sons, with blood; signifying, that as mediators between God and his people, they were to hear his word, do his work, and walk in his ways.


Samuel IV. Curtiss;

PRIESTHOOD IN THE ROMAN-CATHOLIC CHURCH. Very early, indeed already towards the close of the first century, a parallel was drawn between the officials of the Christian congregational and the priests of the Old Testament. (See 1 Ep. of Clement, c. 40.) As yet, however, the idea of the priesthood, with all its real influence on the idea of the office in the Christian congregation, and could exercise none, because, in the Christian congregation, no offering of sacrifices by its officials was known; the whole congregation considering itself a people of priests.

According to Justin (Apol. 1, 67), the individual members of the congregation, and not its officials, are the acting subjects in the celebration of the Eucharist. Tertullian (De ex. cast., 7; comp. De lapt., 17; De monog., 7) bases the right of every Christian to administer the sacraments on the universal priesthood of the faith- ful; and the same idea occurs in Augustine (De civ. Dei, 20, 10), and in Leo the Great (Serm., 4, 1). But, alongside of this idea of a universal priesthood of all the faithful, there developed, in course of time, another idea, of directly opposite character. In Africa people first became used, in what manner is not known, to designate bishops and presbyters as sacerdotes. This usage was current at the time of Tertullian, as may be seen from his polemics against it; and in the third century it also became prevalent in Rome. As soon, however, as a distinction was established between the members and the officers of the congregation, as between priests and laity, it was impossible to prevent the Old Testament idea of priesthood from creeping in, and making itself felt. Now, in the Old Testament, the idea of priest and sacrifice are inseparable; and by offering up the sacrifice for the people, the priest became the mediator between the people and God. There was also a Christian sacrifice; but, as long as the faithful themselves offered up the sacrifice, the idea was rather in favor of that of universal priesthood. As soon, however, as the idea of sacrifice changed, and the sacrifice was offered up, not by the faithful, but for the faithful, that of priest changed too, and the priest became a mediator between God and the faithful. In the time of Cyprian this change was accomplished: see his Epistles, 55, 8; 56, 3; 61, 1, etc. The priest, and not the congregation, had become the acting subject in the celebration of the Eucharist. For the transition in the Greek Church see Apost. Constit., ii. 25, 12, and vi. 5, 1. At the time of Chrysostom the change had taken place.

Thus the priestly character of the higher clergy, derived from the sacrificial character of the mass, was transmitted to the medieval church, which accepted all those ideas as axioms. (See Petrus Lombardus: Sent. iv., dist. 24 J.) When Thomas Aquinas incidentally mentions the universal priesthood of all the faithful, he gives to the idea an almost metaphorical signification: the faithful shall, like the priest, offer up spiritual sacrifices to God. The Roman Catechism also speaks of a twofold priesthood, an internal and an external; but it lays stress on the internal, the hierarchy. The foundation of that priesthood is carried back to the Lord himself, who gave to the apostles and their successors the powers of consecration, of baptism, of offering and administering the Body and Blood of Christ, and of forgiving or retaining sins; and the office itself is spoken of in in- digent expressions. The priest is not only the emissary and interpreter, but the very repre-
sentative, of God on earth; and above his office none higher can be imagined, either with respect to dignity or to power. Admission to that office can be had only through a solemn consecration, sacramentum ordinis, which can be given only by a bishop, but which imparts to the ordained an indestructible spiritual character, by virtue of which he can discharge his lofty spiritual functions. The conditions of admission are baptism, male sex, unmarried state, state of age, etc.; excluded are slaves, those who were born illegitimately, those who have spilt blood, those who suffer from some conspicuous bodily defect, etc. This view of the priesthood the Roman-Catholic Church retained in spite of the objections of the Protestant churches, and she still retains it almost without the least modification. [See Eng. trans. Catechism of the Council of Trent, Balt., pp. 220 sqq.]

PRIESTLEY, Joseph, LL.D., F.R.S., b. at Fieldhead, Yorkshire, March 18, 1733; d. at Northumberland, Penn., Feb. 6, 1804. He was graduated at the dissenting academy at Daventry, and was subsequently Independent minister at Needham Market, Suffolk (1755), and at Nantwich, Cheshire (1758); professor of belles-lettres at Warrington dissenting academy (1761); minister at Mill-Hill Chapel, Leeds; librarian and companion to the Earl of Shelburne (1773); minister at Birmingham (1780) and at Hackney (1791); sailed for America (April 7, 1794), and lived the rest of his days on his son's farm. His great reputation rests on his discoveries in chemistry and physics, particularly the discovery of oxygen, gas, indeed, of almost all gases. But he is mentioned here because he was a vigorous champion of Unitarian sentiments, although ill fitted by temper and study for a religious champion. His principal theological work is A History of the Corruptions of Christianity, Birmingham, 1782, 2 vols., new ed., London, 1871. As among these "corruptions" he put the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, his book excited a great commotion. He also wrote A History of the Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ, compiled from Original Writers, proving that the Christian Church was at first Unitarian, Birmingham, 1786, 4 vols.; Notes on all the Books of Scripture, for the Use of the Pulpy and Private Families, Northumberland (Penn.), 1803, 4 vols. By his advocacy of the "liberal" side in politics, no less than in religion, he made himself so obnoxious at Birmingham, that his house was entered and sacked by a mob on July 14, 1791, while some friends were celebrating the destruction of the Bastille. For this affair he received $2,502 damages.

A statue of him was placed in 1860 in the museum of Oxford University; and another was unveiled at Birmingham, Eng., Aug. 1, 1874; while on the same day, the American chemists celebrated at Northumberland, Penn., the centennial of his discovery of oxygen. His bibliography, compiled in 1786, and placed in the Library of Congress, comprises more than three hundred publications of various sizes, and on numerous subjects. The most of his laboratory was in 1883 given over to the Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C. For his biography, see Memoirs of Dr. Joseph Priestley, to the Year 1795, written by Himself; with a Continuation to the Time of his Decease, by his Son, London, 1806-07, 2 vols.

PRIMACY, PRIMATE. The hierarchical organization followed the political division of the Roman Empire; but in course of time the titles of the superior ecclesiastics were changed. In the Orient, the patriarch stood at the head of the whole organization, and under him the exarchs in the provinces, and the exarchs in the dioceses. In the Occident, the episcopus primus sedis bore the title of primas, which meant the same as metropolitan, or archbishop, or archiepiscopus, or archiepiscopus primus, or archbishop, the more or less prominent position of a bishop depended generally on the importance of the location, or—as in Pontus, Africa, and Spain—on the date of the ordination. The Bishop of Carthage, however, occupied a peculiar position, somewhat similar to that of an Oriental patriarch. He had the right of supervision over all the African provinces; he convened the general synods of Africa, and presided over them; no bishop could be elected without his knowledge; and, in case of a disputed election, he made the decision, etc. But he had no peculiar title: he was simply styled primus, or senex. In course of time, however, the title of primus, originally given to all metropolitans, was superseded by that of archiepiscopus, and retained only by the vicars of the Pope. Their rights—defined partly by older canons, partly by custom—consisted in confirming the bishops and archbishops elected, convening national synods, and presiding over them, receiving appeals, superintending the districts, and crowning the kings. Gradually, however, their rights were absorbed by the Pope, and their position became in reality only one of honor. The primacy of Spain was Toledo; of France, Bourges and Lyons (for Rheims and Narbonne the primacy was a mere title); of Italy, Pisa; of Hungary, Grau; of Bohemia, Prague; of Poland, Gnesen; of Denmark, Lund; of England, Canterbury; of Scotland, St. Andrews; of Ireland, Armagh; of Germany, the three ecclesiastical electorates, and Magdeburg and Salzburg. In Protestant countries the title has been retained in England, where the Archbishop of Canterbury is Primate of all England, and the Archbishop of York, Primate of England; and in Sweden, where the Archbishop of Lund is still styled Primate of Sweden. See J. F. MAUER: Diss. de primatibus, Leipzig, 3d ed., 1741; DIAMAND MOLITORE: De primatibus, Göttingen, 1806. H. F. JACOBSEN.

PRIMICERIUS (from primus, "first," and cera, "wax"), he who has his name inscribed as the first on the waxed tablet; the head of any body of officials, in contradistinction to the secundocerius, tertiocerius, etc. At the papal court, organized, to some extent, on the model of the Byzantine court, there were several officials who bore the title of primicerius. Most frequently, however, it was applied to the head of the lower clergy, the officer ranking immediately after the archpriest and archdeacon, and fulfilling the duties of the praepostor, or scholaslicus, or pracentor.

PRIMITIVE METHODIST CONNECTION. See Methodism.

PRINCE, Thomas, Congregationalist; b. at Sandwich, Mass., May 15, 1687; d. in Boston, Oct. 22, 1758. He was graduated at Harvard College, 1707; visited Barbadoes and Madeira; preached for several years, written his History of Himself; with a Continuation to the Time of his Decease, by his Son, London, 1806-07, 2 vols.
pastor of the Rev. Dr. Joseph Sewall, Old South Church, Boston. His memory rests upon his Chronological History of New England in the form of Annals... with an Introduction containing a brief epitome... of events abroad from the Creation, Boston, vol. i., 1736; Nos. 1, 2, 3 (66 pp. in all) of vol. ii., 1755. The history proper begins with 1602. He intended to bring it down to 1730: but the strange lack of encouragement by the public press, and the continued neglect of his labors, two years elapsed after the appearance of the first volume, ere he began the second, and, in the death coming soon after, he brought the history down no later than Aug. 5, 1633; and as, during the Revolutionary war, many of his manuscripts were destroyed, a large part of his invaluable collection (made during fifty years) of facts respecting the early history of the country has perished. His History was republished (ed. by Nathan Hale), Boston, 1826, and again (ed. by S. G. Drake), Boston, 1852, and portions in fifth edition of Morton’s New-England Memorial, Boston, 1855. Besides this, he wrote An account of the Earthquakes of New England (1755), New England Psalm book revised and improved (1758), and other works. His library was bequeathed to the Old South Church, and by it deposited in the Public Library, Boston, 1866, of which a catalogue has been published. See Swasey: Annals of the American Pulpit, vol. i. 304.

His son Thomas (b. 1722; d. 1748) edited the earliest American periodical, The Christian history, containing accounts of the revival and propagation of religion in Great Britain and America for 1745, Boston, 1745-46, 2 vols. It was published weekly.

PRINCETON, the Village, its Institutions, Theology, and Literature.

I. The Borough of Princeton is situated almost midway between Philadelphia and New York, on the old Indian path between the fords of the Raritan and the Delaware, near its intersection with the line dividing the provinces of East and West Jersey, two hundred and twenty-one feet above the sea, on the first foot-hills, which, rising above the sandy plains of the south, roll on northward and westward to the Allegheny Mountains. The first settlements were made in 1694, and generally called, after the neighboring rivulet, “Stony Brook.” It was called Princeton in 1724. The battle of Princeton, Jan. 3, 1777, was a turning-point in the Revolution. Two eminent citizens of Princeton, Richard Stockton and John Witherspoon, signed the Declaration of Independence. On the 18th of July, 1778, the first Legislature of New Jersey, under the Constitution, met in Princeton, and organized the new State government; and Princeton continued the capital until the latter part of 1778. During four months, from June 20 to Nov. 4, 1783, the American Congress held its session here, in Nassau Hall, the oldest main building, called Nassau Hall (New Light), for the purpose of raising a godly ministry for the Presbyterian Church, and for uniting religion and science in the higher education. The most active founders were Messrs. Dickinson, Pierson, Pemberton, and Burr, residing in East Jersey. The Rev. Gilbert Tennent and Samuel Blair, leading members of the presbyteries of New Brunswick and New Castle, and representatives of the Log College, Friends, Lower Penn., cordially co-operated with the originators of the college from the date of the second charter. The first charter was given by acting Governor Hamilton, in 1746; and the second and permanent charter was given by the great civil patron of the college, Governor Belcher, in 1748. Jonathan Dickinson was chosen first president, May, 1747; and the college opened, in the fourth week of May following, in Elizabethtown, where President Dickinson died on the 7th of October. Rev. Aaron Burr was immediately appointed president; and the college moved to Newark, and the first Commencement was held Nov. 9, 1748. In the fall of 1756, Nassau Hall and the president’s house being finished, the college was removed to Princeton. It is governed by a board of trustees, of which the governor of the State is ex officio president, consisting of twenty-seven persons, including the president of the college, twelve of whom are required by law to be citizens of New Jersey, and one-half of whom are required by uniform custom to be ministers of the gospel. The citizens of Princeton and other friends of the college raised its first funds in small sums. The Rev. Messrs. Tennent and Davies collected money for it in Great Britain. Until recently it has been mainly dependent on tuition-fees. In the last fifteen years its grounds, buildings, museums, library, apparatus, curriculum, and professorships, including a school of science, have been erected, extended, and endowed on a noble scale, by the munificent gifts of such patrons as James Lenox, John C. Green, John I. Blair, William Libbey, Henry G. Marquand, Robert and Alexander Stuart, N. X. Halsted, and others. Following Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary, Princeton College is the fourth in age, and in rank not far behind the first of Amens the forage room of the college; and Washington, for some time in attendance, issued his farewell orders to the Revolutionary armies from the house of Judge Berrien on Rocky Hill. The village itself, numbering three thousand inhabitants, is distinguished only by its impressive and elevated situation; but in recent times the beautifying and improving effort of munificent patrons for the uses of the college and the theological seminary are, upon the whole, unrivalled in America. In this respect the village is admitted to approach more nearly than any other the idea of a Christian university town. The cemetery has grown to be one of the most celebrated in the land; for here lie a long line of illustrious citizens, presidents, and professors, including the Bayards and Stocktons of New Jersey, Edwards, Davies, and Witherspoon, of the college, and the Alexanders, Miller, and Hodge, etc., that almost twenty years elapsed after the appearance of the first volume, ere he began the second, and, in the death coming soon after, he brought the history down no later than Aug. 5, 1633; and as, during the Revolutionary war, many of his manuscripts were destroyed, a large part of his invaluable collection (made during fifty years) of facts respecting the early history of the country has perished. His History was republished (ed. by Nathan Hale), Boston, 1826, and again (ed. by S. G. Drake), Boston, 1852, and portions in fifth edition of Morton’s New-England Memorial, Boston, 1855. Besides this, he wrote An account of the Earthquakes of New England (1755), New England Psalm book revised and improved (1758), and other works. His library was bequeathed to the Old South Church, and by it deposited in the Public Library, Boston, 1866, of which a catalogue has been published. See Swasey: Annals of the American Pulpit, vol. i. 304.

His son Thomas (b. 1722; d. 1748) edited the earliest American periodical, The Christian history, containing accounts of the revival and propagation of religion in Great Britain and America for 1745, Boston, 1745-46, 2 vols. It was published weekly.

II. Its Institutions.— (1) Princeton College (corporate name, College of New Jersey, and from its oldest main building, called Nassau Hall) was founded by members of the synod of New York (New Light), for the purpose of raising a godly ministry for the Presbyterian Church, and for uniting religion and science in the higher education. The most active founders were Messrs. Dickinson, Pierson, Pemberton, and Burr, residing in East Jersey. The Rev. Gilbert Tennent and Samuel Blair, leading members of the presbyteries of New Brunswick and New Castle, and representatives of the Log College, Friends, Lower Penn., cordially co-operated with the originators of the college from the date of the second charter. The first charter was given by acting Governor Hamilton, in 1746; and the second and permanent charter was given by the great civil patron of the college, Governor Belcher, in 1748. Jonathan Dickinson was chosen first president, May, 1747; and the college opened, in the fourth week of May following, in Elizabethtown, where President Dickinson died on the 7th of October. Rev. Aaron Burr was immediately appointed president; and the college moved to Newark, and the first Commencement was held Nov. 9, 1748. In the fall of 1756, Nassau Hall and the president’s house being finished, the college was removed to Princeton. It is governed by a board of trustees, of which the governor of the State is ex officio president, consisting of twenty-seven persons, including the president of the college, twelve of whom are required by law to be citizens of New Jersey, and one-half of whom are required by uniform custom to be ministers of the gospel. The citizens of Princeton and other friends of the college raised its first funds in small sums. The Rev. Messrs. Tennent and Davies collected money for it in Great Britain. Until recently it has been mainly dependent on tuition-fees. In the last fifteen years its grounds, buildings, museums, library, apparatus, curriculum, and professorships, including a school of science, have been erected, extended, and endowed on a noble scale, by the munificent gifts of such patrons as James Lenox, John C. Green, John I. Blair, William Libbey, Henry G. Marquand, Robert and Alexander Stuart, N. X. Halsted, and others. Following Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary, Princeton College is the fourth in age, and in rank not far behind the first of American colleges. Its presidents have been Jonathan Dickinson, Aaron Burr, Jonathan Edwards, Samuel Davies, Samuel Finley, John Witherspoon, Samuel Stanhope Smith, Ashbel Green, James Carnahan, John Maclean, and James McCosh. From the first, until the founding of the theological seminary, the college always, in its president and other officers, had charge of theology. It has sent out 5,500 graduates, 1,087 ministers of the gospel, 1 President and
2 Vice-Presidents of the United States, 310 high magistrates, 187 presidents and professors of colleges and theological seminaries, of whom 92 have been in the service and one-half of these are now in the pulpit. It possesses one of the most rare and extensive paleontological museums in the country, and its united libraries amount to about 75,000.

(2) Princeton Theological Seminary.—After the first settlement of the various Christian denominations in the United States, their candidates for the ministry received their theological education from the more learned pastors. The president, or other theological professor in Princeton College, taught theological classes from the first, until the commencement of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in the same place. The presidents of Yale College began to hold theological classes in 1754: its theological seminary as a distinct department was added in 1822. The Associate Synod founded the first American Protestant theological school in Beaver County, Penn., in 1794, under the Rev. John Anderson, D.D. The Associate Reformed Seminary, under Dr. John Martin Huggins, in 1804; Andover, in 1808; the Dutch Reformed, in New Brunswick, N.J., by Dr. John H. Livingston, in 1810. Princeton Theological Seminary was founded by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, under Dr. Archibald Alexander, in 1812. He continued in office until his death, in 1851. Its principal founders were Rev. Drs. Green, Woodhull, Remy, Miller, Archibald Alexander, James Richards, Amzi Armstrong, etc. Dr. Samuel Miller of New-York City was elected second professor in 1813 (d. 1850). The Rev. Charles Hodge was made professor in 1822 (d. 1878). Rev. Joseph Addison Alexander, D.D., was made instructor in 1833, and professor in 1835 (d. 1860). Rev. John Breckinridge, D.D., became professor in 1836, resigned in 1838. Rev. James Waddel Alexander, D.D., became professor in 1846, and resigned in 1851. The present faculty consists of Revs. Wm. Green, D.D. (became professor in 1851), Rev. A. T. McGill, D.D., in 1854, and retired Emeritus in 1888, Rev. C. W. Hodge, D.D., in 1890, Rev. James C. Moffatt, D.D., in 1861, Rev. Charles A. Aiken, D.D., in 1871, Rev. A. A. Hodge, D.D., in 1877, Rev. Francis L. Patton, D.D., in 1883, Rev. William M. Paxton, D.D., in 1883. The whole number of students, from the beginning to the spring of 1882, has been 3,464. These have graduated from 150 different colleges: 204 have been foreign missionaries. The chief benefactors of the seminary have been Robert and James Lenox, Robert L. and Alexander Stuart, John C. Green, George Brown, and Levi P. Stone, etc. These have endowed this eldest of Presbyterian seminaries with admirable grounds, dormitories, chapel, library, buildings and library, lecture-rooms, professors' houses, scholarship and other funds. The library contain about 40,000 volumes.

School, of the special type represented by the Westminster Standards. This was true equally of the founders of the seminary.—Ashbel Green, James Richards, and others.

The term “Princeton Theology” originated in New England about 1831 or 1832, and was applied to the general characteristics of that system advocated by the Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review in its controversies with the disciples of Drs. Hopkins, Emmons, Finney, and Taylor, the leaders of various phases of the “New-England School.” Of this “Princeton Theology” the characteristic was close and persistent adherence to the type of Calvinism taught in the Westminster Standards as these are interpreted in the light of the classical literature of the Swiss and Dutch and English Puritan theologians, who wrote after the date of the synod of Dort, especially Francis Turretin of Geneva, and John Owen of England. The phrases “Princeton Party” and “The Princeton Gentlemen” were applied to the party represented by the Biblical Repertory during the controversies which terminated in the disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1868. This party maintained a perfect doctrinal agreement with the Old-School party in that struggle, but hesitated to follow its leaders in some of their more extreme and debatable methods of reform, such as the “Act and Testimony” of 1834, etc.

IV. Lit.—The sources of information on the subjects embraced in this article are The History of the College of New Jersey, from its Origin in 1746 to Commencement of 1864, by John McLellan, tenth president of the college, Phila., 1877, 2 vols., J. B. Lippincott & Co.; The History of Princeton and its Institutions, by John Hageman, Phila., 1879, 2 vols., J. B. Lippincott & Co.; Princeton College during the Eighteenth Century, by Rev. Samuel D. Alexander, D.D., 1872; The Princeton Book, a Series of Sketches pertaining to the History, etc., of the College and Theological Seminary, illus. with views and portraits, Boston, 1878, 4to, Houghton, Osgood, & Co.; A Brief History of the Theological Seminary, pamphlet, by Dr. Samuel Miller, Princeton, 1838; The General Catalogue of the College of New Jersey, by Professor H. C. Cameron, D.D., Princeton, 1882; The General Catalogue of the Princeton Theological Seminary, by the Rev. William E. Schrenck, D.D., Princeton, 1882, 8vo, 380 pp.; the Lives of Drs. Archibald and Joseph Addison Alexander, of Drs. Samuel Miller, Ashbel Green, and Charles Hodge. The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, from 1825 to 1872, Dr. Charles Hodge editor-in-chief, represents the “Princeton school” by discussions on all topics, biblical, theological, and ecclesiastical! Dr. Samuel Miller contributed between 1830 and 1842 twenty-five articles; Dr. Archibald Alexander, in all, seventy-seven articles; Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander, ninety-three; Dr. James W. Alexander, one hundred; Dr. Lyman II. Atwater, sixty-six; and Dr. Charles Hodge, a hundred thirty. Mr. Hageman, in his History of Princeton, etc., has enumerated seventy authors, citizens of Princeton, principally officers of the college and seminary. These have issued about four hundred and thirty distinct volumes, besides a larger number of printed essays, sermons, orations, not yet collected. Not counting the works of Jonathan Edwards, the principal permanent works which
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PRIOR and PRIORESS are, as titles of monastic officials, of comparatively late date, — from the time of Pope Celestine V. towards the end of the thirteenth century. With respect to priors, a distinction must be noticed between a prior claustri, and a prior consuetudinis. The former was simply a subordinate officer of the abbot, appointed by him, and in certain cases acting as his substitute; while the latter was himself the head of a monastery, and exercising the same authority as an abbot.

PRIOR and PRIORESS are, as titles of monastic officials, of comparatively late date, — from the time of Pope Celestine V. towards the end of the thirteenth century. With respect to priors, a distinction must be noticed between a prior claustri, and a prior consuetudinis. The former was simply a subordinate officer of the abbot, appointed by him, and in certain cases acting as his substitute; while the latter was himself the head of a monastery, and exercising the same authority as an abbot.

PRIOR. PRISCILLIANISTS.

PRIOR. PRISCILLIANISTS. The sect was first discovered in Spain in 379. Priscillian, a rich and gifted man, of a distinguished family, devoted himself from early youth to philosophical and theological studies, disdaining all vain and frivolous enjoyments. Like many other gifted men of his time, he fell into the hands of the Manichæans, and his eloquence did not allow him to become a mere adept of another sect. He aspired to form a sect himself. Mixing up various elements of Gnosticism and Manichæism with Christianity, he developed a system of his own, and succeeded in having it adopted, not only by a number of women, but even by two bishops, Justanarius and Salvianus. The miserable condition of Catholic Christianity, and the degeneration, spiritual and moral, of the hierarchy, contributed much to his success, not to speak of the general longing after the hidden truth, which the Manichaean propaganda had awakened far and wide in the congregations. Bishop Hyginus of Cordova was the first to take notice of the spreading heresy. But he was a man of Christian feeling and of discrimination: he wished to convert the heretics. Quite otherwise with Bishop Idacius of Emerida, and Bishop Ildacius of Sosserba: they wanted to suppress the heresy. As the condemnation and excommunication launched against the Priscillianists by the synod of Saragossa (380) proved of no avail, the two bishops appealed to the emperor, Gratianus; and he actually issued an edict threatening the heretics with banishment from the country. Meanwhile, Priscillian, who had become Bishop of Avila, repaired to Italy, and exerted himself to win Ambrose of Milan, and Damascus of Rome, for his cause. In that he failed, but by bribery he succeeded in having the imperial edict cancelled. Shortly after, however, Gratianus was assassinated; and a new appeal was made by the Catholic bishops to his successor, Maximus. In spite of the protest of Bishop Martin of Tours, who declared it a crime for the secular power to interfere in matters purely religious, Maximus condemned Priscillian to death, as a heretic; and he was decapitated at Treves in 395. It was the first time that a Christian was punished with death on account of heresy, and all Christendom felt the shock.

The death of the leader, however, was not the end of the movement. The military force which Maximus sent against the Priscillianists was recalled at the instance of Bishop Martin of Tours; and, in spite of the condemnation of the synod of Toledo (in 400), the sect spread freely. The confusion became still worse when the Arian Visigoths broke into the country. They hated the Catholics, and they were too rude to really understand the heretics. At that period Orosius wrote against the Priscillianists, also Augustine and Leo the Great. But every thing proved in vain until King Theodemir abandoned Arianism, and joined the Catholic Church; then the synod of Braga (563) succeeded in employing really effective measures against the heretics, and the sect soon disappeared. See the historian of Orosius, Augustine, Jerome, Leo the Great, and Sulpicius Severus, also S. van Fries: Diss. de Prisc., Utrecht, 1745, and Lübker: De hcr. Prisc., Copenhagen, 1840.

ALBRECHT VOGEL.
PROBABILISM.

PROBABILISM, in morals, denotes a view, according to which it is not necessary that the will shall be determined by a sure conviction of truth: it is sufficient to act upon a probable opinion of truth. Such a view was first developed by the Greek Sophists, and afterwards by the Jewish and Talmudists. In the Christian Church the first traces of it are found in the writings of certain Greek Fathers, after Chrysostom, who admitted a certain "economy," or frav a pia (see Gass: Geschichte d. chr. Ethik, i. 234), and in the mediæval penitentials, which, with the formula nihil nocet ("it does not hurt"), opened up a wide field to moral indifference. Well prepared by the casuists and the Dominican theologians of the later middle ages, the view was finally brought into system by the Jesuit moralists. Gabriel Vasquez was the first to adopt it, about 1588: with Escobar, who died 1633, it reached its full bloom. He discussed, for instance, the question whether it is sufficient to love God once in one's life (Vasquez), or thrice (Henriquez), or once every three years (Coninchi), or once every year (Hurtado de Mendoza). An opinio probabilis, that is, the opinion of some doctor gravis et probus, is quoted for each proposition. Personally he adopts the view of Henriquez, but he declares that the confessor is morally bound to absolution on any of these terms. In 1820 the Sorbonne protested against the doctrine of Probabilism. In 1856 the Lettres provinciales of Pascal made the view actually odious to all serious people. In 1656 Alexander VII. felt compelled to disavow a number of the propositions of the Probabilists, and in 1679 Innocent XI. expressed himself still more plainly on the subject. Nevertheless, when, in 1891, the general of the Jesuits, Tyron Gonzalez, published his Anti-probabilist Fundamenta theologiae moralis, he raised such a storm in the society, that he barely escaped deposition, and the Jesuit moralists continued to teach their old doctrines under various modifications; as Probabilism pure and simple, which asserts that it is by no means necessary to prefer a more to a less probable opinion; or Beprobabili-ism, which declares that the opinion of any opinion unless they are equally probable; or Probabilism, which demands that the more probable opinion shall always be chosen, etc. See SAM. RACHEL: Examen probabilistae Jesuitice, Helmst. 1694; COTTA: De probabilitate morali, Jena, 1728; CONCINA: Storia del probabil. e rigorismo, Lucca, 1748, 2 vols.; JOH. HUBER: Der Jesuitenorden, Berlin, 1873, pp. 284 sqq.

ZÖCKLER.

PROBATION.

PROBATION, Future, the doctrine taught by some modern German divines, that the offers of the gospel will be made to men in the next life who never had a probation in the present life. It must be distinguished from purgatory, where souls are supposed to undergo purification through penal suffering; from the doctrine, that, in the intermediate state, the process of sanctification, incomplete at death, is carried on to perfection; and from Universalism in all its forms. How long the intermediate state is supposed to last is not asserted; though, if it exist at all, there is no reason why it should terminate before the judgment. The most natural mode of conceiving of it is to suppose that the conditions of the sinner as to motive and will, and of the gospel as to the requirements of faith and repentance, are carried over into the intermediate state, covering the period between death and the resurrection. Some hold that all who die unregenerate will have the opportunity in the next life of repenting, and believing in Christ; others (and this is the more common view) limit future probation to the heathen, to infants dying in infancy, and all other persons to whom the gospel had not been presented in this life. In support of one or the other, or both, of these views, it is urged:

1. That it is wrong to make a sharp antithesis between the embodied and the disembodied condition of the soul; that, while death is a crisis, we have no right to regard it as the terminus of all gracious influence and opportunity. In reply to this, however, it should be said that the contrast between the present and the future life is made expressly, or implied, in the New Testament. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after death the judgment" (Heb. ix. 27).

2. That the Bible condemns no one to whom the gospel has not been brought home, and that in the case of heathen who have not heard the gospel, and of infants dying in infancy, it is essential to any fair treatment of them, that offers of the gospel be made to them after death. To this it is replied, that the heathen are not condemned because they rejected Christ, but because they sin—"As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law," and that it is not held that infants dying in infancy are condemned. It is true that the Bible conditions salvation by belief, and that infants cannot believe; but it is far more rational to suppose that the condition of faith applies only to those who were capable of being outwardly called than to suppose that infants dying in infancy are to receive a probation in the next world, and an opportunity to repent, believe, and embrace the gospel.

3. That Christ went and preached to the spirits in prison (1 Pet. iii. 19). To this argument it is enough to reply that this is a very difficult passage, and that it is not certain whether the spirits were preached to in prison, or whether they were preached to in the years of Noah, or after the flood, or after the exodus. For their disobedience had been in prison ever since; that, supposing that Christ went to Hades with a proclamation to the antediluvians, we are not told what it was—it may or may not have been the gospel; and that although such overtures were made to the antediluvians, and at a particular crisis in the economy of grace, it does not follow that they should be continued ever after.

4. That other passages of Scripture furnish a basis for the belief in future probation. The strongest of these are Matt. xvi. 82, and 1 Pet. iv. 6. From the first it is argued, and the high authority of Augustine is quoted in support of the exegesis, that the non-forgiveness of sins against the Holy Ghost in the next world implies the possible forgiveness of all other sins: so Lange, Olshausen, and others. But there is no reason to believe that these words meant more than that future atonement is to be made to the Holy Ghost who can never be forgiven, as, indeed, is taught in so many words in Mark iii. 29. In regard to the second passage, there is the difficulty, referred to above, of knowing whether the text means to teach that the gospel was preached to men while they were in the state of the dead, or whether, having been
PROCESSION. 1982

preached unto, those here spoken of have since then been dead.

It must be evident there is very slight, if there is any, authority for the hypothesis of a probation in the future state. The argument in favor of it rests mainly upon a priori and speculative grounds, founded, partly in sentiment, and partly also in wrong conceptions regarding the covenant of grace. For, in reply to those who advocate the theory, it may be urged:—

1. While it may be properly said that no one under moral government can be justly condemned who has not had a fair opportunity, this cannot be urged in supporting a future probation. If the government of God were conducted upon the principle of individualism, something might be said in favor of a future probation for the heathen. But the Bible emphasizes the race-unity of mankind. It teaches the representative responsibility of Adam, and accordingly that the race had its probation in him. Condemnation, therefore, does not follow rejection of the gospel, though that rejection may enhance it. The gospel finds men in a state of condemnation; and, though acceptance of Christ may be necessary to salvation, rejection of him is not the condition of condemnation.

2. There is no adequate explanation of the apostle's Epistle to the Romans, if the heathen can be justly condemned only after they have rejected Christ. Paul's argument is unequivocally to the effect that the light of conscience is sufficient to condemn them.

3. The Scriptures not only distinctly say, "After death, the judgment," but they teach that we are to "stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body." The references to the future life contained in the New Testament imply that this life is in antithesis to the life to come, as to working, and receiving reward, as to sowing and reaping, as to running, and reaching the goal. The sins that bar entrance into heaven are sins that presuppose the present conditions of our earthly life. Sodom and Gomorrah are represented as suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Christ says, "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him is not the condition of condemnation."

so very different from a Palm-Sunday procession of to-day in a Roman-Catholic country. Processions—in the proper sense of the word, for proce...e "going to church"—are not mentioned, however, in the history of the Christian Church until the fourth century. In Constantinople, where the Arians were not allowed to worship within the walls, they walked morning and evening, in long processions through the streets, out to their meeting-places outside the walls; and as those processions, of which hymns were sung made a great impression on people, and threatened to seduce the Catholics, Chrysostom instituted similar processions, and arranged them with considerable pomp. A notice of Ambrose (Epist. 40, ad Theodotus) shows that processions were in use in the West at the same time, at least, among the monks. During the middle ages the Roman-Catholic Church developed this feature of ceremonial life with great magnificence; and minutely regulated processions became parts of her celebrations, as, for instance, of the Corpus Christi Festival. Since the Reformation, however, processions have lost much of their significance, not only in Protestant countries, but also in countries in which Protestants and Roman Catholics live together. Cf. art. Processionen, in Wetzer u. Welte, viii. 893–909.

PROCESSION. See NEO-PLATONISM.

PROCOPIUS OF CESAREA, b. at Cesarea in Palestina; studied law at Berytus, and accompanied Belisarius as legal adviser on his campaign in Persia in 526; visited Africa, 533–536, and Italy, 536–538; and settled in 542 in Constantinople, where he was made prefect in 562. The date of his death is not known. He wrote a work on the wars of Justinian, another on his public buildings, and a third, which was not published until after his death, and forms a kind of supplement to the first. They have considerable interest to the church historian. The best edition of them is that by Dindorf, Bonn, 1838–38, 3 vols.

PROCOPIUS OF GAZA lived in Constantinople during the reign of Justin I. (518–527), and compiled from the works of the Fathers commentaries on the Octateuch (ed. C. Clauser, Zurich, 1555), on Isaiah (ed. J. Curterius, Paris, 1590), and on Kings and Chronicles (ed. I. Meursius, Lyons, 1620), thus opening the long series of catena-writers.

PROCOPIUS (surnamed The Great, to distinguish him from contemporaries of the same name) was a Bohemian priest, who on the death of Zizka, in 1424, succeeded him as leader of the Hussite army. Procopius was sprung from the lower nobility, and had been a follower of Hus. As a priest he never bore arms; but he learned warfare under Zizka, and conducted campaigns with consummate skill. He was more of a statesman than Zizka, and his policy was to terrify Europe into peace with Bohemia. He wished for peace, but an honorable and enduring peace. In 1426 he invaded Saxony, and defeated the Germans at Aussig. In 1427 he turned to ignominious flight, at Tachau, a vast host of Crusaders. In 1441 he still more ignominiously routed the forces of Germany at Hus. These victories of Procopius rendered inevitable the assembling of the Council of Basel, which was the only hope of
Europe for the settlement of the Bohemian question, which could not be settled by the sword. With the council, Procopius was willing to negotiate for an honorable peace. In January, 1433, Procopius and fourteen other Bohemian leaders came to Basel to confer with the council. The discussions of which ensued form the most complete statement of the Hussite views. Procopius respected Cardinal Cesarini, the president of the council; and the conference was conducted with moderation and good feeling on both sides. When the conference was over, envoys were sent by the council to a diet in Prague to gauge the feeling of Bohemia. Bohemia, anxious to present a united front to the council, strove to reduce the town of Pilsen, which still held by Catholicism. The siege did not succeed, and a mutiny against Procopius arose in the army. The proud spirit of Procopius was broken; and he retired from the management of affairs in September, 1433. Soon after this, the Bohemian Diet accepted the Compacts as a basis of negotiation with the council. When once the idea of peace prevailed in Bohemia, it spread rapidly; and a party in favor of the restoration of Sigismund as king of Bohemia began to form. The barons of Bohemia and Moravia formed a royal league, and Procopius roused himself to oppose them. In May, 1434, the barons’ army met the Taborites, under Procopius, at Lipan. After a desperate fight, Procopius was defeated and killed. With him fell the power of the Taborites, and the moderate party was thenceforth predominant in the management of Bohemian affairs.

LIT. — The authorities for this period are numerous. The chief may be found in HüFler: Geschichtsschreiber der Hussitischen Bewegung, Vienna, 1856—66, 8 vols.; Palecky: Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hussitenkrieges, von 1419 bis 1436, Prag, 1872—73, 2 vols. The conferences with the Council of Basel are given by various writers in Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium Seculi XV., vol. i., Vienna, 1857. For a careful history of the period, Palecky: Gesch. von Böhmen, vol. iii., Prag, 1866—69, 2 vols. The conferences with the Council of Basel were given by various writers in Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium Seculi XV., vol. i., Vienna, 1857.

PRODICIANS. See TRIDENTINE PROFESSION OF FAITH.

PROFESSIO FIDEI TRIDENTINAE. See TRIDENTINE PROFESSION OF FAITH.

PROLOCUTOR, chairman of a convocation. (See art.)

PROMONIER, César Louis, b. at Geneva, Switzerland, Oct. 19, 1831; d. at sea, Nov. 22, 1873. He was in early life in business in the United States, but, returning, studied theology at Geneva and Berlin. In 1863 he was called to the chair of systematic theology in the Free Church theological seminary, Geneva, as successor to Dr. Gaussen (see art.) and held it till the time of his death. He was a delegate to the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, held in New-York City, October, 1873; was upon the "Ville du Havre" when she collided with the "Loch Earn," and went down with the ship. This disaster created great sympathy in the United States; and a large sum was at once raised for the families of the three delegates to the Alliance Conference. — Pronier, Carrasco, and Cook. See memorial sketch in Evangelical Alliance, New York, 1874, pp. 763—765.

PROPAGANDA. The. I. Definition. — The missionary operations of the Roman-Catholic Church were conducted, from the thirteenth century on, by the different religious orders. The Jesuits were specially active in missionary enterprises; and Ignatius Loyola started the idea of establishing colleges for the training of missionaries from the lands where missionary operations were to be carried on. On June 21, 1532, Gregory XV., the first pupil of the Jesuits who reached the papal dignity, founded the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide (the Society for the Propagation of the Faith). This society, as well as the training institute in its affairs, and the whole missionary system of the Catholic Church, is called the Propaganda. The congregation of the Propaganda includes all the cardinals, and has the entire missionary work of the Church under its supervision. When it undertakes a missionary enterprise, it confines the new field to the care of some religious order, and sends out missionaries under the charge of an apostolical prefect (prefectus apostolicus). As the work advances, the Pope, by reason of his authority as universal bishop, substitutes for the prefect an episcopus in partibus (provincial bishop), who is also called apostolic vicar, and finally, if the success warrants it, establishes a bishopric. On account of the heresy of Protestant lands, they are included, with heathen lands, under the head of missionary territory. Pius IX. even went so far as to establish a congregation of the Propaganda for the Greek Church (pro gli affari di Rite orientale). Protestants, being in the eyes of the Catholic Church heretics, are to be brought into subjection to its discipline. The bishoprics in Germany, North America, England, and Holland, are missionary bishoprics in the sense that their bishops have oversight over the heretical Protestants. The Bishop of Paderborn, in 1864, did not hesitate to call himself "the lawful overseer of the Protestants living in his see." The bishops in these lands are in constant communication with the Propaganda at Rome. The doctrine promulgated by Benedict XIV., and reaffirmed by Pius VI. in 1791, is held in the Catholic Church, that the heathen are not to be forced into obedience to the Church, but that Protestants who have received baptism are so to be forced (sunt cogendi). The Church calls to its help the civil power to secure this end, and, if it should ever gain the supremacy in Germany or any other Protestant country, will fully carry out this policy. — See MEIJER: Zur Propaganda, ihre Provinzen u. ihr Recht, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Deutschland, Göttingen, 1852 sqq.; Bullarium Cong. de Propaganda Fide, Rome, 1839 sqq. — MEIJER.

II. MISSIONARY OPERATIONS AMONG THE HEATHEN. Western Africa. — Roman-Catholic missions in Western Africa in the Middle Ages. The Portuguese discoverers who took these regions in the latter half of the fifteenth century planted the Christian Church through the Dominicans and Franciscans who accompanied them. In the kingdom of Congo the favor of
the king (who became a convert) and the compul-
sion of the Inquisition secured for the Christian
doctrines a pretty wide diffusion. The principal
city of the colony is sold to a bishopric at the end
of the sixteenth century, and gloried in a number
of churches and convents. The Jesuits entered
in 1547, and for a time revived the mission, which
had begun to show signs of decay. But the
gradual departure of the Portuguese was accom-
panied with the decline of Christianity; and when,
in the eighteenth century, all commerce of Euro-
peans with Congo ceased, the land reverted to its
heathen condition. Since the recent expedition of
Stanley, the Catholics have again, under the
protection of the Portuguese flag, entered the old
field. An apostolic prefecture was established in
the French possessions of Senegambia in 1763.
The work has been prosecuted with some vigor
since 1848, when the congregation of the Most
Holy Heart of Mary, established for the conver-
sion of the negroes, took up the work. In the first
ten years, 42 out of 75 missionaries became victims
to the climate. This prefecture has been divided,
and the following four apostolic vicariates estab-
lished: 1. Senegambia, with stations at St. Louis,
Gorée, Dacar, near Cape St. Verde, etc., and in-
cluding, in 1878, 10,000 Catholics; 2. Sierra Leone,
with 1,000 Catholics, who were not, from the
heathen population, but from Protestant congre-
gations; 3. Dahomey, including the so-called Benin
coast; 4. The two Guineas, with Gaboon for its
centre, where the zealous and consecrated Father
(later Bishop) Bessieux established several institu-
tions, which are said to be the most flourishing
on the western coast of Africa. This mission,
which he founded in 1849, had 2,000 adherents
at his death, in 1876. There is also an apostolic
prefecture of Corisco and an apostolic vicariate
of Liberia, which, however, for a number of years,
had existed only on paper.

Southern Africa. — This has been unfruitful
ground for Catholic missions till lately. The
Dutch government and population were very in-
imical to them. The apostolic vicariate of the
Cape Colony was established in 1847, and was
divided nine years later. In 1874 the apostolic
prefecture of Central Cape Colony was founded,
and in 1892 the vicariate of Natal. More effort
has been put forth to gather together the Catholics
among the European emigrants than to convert
the heathen. A seminary has been founded in
Grahamstown for the training of native helpers.
From Natal, work is pushed among the Basutos;
but it does not appear how many of the 700 con-
verts of 1880 had before been rescued from a state
of heathenism by the Protestant society of Paris.
The diocese of Central Cape Colony numbered,
in 1878, 390 adherents. The year previous a sta-
tion was established in Namaqualand, where the
Rhenish missionary society has been laboring for
many years. The most advanced mission-field is
the area on the Upper Zambesi. They began their labors in 1879.

Eastern Africa. — Through the discoveries of
the Portuguese, Christianity was also planted in
this region in Mozambique, Inhambane, etc. In
the kingdom of Monomotapa it prevailed for half
a century. With the decline of the Portuguese,
these missions likewise declined. Since 1863, sta-
tions under the protection of the Sultan of Zanzibar
have been maintained on the island and at
Bagamoyo, where the congregations of the Holy
Spirit and of the Holy Heart of Mary have built
up successful educational institutions. Zanzibar
constitutes an apostolic prefecture. Catholic mis-
sions got a foothold in Abyssinia in the seven-
teenth century, but were subsequently suppressed.
Abyssinia was made an apostolic vicariate in 1853. Of the results of the mission there are no
accessible reports.

Central Africa constitutes an apostolic vicari-
ate. The Jesuits attempted to push forward into
this region in 1848, and occupied Khartoum and
Gondokoro. The missions were abandoned on
account of the murderous climate, but resumed in
1861 by the Franciscans. This second effort has
also failed; and in 1885 only two missionaries were
left at Khartoum, forty (most of them Germans)
having succumbed to the climate. The idea of
converting Africa by Africans was taken up, and
in 1877 an institution was founded near Cairo to
train Africans. Another institution, at Verona,
trains Europeans for the work. The station at
Khartoum was re-enforced in 1872. The Catho-
lics, under the direction of the Archbishop of Al-
giers, have pressed on to the kingdom of Mtesa on
the Victoria Nyanza, where they are seeking to
push up the Church Missionary Society, and to
Lake Tanganyika.

North Africa.— The Franciscans have attempted
to win the Copts in Egypt for the Papal chair. The
Jesuits also undertook the work, and by the close
of the last century 15,000 had been won. In 1887
the apostolic vicariate of Egypt was established.
The archbishopric of Algiers includes the sees of
Oran and Constantine-Hippo. There has been
some missionary activity; and different societies
have been at work among the natives, but with
what results we cannot discover.

African Islands. — Madagascar, the most impor-
tant for Catholic missions, became the scene of
Franciscan labors in 1842. In 1874 the Portu-
guese colony of Port Dauphin was destroyed. In
1892, stimulated by the achievements of the Lon-
don Missionary Society, the apostolic prefect of
Bourbon made a new attempt. In 1844 the Jes-
uits undertook the work, and since that time, or,
more definitely, since 1868, when French influence
began to be felt, have had yearly additions of
1,600 adults and 800 baptized children. These
figures seem to be inexact. Tananarivo is the
headquarters of the mission. Several societies
are laboring in Bourbon, Mauritius, and the Sey-
chelles.

Turning to Asia, we pass over the labors of
Catholic missionaries in Syria, Asia Minor, and
Persia, where the efforts are directed to make con-
verts from the Protestant churches. Of the work
among the Mohammedans there is no report.

British India. — Early in the sixteenth century
we find Franciscans and Dominicans at work at
Goa, which in 1534 gave them the title to a bishopric.
With Francis Xavier, who, accompanied by two
other Jesuits, entered Goa in 1542, began a new
period, — a period of earnest and fruitful effort
amongst the natives. He displayed a rare devo-
tion, labored also in Timemvelly, and is said to
have baptized if the Portuguese in a single month.
Zealous as Xavier was, he succeeded only in build-
in up a nominal Christianity. He left after a
few years of effort, and was followed by other Jesuits, who in 1565 counted in the Portuguese possessions in India 300,000 Christians. Goa was elevated to an archbishopric in 1557. In 1566, in the hope of reaching the Aborigines, the Jesuit Roberto de Nobili published a holy Veda, in which he accommodated Christianity to the Brahmins. It secured, so it is said, the conversion of 30,000 natives; but the principle carried out in the book was condemned by the Pope. The Indian missions subsequently suffered with the decay of the Portuguese power. In the present century new life has been infused into them. There are a number of apostolic vicariates; and the different dioceses are distributed among the Benedictines, Jesuits, and other orders. Missionaries from the Mill-Hill Seminary, near London, have been carrying on work since 1879 in the vicariate of Afghanistan and Beloochistan. The following table gives the statistics of 1879, according to the vicariates:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>106,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaffna</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quilon</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varkapoly</td>
<td>310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagasaki</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay-Puna</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>14,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madura</td>
<td>68,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangalore</td>
<td>84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>243,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,432,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to determine the value of these figures, as all the European Catholics in India, and all the old and nominal Christians, are included in the table. The Catholic schools of India had only 31,436 pupils in 1868, while the Protestant schools a few years later had 115,735.

Farther India.— Malacca was made a bishopric in 1537, after Xavier had labored there for two years. The early missions in Burmah accomplished little. In 1722 it was made an apostolic vicariate. Since 1858 it has been under the control of the Paris Missionary Seminary. It is now divided into three vicariates, with 16,000 Catholics. In 1859 the mission was a flourishing condition in the last century. After a period of lapse, it was revived in 1840. Siam now includes two vicariates,— Nagasaki, with 20,000 Catholics in 1891, and Tokio.

Australia.— A missionary station was established in 1846, by the Benedictines, among the aborigines. It is at New Nursia, West Australia. Spanish monks instruct about 800 natives in the art of agriculture and different trades.

New Zealand, etc.— In 1833 Gregory XVI. organized the apostolic vicariate of Eastern Oceania, and three years later that of Western Oceania. Bishop Pompallier arrived in New Zealand in 1838, planted stations where Protestant missions had borne most fruit, and succeeded in winning 5,000 Maoris in the first twelve years. War deprived the church of these converts, and in 1870 the Bishop of Auckland complained that there was no mission among the Maoris. The missions in New Caledonia, begun in 1843, included, in 1875, 3,000 baptized persons. The Loyalty Islands, which had been a fruitful field for the London Missionary Society, were forcibly annexed by France in 1864. A French Catholic mission entered the country, preceded by French cannon. The natives have proved remarkably faithful, and in 1876 there were only 2,000 Catholics. The Fiji Islands were entered in 1844, and 7,800 Catholics are ascribed to the islands. How many of these are natives is not stated. The apostolic prefect has his residence on Ovalau.

Central Oceanica constitutes an apostolic vicary.
riate. Bataillon started a mission on the Island of Ua in 1836. The whole population of 4,000 is Catholic. The same is true of the population (15,000 souls) of Futuna. The French flag compelled many of the islands to receive the mission. This was the case with the Tuamotu Islands in 1838. But the natives remained true to the Protestant Church. For example, in the northern group there are 6,000 Protestants and only 200 Catholics. On the Samoas, where a mission was started in 1845, there are “about 5,000 converts.” The violent occupation of Tahiti by the Catholics at the time stirred the blood of the Protestant world. In 1836 two priests were expelled from the land; but the French compelled the Protestant queen to re-admit them to her dominions, and to pay a heavy indemnity, and forced her in 1842 to accept a French protectorate. The people rose in revolt against this for foreign injustice, and could only be put down after two years of resistance. The Protestant missionaries, robbed of their influence, left. The whole population was forced to contribute to the cathedral of Papeiti; but, notwithstanding these measures, only 500 converts have been made. The result of many to a semi-heathenish life is due to the violent measures of the Catholics, by which the congregations were robbed of their pastors. A small vessel, “The Vatican,” plies between Tahiti and the adjoining islands. The Marquesas Islands form a vicariate by themselves. Catholic missionaries in 1838 planted themselves at the very station which had been the scene of the hard struggles of a Protestant mission. Under the protectorate of the French flag (1842) earnest efforts have been made to win the islanders, but with little success.

The Hawaiian Islands.—The Catholics succeeded in getting a foothold on this territory of the American Board in 1840. The entire population had at that time renounced heathenism. The mission has been successful, and in 1874 there were 24,000 Catholics on the islands. The success of the mission was due to the devotion of Father Damian Deveuster, who lies in the station of St. Boniface on the Red River. Under these circumstances it is not possible to get a fair conception of the success of Catholic missions. It is a fact, however, that their survival in the middle of this century followed the hard and heroic pioneer work of Protestant missionaries. So far as we can judge, the results of Roman-Catholic missions in this period have been, upon the whole, very small, and disproporioned to the amount of labor spent. The number of converts made in this century would be very small if the multitudes converted at an earlier period were not counted in.

PROPHETIC OFFICE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. The object and signification of the Old Testament prophecy is seen from Deut. xviii. 9-22. Before his death Moses appointed a successor, in the person of Joshua, for the theocracy, and laid down rules for the monarchy, thus indicating, that, with his death, the revelation of the divine will was not to be final, but new organs of revelation were to be expected. The theocratical people was not to be left without a guide, thus being led to take refuge in heathenish divination. And, as the people was unable to bear the terrors of the appearance of God, Jehovah intended to communicate his will to the people through men, by raising from among the people, who occupy an island by themselves, deserves mention.

America.—In America we are brought in contact with the missions among the Indians and negroes. For the United States, see arts. Indians and Roman-Catholic Church in the United States. In the diocese of Quebec, Canada, the Jesuits have been laboring among the Indians since the beginning of the eighteenth century. Perhaps 18,000 Canadian Indians are connected with the Catholic Church. The centre of missionary operations in the diocese of Toronto is the station of St. Boniface on the Red River, established in 1820. The centre in the western diocese of St. Albert is St. Anna, established in 1843. The apostolic vicariate of Athabasca began with a station in 1849.

In Mexico the cross was planted by the bloody hand of Cortez. The first missions were Franciscans, and in the first six years 200,000 heathen were converted. There are now 6,000- 000 Christian Indians in Mexico; but their Christianity is for the most part a nominal profession. The case is similar in Central America, where there are 1,200,000 Catholic Indians. In the West Indies the natives died out, and the negroes were baptized without much preparation. In South America the Jesuits carried on extensive missionary operations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and trained the Indians in the arts of civilized life. With the abolition of the order, the Indians were neglected, and returned to a semi-heathen condition.

We regret to be obliged to renounce the plan of giving a statistical table of Catholic missions. The facts and reports forbid it. The defective ness of the reports seems, in many cases, to be intentional. The successes are frequently exaggerated, and the failures suppressed; while the achievements on the fields cultivated by Protestant societies are magnified and gloried in.

The historic origin of prophecy is connected
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with the foundation of the theocracy (cf. Jer. vii. 23). Moses, in spite of his high position (Num. xii. 6-8), is really the first in the prophetic office (Deut. xxxiv. 10). He is the prophet, not only in the wider sense in which the name nakh was already used by the patriarchs (Gen. xx. 7; Ps. cv. 15), but in the special significance, because he is in possession of that gift of the spirit which makes the prophet (Num. xi. 25).

Side by side with Moses, his sister Miriam is mentioned as a prophetess (Exod. xiv. 20). Josuua is nowhere called Nabi. In the period of the Judges the prophetic office appears in Deborah (Judg. iv. 4, 6, 14). The same book also mentions (vi. 8) a prophet; and 1 Sam. ii. 27, a "man of God," a prophet presumably. The watchman of their leaders were judged in accordance with the divine law. In short, they became the pleads of their leaders were judged in accordance with the divinely inspired prophets. The many prophets which then emerged Samuel brought together, and formed the so-called schools of the prophets, or, rather, prophetic society. That Levites also belonged to this society, we may infer from the fact that not only was Samuel a Levite, but also that sacred music was cultivated in that society, which had its seat at Ramah. We may also assume that sacred literature was cultivated there, as, no doubt, prophetic writing, especially theocratic literarography, commenced with Samuel (cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 20). At that time the foundation may have been laid for that great historic work which is so often mentioned in the books of Kings, and which undoubtedly was known to the chronicle-writer. That the members of the prophetic society did not lead an ascetic life, we learn from Joel (xvi. 17). When a plague visited the country, he brought it about that both priests and people held a fast-day. This is what we should expect of the prophets now exercised. With the institution of the monarchy, Samuel had resigned his judicial and executive function, and the prophets now became watchmen of the theocracy; hence they are called nefilim or metseppim (Mic. vii. 4; Jer. vi. 17; Ezek. iii. 17, xxxiii. 7). The watchmen exercised their functions not only over the people, but also over the monarchy; and the ways of the people and of their leaders were judged in accordance with the divine law. In short, they became the spiritual overseers and theocratic historiographers.

The relation of the prophetic office to the monarchy is shown in the behavior of Samuel towards Saul (cf. 1 Sam. xv. 11, xvi. 1; and Samuel's word (1 Sam. xv. 22) is, so to say, the programme for the position of the prophetic office to the sacrificial cult. After the election of David in the place of Saul, Samuel retired to Ramah for the remainder of his life, in which he had no intercourse (1 Sam. xxviii. 6). It seems, however, that they were on good terms with David; and Gad the prophet (1 Sam. xxi. 5), who is mentioned beside Nathan, probably belonged to the society at Ramah. The chief musicians appointed by David (1 Chron. xxv. 1, 6; 2 Chron. xxxii. 36; xxvii. 5), the latter of whom prophets and seers, must not be placed in the same line with Gad and Nathan, although the sacred song emanating from the heart moved by the Divine Spirit may be called prophesying.

Under Solomon the prophetic office for a time stood in the background, until towards the end of his reign, when his heart was inclined to apostasy, the warning voice of the prophet, perhaps of Ahijah the Shilonite, was heard (1 Kings xi. 11-13). The great influence which the prophetic office still exercised among the people may be seen from what we read of the prophet Shemaiah (1 Kings xii. 21 sq.; 2 Chron. xi. 2). In the following centuries the activity of the prophetic office was mainly in the kingdom of the ten tribes, the history of which was mainly the conflict between the prophets and the apostatized kings. That prominent prophets had their circles, where they gathered their friends and disciples (cf. 1 Sam. vi. 18), and where, in the midst of the apostasy of the people, the Divine Word was studied, and transmitted to future generations. We therefore only meet with individual prophets in the history of the kingdom of Judah. Thus under Rehoboam we find Shemaiah (2 Chron. xii. 5 sq.); under Asa, Azariah, the son of Oded (2 Chron. xv. 1), and Hanani (xvi. 7). Under Jehoshaphat we find Jehu, the son of Hanani (xix. 2), and Eliezer (xx. 37). During Jehoshaphat's reign the work of the priests seems to have been of more influence than that of the prophets, as may be seen from 2 Chron. xiv. 7 sq., where, among those who were sent about to teach the people, no prophets are mentioned, but priests acted harmoniously, we see from Joel, who belonged to the earlier period of the reign of Joash. When a plague visited the country, he brought it about that both priests and people held a fast-day. In the latter part of Joash's reign lived Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, the first martyr of the prophets of Judah (2 Chron. xxiv. 19 sq.). Under Joash's successor, Amaziah, two prophets (2 Chron. xxv.) are mentioned. Taken all in all, the work of the prophets in Judah, with the exception of Isaiah, was of less effect than that of the prophets in the kingdom of the ten tribes.

With Joel, or perhaps with Obadiah, i.e., in the first decades of the ninth century B.C., the beginning was already made with the writings of prophetic books. The older prophets also had uttered prophecies, which were written down in the prophetic books of history. The basis of the prophetic books of history was the ancient prophecies in the older testimonia of revelation; but, whilst the former prophets had more regard for the present of the kingdom of God, the prophetic word now views the future. Despised and mistrusted by the contemporaries, the prophetic word in its historic fulfilment was to legitimate to future generations God's truthfulness, and was intended as a guide to the pious. For
this reason, the word of the prophets had to be transmitted faithfully, which could only be done in writing. This writing down is referred to by the prophets as having been done at divine command (Isa. viii. 1; Hab. ii. 2 sq.; Jer. xxxvi. 2), and, by expressly emphasizing the object of the writing, to show to coming generations the truth of the prophecy (Isa. xxx. 8; Jer. xxx. 2, 3; Isa. xxvi. 1 sq.). In this writing down follows the oral utterance in order to confirm the latter, and where sometimes (Isa. viii. 1 sq.; perhaps Isa. xxx. 8 belongs here also) it was sufficient to note down before witnesses the more salient points. In general, however, the literary activity is independent from the oral preaching; and prophets (like Amos, Hosea, Micah) probably did not write down their prophetic utterances till towards the close of their life, thus transmitting to the world in a formulated order a totality of their prophetic office. That some literary productions have been lost, we may infer from the reference of the writing-down to old sources, as Isa. ii. 2-4; Mic. iv. 1-4; Isa. xv. sq. But, on the other hand, we perceive herein an important peculiarity of prophetic literature; viz., the connection which exists between the prophetic books, in so far as the younger prophets in a great many instances looked up the utterances of the older prophets, and made them their own, enlarged and developed the same. Thus, e.g., Amos i. 3 follows Joel iii. 18; the younger Micah takes up the close of the discourse of the older (1 Kings xxii. 28). Almost throughout all prophets, especially in Zephaniah and Jeremiah, we find allusions and references to former prophetic works; but herein we perceive the unity of the spirit in which the prophets stand, who, in spite of the changes of times, followed up this one unity of the word of God which they proclaimed; thus also proving the lasting validity of the not yet fulfilled prophecies.

As has already been indicated, the work of Isaiah was of the greatest effect in the kingdom of Judah. At the beginning of his ministry, Judah was in the zenith of her power, brought about under the powerful reigns of Uzziah and Jotham. And although these kings in general preserved the theocratic order, yet the moral and religious condition of the people was less pleasing; since corruption, idolatry, and other vices had taken a hold upon the people, especially upon the higher classes. In connection with this we find a degenerated priesthood (Mic. iii. 11; Isa. xxviii. 7), which, together with a number of false prophets and flattering demagogues, strengthened the people in their sins (Isa. ix. 14 sq.; xxvii. 7; Mic. iii. 11, iii. 5). After Isaiah had already announced under Jotham the coming of the great day of Jehovah (Isa. ii.—vi.), his public activity, as far as we can see from his own book (vii.), commences under Ahaz, in that critical moment when the political question of the day. Whilst Jeremiah, who in propheticspirit recognized the divine mission of the Chaldean power, exhort to a faithfulness adherence to the oath sworn to the heathenish power, the false prophets exorted to break the Chaldean yoke (Jer. xxvi., xxviii.) by making a union with Nebuchadnezzar. The false prophet who thus opposed Jeremiah was Hananiah. In the captivity, also, the Jews were led astray by Ahaziah, Zedekiah, and Shemaiah, against whom Jeremiah also lifted up his voice in warning the people (cf. Jer. xxix. and Ezek. xiii. 9). It is remarkable, that, according to Ezek. xiii. 17—23, the false prophets were mainly women; for, though the female seer was not altogether excluded from the prophetic gift, yet prophetesses were exceptional cases in those eminent men of God, of which Jeremiah, amidst many sufferings, carried on till the dissolution of the kingdom, he stood alone as prophet in Jerusalem, assisted only by his companion and pupil, Baruch, in the writing-down and proclaiming of his prophecies. But outside of Jerusalem, in his captivity, the prophet Ezekiel was his contemporary fellow-laborer, whose fifth year of his captivity, was called to the prophetic office. Ezekiel's position among the
exiles is to be compared with that of the prophets among the ten tribes. Without a temple and sacrifice, he is to the people the nucleus for preaching the Divine Word, and giving them prophecies, which continually had Israel's future mission in view, whose laws, especially the sabbath, were observed, which could be kept even in heathen lands. These observances were, so to say, a fence for the people, scattered among the nations, against heathenish customs. This must be especially held in view in order to understand Ezekiel and his junior contemporary Daniel. It is true, that the former often speaks of usages and customs (cf. iv. 14, xx. 15); but he does not regard the sanctification of the people in such formalities, as may be seen from the manner in which he exercises his prophetic office, and from his prophecies, according to which the restitution of Israel was mainly conditioned through the outpouring of that spirit which creates a new heart (xi. 19, xxxvi. 28), and which was to follow, by a new outpouring. 

During that long intervening time, it is Israel's calling to preserve in itself the root of the future temple. When despondency took hold on the people, and the better ones doubted whether Israel could still hope for forgiveness of sins, and fulfilment of the divine promises, Haggai and Zechariah were called (xxiv. 1, xi. 1, viii. 19). 

As to the activity of Israel's watchmen (cf. Isa. lii. 8, etc.) after the return of the people to the Holy Land, we know nothing. Our knowledge of the post-exile activity of the prophets commences with the period of the Maccabees, which began with the interruption of the building of the temple. When dependency took hold on the people, and the better ones doubted whether Israel could still hope for forgiveness of sins, and fulfilment of the divine promises, Haggai and Zechariah were called (xxiv. 1, xi. 1, viii. 19). 

The prophetic office in the exile was not only a righteousness through works, it must not be overlooked, that, in all these instances (as in i. 8 sq., iv. 24, vi. 11), Daniel's adherence to the faith of the laws of his fathers is expressed; and that he did not intend to teach the religion of ceremonies may be seen from his penitential prayer (ix. 4 sq.). 

The prophetic office in the exile was not only a righteousness through works, it must not be overlooked, that, in all these instances (as in i. 8 sq., iv. 24, vi. 11), Daniel's adherence to the faith of the laws of his fathers is expressed; and that he did not intend to teach the religion of ceremonies may be seen from his penitential prayer (ix. 4 sq.).

As to the activity of Israel's watchmen (cf. Isa. lii. 8, etc.) after the return of the people to the Holy Land, we know nothing. Our knowledge of the post-exile activity of the prophets commences with the period of the Maccabees, which began with the interruption of the building of the temple. When dependency took hold on the people, and the better ones doubted whether Israel could still hope for forgiveness of sins, and fulfilment of the divine promises, Haggai and Zechariah were called (xxiv. 1, xi. 1, viii. 19). 

The prophetic office in the exile was not only a righteousness through works, it must not be overlooked, that, in all these instances (as in i. 8 sq., iv. 24, vi. 11), Daniel's adherence to the faith of the laws of his fathers is expressed; and that he did not intend to teach the religion of ceremonies may be seen from his penitential prayer (ix. 4 sq.).

As to the activity of Israel's watchmen (cf. Isa. lii. 8, etc.) after the return of the people to the Holy Land, we know nothing. Our knowledge of the post-exile activity of the prophets commences with the period of the Maccabees, which began with the interruption of the building of the temple. When dependency took hold on the people, and the better ones doubted whether Israel could still hope for forgiveness of sins, and fulfilment of the divine promises, Haggai and Zechariah were called (xxiv. 1, xi. 1, viii. 19).
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PROPHETS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

From Matt. xxiii. 34 (cf. Luke xi. 49) we learn, 
that, after the ascension of Christ, prophets were 
to come who would proclaim, especially to the 
Jewish people, the truth of the salvation as it is 
now coming to pass, and that such a one, who is 
and which says unto the cities or Judah, "Behold 
you murderers, which said unto the cities of Judah, "Behold 
you murderers, which said unto the cities of Judah, "Behold 
who went about in Judaea, Samaria, Galilee, and 
preached the word of God to the Jews.

In transferring the office of the Church to her 
members, we thus get the wide range in which 
the idea of the New-Testament prophecy is to be 
taken. It corresponds entirely with Deut. xviii. 
18 sq.; and thus a prophet is such a one, who is 
called by the spirit of God, here by the spirit of 
Jews Christ, to become the organ of communicating 
the truth in such a manner that his testimony, 
with convincing power of the truth, proves itself 
to the hearers as the word of God (2 Cor. 
ii. 14-17). The prophetic illumination comprises 
the contents and form of the speech (Matt. x. 19, 
20). It does not exclude the subjective activity of 
the prophets, but includes it (1 Cor. xiv. 22), 
and lifts it up beyond the natural degree of 
knowledge and faculty, and renders it serviceable 
to the higher purposes of the Holy Spirit. The 
object of prophecy is the edification of the congrega 
tion (1 Cor. xiv. 4), and this also must be taken 
in the widest sense.

In the Acts of the Apostles, mention is made of 
the following, as men of prophetic calling: 
Agabus (xi. 28), Barnabas, Simeon Niger, Lucius 
of Cyrene, Manaen, and Saul (xiii. 1), from among 
whom Barnabas and Saul were separated for the 
work whereunto the Holy Ghost had called them. 
Judas and Silas, who were sent with Barnabas 
and Paul to Antioch (xx. 23-29), were also prophets; 
and prophetic faculties were also given to 
the four virgin daughters of Philip (xx. 9). 

The charismata of prophecy was not limited to 
these individuals. It was found in the congrega 
tions of the apostolic times everywhere. Where 
ever Paul speaks of the gifts, offices, faculties, of the 
Church (Rom. xii. 6-8; 1 Cor. xii.-xiv.; Ephes. 
iv. 11; 1 Thess. v. 20), he also mentions the 
prophets immediately after the apostles (1 Cor. 
xxii. 28; Ephes. iv. 11). He distinguishes be 
tween prophets and evangelists, pastors, teachers. 
As to their activity in the congregations, cf. 1 Cor. 
xiv. 1, 8, 5, 19, 29-38. Excluded from public 
speaking, as well as from prophesying, were 
women (1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35).

As to the contents of the prophetic speech, 
we have no particulars; but, in order to find out 
the pureness and divine origin of such communica 
tions, the Church had the gift of discerning of 
spirits (1 Cor. xii. 10) which accompanied prophecy 
(xiv. 29), and for which a canon was laid down 
(1 John iv. 1-5). Although the apostolic rule of 
discerning of spirits already shows that the warn 
ing words of Jesus (Matt. vii. 15, 22, xxiv. 4 sq. 
23 sq.) were already fulfilled at a very early time 
(Acts xx. 30; Rev. ii. 20), the Apocalypse of St. 
John was certainly intended to be the keystone of 
New-Testament prophecy; since, after the death of 
the apostles, prophecy makes room for the 
use of the writings of the New Testament, which 
ever since have become the rule of faith for the 
believers. To the believer the more sure word of 
prophecy (2 Pet. i. 19) must be sufficient, which 
shineth as a light in this dark place, until the day 
dawn, and the daystar arise. K. BURGER.

PROPITIATION. A sacrifice offered to God to 
render him propitious. Such an effectualsacrifice 
was Jesus Christ; he is therefore our propi 
tiation. For the doctrinal statements, see ATONE 
MENT.
PROSELYTES OF THE JEWS. At all times there were non-Israelites, who, by conversion to the God of Israel, were incorporated into the people of Israel. They must be distinguished from the so-called strangers, who, either for a time or permanently, resided among Israel, and the number of whom amounted, in the time of David and Solomon, to 153,800 (2 Chron. ii. 17). Many of these strangers became adherents of Jehovah, and became circumcised in the house of the household of Israel. Slaves who were circumcised, and partook of the Paschal lamb (Exod. xii. 44), may also be called proselytes. The children of a heathenish slave born in the house were circumcised; but, according to rabbinic interpretation, they were not yet like a free-born. According to Jebamoth (fol. 46, col. i.), the master, in case he held of Israel. Slaves who were circumcised, may also be called proselytes. The children of a heathen, was to make it known in the act of baptism by putting around him a chain. The baptism did not mean liberty, but servitude: it coupled with it (Gal. v. 3) the whole Mosaic ceremonial law: they thereby become "sons of Israel," and "Israelites in every respect," and are called also "complete Israelites." When a proselyte asked for admission, he was first catechised as to his motives. If these were satisfactory, he was first instructed as to the divine protection of the Jewish people, and then circumcised — only when he was a male — in the presence of three teachers. In the case of a convert already circumcised, it was still necessary to draw a few drops of "the blood of the covenant." A special prayer accompanied the act of circumcision. The proselyte then takes a new name, opening the Hebrew Bible, and accepting the first that came. But the convert was still a "stranger;" and, unless he had been baptized, his children are counted as bastards, i.e., aliens. To complete his admission, baptism was required. When the wound caused by circumcision was healed, he was stripped of all his clothes in the presence of the three witnesses who had acted as his teachers, and who now acted as his sponsors, the "fathers" of the proselyte, and led into the pool or tank. As he stood there, up to his neck in water, they repeated the great commandments of the law. These he promised and vowed to keep; and then, with an accompanying benediction, he plunged under the water. A female proselyte was conducted to the tank by three women, while the three teachers stood outside at the door, reading to her aloud the promises and vows of the law. A new name was given to her after baptism. By baptism the proselyte became a new creature. All natural relationships were cancelled. As long as the temple stood, baptism was followed by the offering of a sacrifice consisting of two turtle-doves or pigeons. After the destruction, a vow to offer it as soon as the temple should be rebuilt was substituted.

As to the proselytes of the gate, also known as the "sojourners" (Lev. xxxv. 47), they were not bound by circumcision and the other special laws of the Mosaic code, but obliged themselves to observe the so-called "seven precepts" of Noah: (1) against idolatry, (2) against blaspheming, (3) against bloodshed, (4) against uncleanness, (5) against theft, (6) of obedience, with (7) the prohibition of flesh with the blood thereof. Whoever wished to become a proselyte of the gate had to declare it solemnly; last surviving proselytes became contemptible to the Jews themselves. In the Talmud they are spoken of as dangerous to Israel as leprosy, preventing the coming of the Messiah. The proselytes, says the Talmud, were the cause that the Jews made the golden calf, and (Num. xi.). Abaelom's behavior was caused by his mother, Maacha, whom David made a proselyte. But there were not wanting those who praised the proselytes. That there were many Jewish converts from among the Greeks and Romans, who exercised a Jewish influence, we see from Cicero, Pro Flacco, orq. i. 9, sqq., 4, 142; Juvenal, 14, 96 sq.; Tacitus, Ann., 2, 85, Hist., 5, 5; Seneca, De supern.; Dio Cassius, 37, 17. A catalogue of proselytes mentioned by ancient writers is given by Caussé in Museum Hagganum, i. 540 sqq. The rabbis distinguished proselytes of righteousness and proselytes of the gate. The proselytes of righteousness receive circumcision, and with it (Gal. v. 3) the whole Mosaic ceremonial law: they thereby become "sons of Israel," and "Israelites in every respect," and are called also "complete Israelites."
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PROSERPINE-TAufe, Berlin, 1828. The Talmudic treatise concerning proselytes (Massrecheth Gerit) has been published by R. Kirchheim, in Septem libri Talmudici partil Hierosolymitani, Frankfurt-on-the-Main, 1851. (DELITZSCH.)

PROSPER OF AQUITANIA, the ardent literary champion of Augustine. Of his personal life very little is known. He was born in Aquitania, and probably in the last decade of the fourth century. He died in Rome, but the date of his death is not known. He received the ordinary rhetorical education. As a theologian he became a pupil of Augustine; and, though he never made the personal acquaintance of his master, he clung to him with unwearied perseverance. From 428 to 434 he lived in Southern Gaul, in intimate converse with the monastic settlements of Provence, more especially of Marselles. There he became acquainted with a set of views very different from those he had adopted from Augustine; and he opened the Semi-Pelagian controversy (429) by his letter to Augustine, giving an account of those views, and asking him to interfere. He himself wrote, before the death of Augustine, his epistle to Aegidius of Bordeaux, and his poem on the death of Augustine, he wrote in his defence, Pro Augustino responsiones, and was generally considered as the leading representative of the Augustinian views.

Two Genoese priests addressed a number of questions to him concerning difficult passages in the works of Augustine, and he answered them by his Responsiones ad excerpta Gennensium. A work of similar character is his Responsiones ad capitulo objectionum Vincentianorum; the author, probably, being Vincentius of Lerius, who was a Semi-Pelagian. But, in spite of his zeal and industry, Prosper did not succeed in converting the Massiliotes to the Augustinian views. In 432 he visited Rome, to induce Pope Celestine I. to interfere; in the next year he published his last instalment in the controversy, De gratia Dei elliberaarbilrio; and in 434 he moved to Rome. There he finished his Chronicle, one of his principal works. The first part (to 378) is only an extract from Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine: the second part (to 455) is original, and written, as the book itself shows, partly in Gaul, and partly in Rome. He also wrote a book of epigrams, and a Liber Sententiarum, or "Collection of Gems," from Augustine. The best edition of his works is that by Le Brun and Mangante, Paris, 1711.

Hauck.

PROTESTANTEN-VEREIN (Protestant Union), a voluntary organization of rationalistic ministers and professors in Germany. It was formed in 1863, and fairly started June 7 and 8, 1865, at Eisenach. Since 1867 it has had yearly meetings. But it has come into such strong opposition to the orthodox and conservative tendencies of the German Church authorities, that it has had to fight for its life. See Holtzmann u. Zöpfel: Lexikon für Theologie u. Kirchengesch., Leipzig, 1876, s. a. a. a.

PROTESTANTISM. See REFORMATION.

PROTEVANGELIUM. See APOCRYPHA.

PROTONOTARIUS APPOSTOLICUS. According to later accounts, Bishop Clement of Rome first appointed a notary (notarius regionarius) in each of the seven wards of the city, for the purpose of drawing up an official record of the deeds and sufferings of the martyrs. These notaries belonged to the clergy of the city. They were appointed by the Pope; and, when it proved necessary to increase their number, the seven original notaries were distinguished by the title Protonotarum Apostolici. In course of time they obtained other distinctions and great revenues. They even claimed to take precedence of the bishops, which, however, Pius II. denied them by the breve of June 1, 1459. They formed a college of their own, and their number was by Sixtus V. increased to twelve. In the papal chapel they sat on the second tier; but in the consistories, where four of them must be present, they sit beside the Pope; and their signature is necessary to the validity of any document which concerns the whole Roman-Catholic Church. See BANGN: Die romische Curie, Münster, 1854.

PROTO-PRESBYTER, or PROTO-POPE, corresponds, in the Greek-Russian Church, to the arch-priest of the Church of Rome, denoting an intermediate officer between the bishop and the priests. There is a proto-presbyter or proto-pope at each cathedral; and, as far as he exercises a kind of superintendence over the parishes, his position resembles that of the dean. He is not bound to remain unmarried.

PROUDFOOT, William, S. T. P., b. in the parish of Manor, Peeblesshire, Scotland, May 22, 1788; d. in London, C. W., Jan. 16, 1851. He was the son of pious, godly parents, and from a child knew the Scriptures. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, where he was distinguished alike for his rare natural endowments and for the extent and variety of his attainments. After leaving the university, he attended a full course of five sessions at the theological hall of the Secession Church, at that time under the charge of the venerated and venerable Dr. Lawson, many of whose students lived to do him honor, and none more than the gifted and learned Mr. Proudfoot. About the age of twenty-five he was ordained as pastor of the congregation of Pitrodie, in Fife, where for nearly twenty years he labored as an earnest and able minister. He took a deep and lively interest in all questions connected with the government and extension of the church. His lofty intellectual powers, his rich mental culture, and vast and varied acquirements, fitted him for a prominent place among his fellow-laborers in any sphere. When, in 1832, the United Secession Church resolved to establish a mission in Canada, Mr. Proudfoot was one of three chosen to go out as pioneers. On his arrival, he went west as far as London, then only a city of the future. The entire region was only being opened up for settlement. For many years he visited different sections of the country; the roads often almost impassable, and accommodations of any kind of the most primitive style. From his mature age, personal dignity, high character, and great force of will, he was recognized as a leader, a patriarch, an apostle, fully acknowledged by his brethren to be primus inter pares. He was chosen clerk of the synod, and, except when acting as moderator, filled that office with great judiciousness and tact. He was wise in counsel, as well as efficient in action; and his opinions had great weight in any deliberative assembly. In 1844 he was unanimously chosen...
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the first professor of theology in that branch of the church; and most ably and satisfactorily did he discharge the duties of that office till his decease. On the occurrence of that sad event, the church felt deeply the sore bereavement; and the synod, regretting the high estimate they entertained of his eminent talents, his varied erudition, and manifold services. Mr. Proudfoot was a man of commanding presence, of great personal power, and force of character. In debate his spirit was candid, his argument cogent, his language incisive, his invective sometimes sarcastic and scathing. As a theologian, he was scholarly and profound; as a scholar, erudite and accurate; as a preacher, instructive and impressive; as a teacher, clear, logical, and inspiring. It is a matter of painful regret that the treasures which he left in neatly written manuscripts have never been published; but it is not yet too late to hope that his memoir, and some of his discourses and sermons, may enrich the theological literature of the Dominion.

William Ormiston.

PROVERBS OF SOLOMON. I. The External Plan of the Book of Proverbs, and its own Testimony as to its Origin. — The internal superscription of the book, which recommends it, after the manner of later Oriental books, on account of its importance, and the general utility of its contents, extends from verse 1 to 6; with verse 7 the book itself begins. The book is described as "the proverbs of Solomon," and then there is annexed the statement of its object, which, as summarily set forth in verse 2, is practical, and that in a twofold way, — partly moral (3-5), and partly intellectual (6). The former presents moral edification, moral sentiments for acceptance, not merely to help the unwise to attain to wisdom, but also to assist the wise. The latter seeks by its contents to strengthen and discipline the mind to the understanding of thoughtful discourses generally: in other words, it seeks to gain the moral ends which proverbial poetry aims at, and at the same time to make it familiar; so that the reader, in these proverbial proverbs of Solomon, or by means of them as of a key, learn to understand much like apothegms in general. Thus understood, the title of the book does not say that the book contains proverbs of other wise men besides those of Solomon: if it did, it would contradict itself. It is possible that the book contains also non-Solomonic proverbs, possible that the author of the title of the book added such to it himself; but the title presents to view only the proverbs of Solomon. If i. 7 begins the book, then, after reading the title, we cannot think otherwise than that here begin the Solomonic proverbs. If we read farther, the contents of the book, or of the part of the book added such to it itself; but the title presents to view only the proverbs of Solomon. If i. 7 begins the book, then, after reading the title, we cannot think otherwise than that here begin the Solomonic proverbs. If we read farther, the contents of the book, or of the part of the book added such to it itself; but the title presents to view only the proverbs of Solomon. So much the more are we astonished when we meet at x. 1 with a new superscription, which is followed to xxii. 16 by a long succession of proverbs of quite a different tone and form, — short maxims (washaks proper); while in the preceding parts of the book the words of wisdom were of the second kind than monitory discourses. What, now, must be our opinion when we look back from this second superscription to the part (i. 7-ix.) which immediately follows the title of the book? Are i. 7-ix., in the sense of the book, not the proverbs of Solomon? From the title of the book, which declares them to be so, we must judge that they are. Or are they proverbs of Solomon? In this case the new superscription (x. 1) appears altogether incomprehensible. And yet only one of the two is possible. On the one side, therefore, there must be a false appearance of contradiction, which in a closer investigation disappears. But on which side is it? If it is supposed that the tenor of the title (i. 1-6) does not accord with that of section x. 1-xxii. 10, but that it accords well with that of i. 7-ix., then Ewald's view is probable, that i.-ix. was originally one whole, intended to serve as an introduction to the larger Solomonic Book of Proverbs, beginning at x. 1. But it is also possible that the author of the title has adopted the style of section i. 7-ix. The introductory section (i. 7-ix.) and the larger section (x.-xxii. 10) are followed by a third section (xxii. 17-xxiv. 22), which again is followed by a short fourth section (xxiv. 23-34), a kind of an appendix to the third, bearing the superscription, "These things also belong to the wise." The proverbs of Solomon begin again at xxx. 1, extending to xxix. This fifth portion of the book has a superscription similar to that of the preceding appendix, commencing, "Also [32] these are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, collected." The Hebrew word translated "collected" denotes "to remove from their place," and means that the men of Hezekiah removed from the place where they found them the following proverbs, and put them together in a separate collection. The words have thus been understood by the Greek translator. The Hezekiah gleanings of Solomonic proverbs are followed by two appendices, the authors of which are given: the first (xxx.) is by "Agur the son of Jakeh," the second (xxxi. 1-9), by a "King Lemuel." In so far the superscriptions are clear. The names of the authors, elsewhere unknown, point to a foreign country; and to this corresponds the peculiar complication of these series of proverbs. As a third appendix to the Hezekiah collection (xxxi. 10 sq.), follows a complete alphabetical proverbial poem in praise of a virtuous woman.

By reviewing the whole argument, we see that the Book of Proverbs divides itself into the following parts: 1. The title of the book (i. 1-6), by which the question is raised, how far the book extends to which it originally belongs; 2. The introductory discourses (i. 7-ix.), in which it is a question whether the Solomonic proverbs begin with these, or whether they are only the introduction thereto, composed by a different author, perhaps the author of the title of the book; 3. The first great collection of Solomonic proverbs (xxi. 10 sq.); 4. The second great collection, the "words of the wise" (xxii. 17-xxiv. 22); 5. The second appendix, supplement of the words of some wise men (xxiv. 23 sq.); 6. The second great collection of Solomonic proverbs, which the "men of Hezekiah" collected (xxv.-xxix.); 7. The first appendix to this second collection, the words of Agur (xxx.); 8. The second appendix, the words of King Lemuel (xxxi. 1-9); 9. Third appendix, the acrostic ode (xxxi. 10 sq.). These nine parts may be comprehended under three groups: the introductory hortatory discourses with the general title at their head, and the two great collections of Solomonic proverbs, with their two appendices.
In prosecuting our farther investigations, we shall consider the several parts of the book, first from the point of view of the manifold forms of their proverbs, then of their style, and, thirdly, of their type of doctrine.

11. The Several Parts of the Book of Proverbs with Respect to the Manifold Forms of the Proverbs.

— That the Book of Proverbs is not a collection of popular sayings, we see from the fact that it does not contain proverbs of one line each. It is, indeed, probable that popular proverbs are partly wrought into these proverbs, and many of their forms of expression are moulded after the popular proverbs; but, as they thus lie before us, they are, as a whole, the production of the technical mashal poetry. The simplest form is, according to the fundamental peculiarity of the Hebrew verse, the distich. The relation of the two lines to each other is very manifold. The second line may repeat the thought of the first, only in a somewhat altered form, in order to express this thought as clearly and exhaustively as possible. Such proverbs we call synonymous distichs; as, e.g., xi. 25:

"A soul of blessing is made fat;
And he that watereth others is himself watered."

Or the second line contains the other side of the contrast to the statement of the first: the truth spoken in the first is explained in the second by means of the presentation of its contrary. Such proverbs we call antithetic distichs; as, e.g., x. 1:

"A wise son maketh his father glad,
And a foolish son is his mother's grief."

Sometimes it is two different truths that are expressed in the two lines; and the authorization of their union lies only in a certain relationship, and the ground of this union, in the circumstance that two lines are the minimum of the technical proverb — synthetic distichs; as, e.g., x. 18:

"A cloak of hatred are lying lips;
And he that speaketh slander is a fool."

Sometimes one line does not suffice to bring out the thought intended, the begun expression of which is only completed in the second. These we call integral (eingedankige) distichs; as, e.g., xi. 31 (cf. 1 Pet. iv. 18):

"The righteous shall be recompensed on the earth:
How much more the ungodly and the sinner!"

But there is also a fifth form, which corresponds most to the original character of the mashal; the proverb explaining its ethical object by a resemblance from the region of the natural and everyday life, the parabolé proper. The form of this parabolic proverb is very manifold, according as the poet himself expressly compares the two subjects, or only places them near each other in order that the hearer or reader may complete the comparison. The proverb is least poetic when the similarity of the two subjects is expressed by a verb; as xxvii. 15 (to which, however, verse 16 belongs):

"A continual dropping in a rainy day,
And a contentious woman, are alike."

The usual form of expression, neither unpoeetic nor properly poetic, is the introduction of the comparison by kēn ("as"), and of the similitude in the second clause by ken ("so"); as x. 20:

"As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes,
So is the sluggard to them who give him a commission."

This complete verbal state of the relation of similarity may also be abbreviated by the omission of the ken, as xxv. 13, xxvi. 11:

"As a dog returning to his vomit,
A fool returning to his folly."

We call the parabolic proverbs of these three forms comparisons. The last, the abbreviated form of the comparative proverb, forms the transition to another kind of parabolic proverb, which we call, in contradistinction to the comparative, the emblematic, in which the contrast and its emblem are loosely placed together, without any nearer expression of the similitude. This takes place either by means of the copulative ken, as xxv. 25:

"Cold water to a thirsty soul,
And good news from a far country,"

or without the ken; in which case the second line is as the subscription under the figure or double figure painted in the first; e.g., xi. 22:

"A gold ring in a swine's snout,
A fair woman, and without understanding."

These ground forms of two lines can, however, expand into forms of several lines. Since the distich is the peculiar and most appropriate form of the technical proverb, so, when two lines are not sufficient for expressing the thought intended, the multiplication to four, six, or eight lines, is most natural. In the tetrastich, the relation of the last two to the first two is as manifold as is the relation of the second line to the first in the distich. There is, however, no suitable example of four-lined stanzas in antithetic relation: but we meet with synonymous tetrastichs, e.g., xxii. 15 sq.; xxiv. 3 sq.; xxv. 28 sq.; synthetic, xxx. 8 sq.; integral, xxx. 17 sq.; comparative, xxvi. 18 sq.; and emblematical, xxx. 4 sq.

Proportionally the most frequently occurring are tetrastichs, the second half of which forms a proof clause commencing with kēt or kēn. Among the less frequent are the six-lined, presenting (xxiii. 1-3, xiv. 11 sq.) one and the same thought in manifold aspects, with proofs interpersed. Among all the rest which are found in the collection (xxiii. 12-14, 19-21, 26-28, xxx. 16 sq., xxx. 29-31), the first two lines form a prologue introductory to the substance of the proverbs; as, e.g., xxiii. 12-14:

"Oh, let instruction enter into thine heart,
And apply thine ear to the words of knowledge.
Withhold not correction from the child;
For, if thou beatest him with the rod, he dies not.
Thou shalt beat him with the rod,
And deliver his soul from hell."

Similarly formed, but more expanded, is the eight-lined stanza (xxiii. 22-28), the only one which is found from the tenth chapter on. Here the mashal proverb already inclines to the mashal ode; for this octastich may be regarded as a short mashal song, like the alphabetical mashal psalm (Ps. xxxvii.), which consists of almost pure tetrastichs. We have now seen how the distich form mutiples itself into forms consisting of four, six, and eight lines; but it also unfolds itself into forms of three, five, and seven
Tristichs arise when the thought of the first line is repeated (xxvii. 22) in the second, according to the synonymous scheme; or when the thought expressed in one or two lines (xxv. 8, xxvii. 10), there is added its proof. The parabole scheme is here represented when the object described is unfolded in two lines, as in the comparison xxv. 13, or when its nature is portrayed by two figures in two lines, as in the emblematic proverb xxv. 20:

"To take off clothing in cold weather,
Vinegar upon nitre.
And he that singeth songs to a heavy heart."

In the few instances of penticstichs which are found, the last three lines usually unfold the reason of the thought of the first two (xxii. 4 sq., xxv. 6 sq., xxx. 32 sq.): to this, xxiv. 13 forms an exception, where the keth before the last three lines introduces the expansion of the figure in the first two. As an instance we quote xxv. 6 sq.:

"Seek not to display thyself in the presence of the king.
And stand not in the place of the great;
For better that it be said unto thee, Come up hither.
Than that they humble thee in the presence of the prince,
While thine eyes have raised themselves."

Of heptastichs there is only one example in the collection; viz., xxiii. 6-8:

"Eat not the bread of the jealous,
And lust not after his dainties;
Thy morsel which thou hast eaten must thou vomit up,
And thou hast wasted thy pleasant words."

From this heptastich, which one will scarcely take for a brief mashal ode, according to the compound strophe scheme, we see that the proverb of two lines can expand itself to the dimensions of seven and eight lines. Beyond these limits the parabolic scheme is here represented when the object described is unfolded in two lines, as in the comparison xxvii. 13, or when its nature is portrayed by two figures in two lines, as in the emblematic proverb xxv. 20:

"There are six kings which Jahve hateth,
And seven are an abhorrence to his soul
Haughty eyes ... brethren."

Such numerical proverbs, to which the name middak has been given by later Jewish writers, are found in xxx. We may also mention the mashal chain; i.e., the ranging together, in a series, proverbs of a similar character, such as the chain of proverbs regarding the fool (xxvi. 1-12), the sluggard (xxvi. 13-16), the talebearer (xxvi. 20-22), the malicious (xxv. 22-28): but this form belongs more to the technics of the mashal collection than to that of the mashal poetry.

On examining the separate parts of the book, we find, that, in the introductory pedagogic part (i.-xxix.), there is exceedingly little of the technical form of the mashal, as well as generally of technical form at all. It consists, not of proper mashals, but of fifteen mashal odes, or rather, perhaps, mashal discourses, didactic poems of the mashal kind. The second part (xxxii.-xxxii. 16), containing three hundred and seventy-five proverbs, consists, for the most part, of distichs. An apparent distinction seems to be the tristich xix. 7; but this, too, is a distich with the disfigured remains of a distich that has been lost. The Septuagint has here two distichs which are wanting in our text: the second is that which is found in our text, but only in a mutilated form:

"He that does much harm perfects mischief,
And he that uses provoking words shall not escape," probably the false rendering of —

"The friend of every one is rewarded with evil:
He who pursues after rumors does not escape."

These distichs are, for the most part, antithetic; although we also find the synonymous (xi. 7, 25, xiii. 14, 28, xiv. 19, etc.), the integral (xiv. 7, xv. 3 sq.), especially in proverbs with the comparative mxii. 5, 16, 17, xvi. 6, 18, xvii. 10, xix. 19, xxi. 1) and with the ascending qash, "much more" (xi. 31, xiv. 25, xvi. 17, xix. 30, xxiv. 1 sq.), "more", "much more" (xii. 1-4). Between these limits are the tetrastichs, which are the most popular form (xxii. 22 sq., xxiv. 22): the words of the wise," prefixed by xxii. 17-21, which comprehends all the forms of the mashal, from those of two lines in xxii. 28, xxiii. 9, xxiv. 7, 8, 9, 10, to the mashal song, xxvii. 29-35. Between these limits are the tetrastichs, which are the most popular form (xxii. 22 sq., xxiv. 22): the words of the wise," prefixed by xxii. 17-21, which comprehends all the forms of the mashal, from those of two lines in xxii. 28, xxiii. 9, xxiv. 7, 8, 9, 10, to the mashal song, xxvii. 29-35. Between these limits are the tetrastichs, which are the most popular form (xxii. 22 sq., xxiv. 22): the words of the wise," prefixed by xxii. 17-21, which comprehends all the forms of the mashal, from those of two lines in xxii. 28, xxiii. 9, xxiv. 7, 8, 9, 10, to the mashal song, xxvii. 29-35. Between these limits are the tetrastichs, which are the most popular form (xxii. 22 sq., xxiv. 22): the words of the wise," prefixed by xxii. 17-21, which comprehends all the forms of the mashal, from those of two lines in xxii. 28, xxiii. 9, xxiv. 7, 8, 9, 10, to the mashal song, xxvii. 29-35.
which contains a hexastich (xxiv. 23 sq.), a distich (26), a tristich (27), a tetra
distich (28 sq.), and a mashiach ode (30 sq.) on the sluggard; the last
in the form of an experience of the poet, like Ps. xxv. 1 sq.
The material which had been recorded from this experience is expressed in
two verses such as we have already found at vi. 10 sq.
These two appendices are, as is evident from their commencement as well as from their
conclusion, in closest relation to the introduction (i. 7-ix.).

There now follows, in xxv.-xxix., the second
great collection of "proverbs of Solomon." "arranged," as the heading says, by the direction of
King Hezekiah. It divides itself into two parts;
for as xxiv. 30 sq., a mashiach hymn, stands at the
end of the two appendices, so the mashiach hymn
xxii. 23 sq. must be regarded as forming the division between the two halves of this collection.
It is very sharply distinguished from the collection
beginning with chap. x. In the first collection
the proverbs are exclusively in the form of
distichs; here we have also some tristiches (xxv. 8, 13, 20, xxvii. 10, 23) and a tetrastich (xxv.
4 sq., 9 sq., 21 sq., xxvi. 18 sq., 24 sq., xxviii. 15
sq.), and pentaestichs (xxv. 6 sq.), besides the
mashiach hymn already referred to. The kind of
arrangement is not essentially different from that in
the first collection: it is equally devoid of plan,
yet there are here some chains or strings of related
proverbs (xxvi. 1-12, 13-16, 20-22). A second
essential distinction between the two collections
is this, that while, in the first, the antithetic proverb
forms the prevailing element, here it is the para
bolic, and especially the emblematic: in xxv.-xxvii.
the proverbs are almost without exception of this
character.

The second collection of Solomon's proverbs has
also several appendices, the first of which (xxx.),
according to the inscription, is by an other
wise unknown author, Agur the son of Jakeh, and
presents in a thoughtful way the unsearchableness of
God. This is followed by four pieces, such as a
tetraestich regarding the purity
collection (11-14), the insatiable
fors, such as a tetrastich regarding the purity

position between riches and poverty (7-9), a dis
tich against slander (10), a priamel without the
acrostic (xxxi. 10 sq.).
It is very sharply distinguished from the collection

In their form of expression, — x. 1 = xv. 20, vii. 2=
xxii. 2, xix. 5 = xix. 9, xvi. 9 = xvi. 19; (3) proverbs
almost identical in form, but somewhat differ
in sense, — x. 2 = xi. 4, xiv. 14 = xiv. 27; (4) proverbs
the first lines of which are the same, —
x. 15 = xviii. 11; (5) proverbs with their second
lines the same, — x. 6 = x. 11, x. 8 = x. 10, xxv.
33 = xviii. 12; (6) proverbs with one line almost
the same, — x. 13 = xix. 19, xvi. 21 = xvi. 5, xii. 14
= xiii. 2, xiv. 31 = xvii. 5, xii. 12 = xvii. 2. Com
pare also xvi. 28 with xvii. 9. Comparing the
second collection (xxv.-xxix.), we find, (1) whole
proverbs perfectly identical, — xxv. 24 = xxi. 9,
xxvi. 22 = xviii. 8, xxvii. 12 = xix. 3, xxvii. 13 =
xx. 16; (2) proverbs identical in meaning with
somewhat changed expression, — xxvi. 13 = xixx.
13, xxvii. 15 = xix. 24, xxviii. 6 = xvi. 1, xxviii.
19 = xvi. 11, xxvi. 10 = xvi. 2; (3) proverbs
with one line the same and one line different, — xxv.
21 = xvii. 3, xxix. 22 = xv. 18. Compare also
xxvii. 15 with xix. 13.

From the numerous repetitions of proverbs, and portions of proverbs, of the first collection of the
proverbs of Solomon" in the Hezekiah collec
tion, we conclude that the two collections were by
different authors: in other words, that they had
not both "the men of Hezekiah" for their authors.
As to the time when the first collection originated,
fits best for the time of Jehoshaphat. The
Older Book of Proverbs, which appeared between
Solomon and Hezekiah, contained i.-xxiv. 22 of
our canonical work: the "proverbs of Solomon "
(x. 1-xxii. 16), which formed the principal part,
the very kernel of it, were enclosed on the one
side, at their commencement, by the lengthened
introduction (i. 7-ix.), in which the collector
announces himself as a highly gifted teacher and
as the instrument of the spirit of revelation, and
on the other side they were shut in at their close by
the "words of the wise" (xxii. 17-xxiv. 34). The
author, indeed, does not announce (i. 6) such a
supplement of "the words of the wise;" but, after
these words in the title of the book, he leads us to
expect it. The introduction to the supplement
(xxii. 17-21) sounds like a sequel or a historical
introduction, and corresponds to the smaller com
pass of the supplement. The work bears, on the
whole, the stamp of a unity; for, even in the last
proverb with which it closes (xxiv. 21 sq.), there
still sounds the same keynote which the author
had struck at the beginning, and to the time subsequent to Heze
The Book of the Proverbs on the Side of its Manifoldness of Style and Form of Instruction.

Beginning our inquiry with the relation in which x. 1-ix. stand to each other with reference to their forms of language, we come to the conclusion that there exists a linguistic unity between the two sections. And as to the linguistic unity of i. 1-ix. with both of these, maintained by Keil, our conclusion is, that, notwithstanding the numerous points of resemblance, i. 1-ix. demands an altogether different author from Solomon, and one who is more recent. If we hold by this view, then these points of resemblance between the two "collections. And as to their primary stock, truly Solomonic, though not without an admixture of imitations; that, on the contrary, the introduction (i. 7-ix.) and "the words of the wise" (xxii. 17-xxiv.) in two of their maxims refer to the older collection of Solomonic proverbs, while, on the contrary, "the words of the wise" (xxiv. 23 sq.) refer in xxiv. 23 to the Hezekiah collection, and in xxiv. 33 sq. to the introduction (i. 7-ix.), strengthens the supposition, that, with xxiv. 23, a second half of the book, added by another hand, begins. There is no reason for not attributing the appendix (xxx.-xxxii.) to this second collector: perhaps he seeks to render, by means of it, the conclusion of the extended Book of Proverbs uniform with that of the older book. Like the older collection of "proverbs of Solomon," so, also, now the Hezekiah collection has "proverbs of the wise" on the right and on the left, and the king of proverbial poetry stands in the midst of a worthy retinue. The second collector distinguishes himself from the first by this, that he never professes himself to be a proverbial poet. It is possible that the proverbial poem of the virtuous woman (xxxii. 10 sq.) may be his work; but there is nothing to substantiate this opinion.

IV. The Book of the Proverbs on the Side of its Manifoldness of Style and Form of Instruction.

What was the character of this chokma (or wisdom)? To what was it directed? To denote its condition and aim in one word, it was universalistic or humanistic. Emanating from the fear or the religion of Jahve (x. 29), but seeking to comprehend the spirit in the letter, the essence in the form of the national life, its effort was directed towards the general truth affecting mankind as such. While prophecy, which is recognized by the chokma as a spiritual power indispensable to a healthy and moral development (xxiv. 18), is of service to the historical process into which divine truth enters to work out its results in Israel, and from thence outward among mankind, the chokma seeks to look into the very essence of this truth through the robe of its historical and national manifestation, and then to comprehend those general ideas in which could already be discovered the fitness of the religion of Jahve for becoming the world-religion. From this aim towards the ideal in the historical, towards the everlasting name amid changes, the human (I intentionally use this word) in the Israelitish, the universal religion in the Jahve religion (Jahetum), and the universal morality in the law, all the peculiarities of the Book of Proverbs are explained, as well as of the long, broad stream of the literature of the chokma, beginning with Solomon, which, when the Palestinian Judaism assumed the rugged, exclusive, proud national character of Pharisaism, developed itself in Alexandrinism.

When James (iii. 17) says that the *wisdom* that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be treated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocr-
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risey," his words most excellently designate the nature and the contents of the discourse of wisdom in the Solomonic proverbs; and one is almost inclined to think that the apostolic brother of the Lord, when he delineates wisdom, had before his eyes certain parts of the Proverbs. For even in them the purity by the most impressive admonitions. Next to its admonitions to purity, are those especially to peacefulness, to gentle resignation (xiv. 29), quietness of mind (xiv. 32), and humility (xi. 2, xv. 33, xvi. 5, 18), to mercy, even toward beasts (xii. 10), to firmness and sincerity of conviction, to the furtherance of one's neighbor by means of wise discourse and kind help.

Bruch, in his Weisheitslehre der Hebräer, 1851, was the first to call special attention to the chokmah, or humanism, as a peculiar intellectual tendency in Israel; but he is mistaken in placing it in an indifferent and even hostile relation to the national law and the national cultus, which he compares to the relation of Christian philosophy to orthodox theology. Of highest interest for the history of the Book of Proverbs is the relation of the Septuagint to the Hebrew text. One half of the proverbs of Agur (xxx. of the Hebrew text) are placed in it after xxiv. 22, and the other half after xxiv. 34; and the proverbs of King Lemuel (xxx. 1–9 of the Hebrew text) are placed after the proverbs of Agur; while the aerostic proverbial poem of the virtuous woman is in its place at the end of the book. Besides, there are many proverbs in the Septuagint which are wanting in the Hebrew, but which are translations from the Hebrew, and may easily be re-translated into the Hebrew (comp. iv. 27, ix. 12, xii. 18). On this subject, compare Berthau's *Introduction to his Commentary*, 1847; Hitzig, to his, 1858; Ewald: *Jahrbuch*, 1861; J. G. Jäger: *Observationes in Proverbiorum Solomonis Versionem Alexandrinam*, 1788; de Lagarde's *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverben*, 1863; Heinckenhof: *Zur Textkritik der Proverben*, in Vierteljahresschrift für deutsche und englische Theologie, No. vii., 1865, ix., x., 1868; compare also the *Græce Venetus* in the edition of Gebhardt, Leipzig, 1875, and a description of this version by Pick, in McClin tock and Strong's *Cyclopedia*, s. v., Veneta Version].


PROVIDENCE. — The doctrine of providence, representing God not only as the sustainer, but also as the ruler, of the world, forms, on the one side, the complement to the doctrine of creation, while on the other it includes the doctrine of predestination as a special subdivision. Belief in providence forms one of the principal roots of all living religion, and is inseparable from belief in a personal God. Lactantius was quite right when he denounced the Hebrew text (inst., i. 2), and Clement of Alexandria uses similar language. Even in its lowest form, as Feti chism, religion is based on faith in providence; and when that faith disappears, as in the most extreme forms of Epicureanism and Stoicism, religion itself disappears. As the revelation of the living, personal God, Scripture is, in a special sense of the words, the book of providence, unfolding its nature and working in the relation between human and divine counsel (Prov. xvi. 1–9), in the restriction and destruction of evil (Ps. lxv. 8, and Isa. viii. 10) and its turning into good (Gen. i. 20), in the complete change of all anti-Christian schemes in favor of the kingdom of God (Acts iv. 27, 28), in the ruling of the whole world (Acts xvii. 26), and in the guidance and preservation of the faithful (Ps. xxxvii. 5; Rom. viii. 28; Matt. x. 28–31). The Book of Job is throughout a book on providence; and the same may be said, in a still higher sense of the words, about the Gospels. The word providentia (προευθυνεῖα) we owe to the apocryphic stage of the Old-Testa ment theology (Wisdom xiv. 3, xviii. 2).

On account of this its central position in the sphere of religion, the doctrine of providence is, like that of God, characterized by a certain stability which excludes all sudden and striking changes. It has, nevertheless, been treated by all great theologians, from Lactantius to Thomas Aquinas, and again from the Reformation down to our days, sometimes in connection with the doctrine of God, sometimes in connection with the doctrines of predestination and evil. But it is evident, from its very character as a general article of faith, that it has its place in the Creed rather than in the system. In the Small Catholic of Luther it is treated in the explanation of the first article of the Apostles' Creed, but only cursorily, and it has received no more elaborate treatment in the Large Catechism, or in the Lec i of Melanchthon; but in the Heidelberg Catechism (Qu. 27, 28) it forms one of the most elabora
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points of the whole development, and in the Confes- satio Helveticia it is also defined with great care. The Catechismus Romanus too (p. i. c. ii. qu. 15-20) treats it at length. In the later Protestant theo- logy, from Chemnitz to Nietzsche, the subject has received its complete systematical development: though at first the christological principle was not the same prominence; that is, the doctrine of God and of man were kept too abstractly monotheistic, without being brought into suffi- ciently close connection with the doctrine of Christ, which, of course, had its influence on the doctrine of providence; while the dissolution of the idea of providence into the elements of main- tenance and government, and the division into providentia generalis, speciatis, and specialissima, were very early adopted. See Hase : Hutterus mains, Leipzig, 1827.

The idea of providence into the elements of main- tenance and government, and the division into providentia generalis, speciatis, and specialissima, were very early adopted. See Hase : Hutterus

As a full and living faith in the providence of God depends upon a sound and true conception of his nature and the various intentions of the latter idea have given rise to similar aberrations of the former. From infidelity and scepticism sprung materialism, mechanism, sensualism, and casualism; from superstition and credulity, fatal- ism, determinism, particularism, and occasional- ism. When the causa secundae in external nature are recognized as the sole ruling power, infidelity will produce materialism or mechanism, according as it emphasizes matter or form: in human life a similar manner of proceeding will produce sensual- ism or casualism, though, indeed, casualism, when consistently developed, is neither more nor less than a complete denial of all casuality. In paganism, superstition gives its idol, the inexo- rable destiny, either a transcendental form (fatal- ism) or an immanent form (determinism); while particularism and occasionalism are superstitious forms developed within monotheism. Generally speaking, the relation between providence and the causa secundae of external nature and human life forms one of the principal problems of the whole subject, and admits of a double solution besides the orthodox one, according to which the causa secundae, though acting in strict conformity with their own nature, act only on the basis of the causa primum: — namely, one deistic,— God maintains not the world, but only the laws and powers active in the world; and one pantheis- tic, — God works all in all, but without passing beyond the limits of natural law. Closely connected with this problem, though of much less importance, are those of the relation between providence and chance (casualism dissolving all life into a mass of blind chances), and between providence and small things; the popular con- sciousness being very apt to doubt the existence of a particular providence. Of the greatest signif- icance is the problem of the provision of human providence and human freedom, or between providence and evil; but they are more properly treated under the doctrine of predestination.

LIT. — The older literature from Zwingli may be found in Walch : Bibl. Theol. 1. pp. 81, 178, 246. Of modern treatments of the subject, see Bongardt : Christliche Lehre von der Vorse- hung, Berlin, 1820; and Paulus : Vorstellung, Stutt- gart, 1840.

PROVINCIAL (Provincialis Superior). Those monasteries of the same order which were situ- ated in a certain district formed a unity under the head of a custos: and all the custodiae of a country formed a still higher unity under the name of a province. At the head of the province stood the provincial.

PROVOST (Propositus) was the name of a mon- astic official immediately subordinate to the abbot, and co-ordinate to the diaconus, according to the rules of St. Benedict. When Chrodegang organized the cathedral chapters on the monastic model, he retained the office of the propositus, which, however, in some cases, was united with that of the archi-diaconus. The principal duties of the provost were, distribution of the common income, superintendence of discipline, etc.

PRUDENTIUS, Aurelius Clemens, the most original and the most fertile of the elder Chris- tian poets of the West; was born in Spain, 348, and belonged to a distinguished family. He entered upon a political career, held offices of importance, and have led a gay life, until a spiritual change took place, and he became a poet, as much from devotion as from aesthetic enthusiasm. When he was fifty-seven years old, he collected his poems. The year of his death is not known. His principal works are: Liber Cathemerinon, twelve hymns (of which the first six are adapted for the regular hours of prayer), written on the model of Ambrose, though with greater prominence given to the allegorical and descriptive elements, and in a variety of me- tres, so that they have been used in the church service only in parts; Peristephanon, fourteen hymns on martyrs, very much in the character of ballads, and more original than the Liber; three polenical poems in hexameters, — Apotheosis, a defence of the divinity of Christ against the Pat- tripassians, Sabellius, and others; the Hanarti- genia, against the Gnostic dualism of Marcion; and Contra Symmacianum (2 books), against the heathen state religion. Of less interest are his Psychomachia (the first instance in the West of a purely allegorical poem) and Dittachron, explana- tions of Bible pictures. The best editions of his works are those by Arevalo, Rome, 1788, and Dresel, Leipzig, 1860. See Clemen: Rock- haus : Prudentius, Leipzig, 1872. EBERH.

PRUDENTIUS OF TROYES, a native of Spain, whose true name was Galindo; came early to France, and was in 847 appointed bishop of Troyes. He died April 6, 861, and was rever- enced as a saint by his diocese. In the predesti- nation controversy he sided with Gottschalk, and wrote an epistle, Ad Hinkmarum and De prad. contra Jo. Scotum. He also continued the Annales Bertinianii from 835 to 861.

PRUSSIA contains, according to the census of 1880, a population of 27,279,111, of which 17,618,580 belong to the Evangelical State Church, 9,205,138 to the Roman-Catholic Church, 96,655 (14,961 Old Lutherans and Separate Lutherans, 13,072 Mennonites, etc.), to minor Christian de- nominations, and 363,970 are Jews. The Evan- gelicals are chiefly settled in the provinces of Brandenburg, Pommerania, Saxony, Hanover, and Schleswig-Holstein, in the provinces of East Prussia, Silesia, Westphalia, and Rhenish Prussia.

The relation between the State and the Roman- Catholic Church has for the last ten years been
the subject of very energetic and comprehensive legislation; but the unflinching resistance of the clergy, steadily inflamed by the Pope and the curia, and to a certain extent, also, supported by their flocks, has made it impossible for the government to carry through its principle; and matters are left in a state of deadlock. By a law of July 8, 171, the Roman-Catholic division of the Prussian ministry of Cultus, Public Education, and Sanitary Affairs, was abolished. By a law of March 11, 1872, the superintendence of all instruction and education, private or public, was exclusively reserved for the State. By the so-called Falk Laws (which art. sec.), or May Laws of May 11, 12, 13, and 14, 1873, all non-Germans, that is, persons not educated at the German universities or in the German seminaries, were excluded from holding office in the Roman-Catholic Church in Prussia; the power of the bishop over the lower clergy was curtailed, and the clergy over the laity was limited, so that no punishment touching any person's body or property, his social position or civil honor, could be administered by an ecclesiastical court; a civil court of ecclesiastical affairs, which enabled the government to deal with refractory bishops, was established; and the clergy was summoned to take an oath of obedience to the laws of the State. Other laws followed, dissolving the monasteries, and expelling the monastic orders (July 4, 1872, and May 31, 1875), and re-organizing the administration of the property of the Church (May 20, 1874, and April 22, 1875); but it became more and more difficult to enforce these laws; and, after the death of Pius IX., negotiations began between the Prussian Government and the Roman curia, and to a certain extent, also, supported by the unflinching resistance of the clergy, and to a certain extent, also, supported by the learned but dull work Histriomastix (1006 pp in quarto), against plays, masks, dancing, etc. For the alleged seditious writing in it he was tried in the Star Chamber (Feb. 7, 1683), and condemned to the loss of his ears, perpetual imprisonment, and to pay a fine of five thousand pounds. The instigation to this infamous sentence came from Archbishop Laud, whose anisomy he had won by writing against Arminianism and the jurisdiction of the bishops. The same implacable prince condemned him (June 30, 1637) to branding, and imprisonment in remotest prisons, for a fresh seditious and libellous work (News from Ipswich). He was released by the Long Parliament, and with Burton, another victim of Laud's cruelty, received in London (Nov. 28, 1640) with a perfect ovation. Shortly afterwards Prynne was elected at Newport to a seat in Parliament (1641), and by a strange turn of affairs was the solicitor in the trial of Laud (1644), and arranged the whole proceedings. On Monday, Dec. 4, 1648, he advocated in Parliament the cause of Charles. He was expelled in 1650 from the House of Commons for his vehement opposition to Cromwell, but re-admitted 1658. He promoted the Restoration, and was rewarded with the appointment of keeper of the records in the Tower (1669); and his collection of records is considered a model work. His learning was very great.

**PSALMODY IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH.** As psalm-singing was the practice of the synagogue, it is an integral part of Christian worship from the beginning. Justin Martyr speaks of the Christians singing "hymns;" but by these he probably meant sacred lyrics in general, including the Psalms. The first Council of Braga (383 A.D.) expressly
PSALMS.

1. Their Position in the Old-Testament Canon.— The Psalter always forms a part of the so-called Kethubim, or Hagiographa; but its position among these varies. That it opened the Kethubim in the earliest period of the Christian era is evident from Luke xxiv. 44. The order of the books in the Hebrew manuscripts of the German class, which is followed by our manual editions, is, Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, and the five Megilloth. But the Massorets and the Spanish manuscripts have the following order: Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, and the five Megilloth (awkwardly separating the Chronicles from Ezra), Nehemiah, in order to let Chronicles follow after the books of the Law. According to the Talmud (Baba Bathra 14a), the order is as follows: Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs; Ruth preceding the Psalter as its prologue, since Ruth is the ancestor of him to whom the sacred lyric owes its richest and most flourishing era (Beraqchoth 7'). It is undoubtedly the most natural order that the Psalter should open the division of the Kethubim, and for this reason, that, according to the stock which forms the basis of it, it represents the time of David; and then afterwards, in like manner, the Proverbs and Job, and the Choknia-literature of Solomon. But it is at once evident that it could not have no other place but among the Kethubim. The codex of the giving of the law, which is the foundation of the old covenant and of the nationality of Israel, as also of all its subsequent literature, occupies the first place in the canon. Attached to these five books is a series of historical writings of a prophetic character, which has the collective title of nebiim (prophets). All the remaining books could manifestly only be classed under the third division of the canon, which, as could hardly have been otherwise in connection with Thora and Nehemiah, has been so, in the most general way, Kethubim, which corresponds to the τὰ ἕξις νόττων κόλλων of the grandson of Ben-Sira.

2. Name.— At the close of the seventy-second Psalm (ver. 20) we find the subscription, "the prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended." The whole of the preceding psalms are here comprehended under the name of Tephilloth (prayers), which is striking, since, with the exception of Ps. xvii. (and, farther on, Ps. xxxvii., xc, cxxi., cxxlii.), they are all insulated otherwise, and because, in part, as e.g., Ps. xvi. i. and ii., they contain no supplementary address to God, and have, therefore, not the form of prayers. Still, the collective name of Tephilloth is suitable to all psalms. The essence of prayer is a direct and undiverted looking towards God and the absorption of the mind in the thought of him. All psalms share in this, even the didactic and hymnic, without any supplementary address, as Hannah's song of praise (1 Sam. i. 1). The title inscribed on the Psalter is (Sepher) Tephillim, for which Tephillim and Thilli are also used. This name, as well as Tephilloth, occurring in later Jewish writings, is strange, since the Psalms, for the most part, are hardly hymns in the proper sense: most of them are psalms, and only one (Ps. cxiv.) is directly inscribed Tephillah. But even the name Thehillim is admissible; for all psalms partake of the nature of the hymn, and all speak of the magna Dei. In the Koran, the Psalter is called zabur: in the Hellenistic Greek, the corresponding word psalmoi is the more common. The Psalm collection is called biblos psalmon (Luke xx. 42; Acts i. 20), or psaltération.

3. Historical Suppositions of the Psalm Composition.— The lyric is the earliest kind of poetry, and Hebrew poetry is therefore essentially lyric; neither the epic nor the drama, but only the mahal, has branched off from it, and not attains to the independent form. The first book of the Thora speaks of the origin of all things, also of the origin of poetry. In the joyous exultation of Adam over the creation of the wife, we yet see the undivided beginning to which poetry and prose go back. Before the fall there was no poetry, because there was no art; and no which shows there existed no every-day mood. After the fall, we first meet with music and poetry in the house of Lamech. The art of poetry and the art of music are con-
The blessing of Melchisedec, and that with which Rebecca is sent forth from the house of Bethuel, represent the poetry of the heathen world upon which grace did shine: the blessings of Isaac and Jacob represent the poetry of the birthplace of Israel sanctified by grace. Here poetry speaks with the strong voice of the Spirit from which proceeded, not only Israel's future poetry, but also Israel's future. The spirit of the world has produced poetry, and the spirit of faith ascribed to Moses, and may be his, we then have in these three documents, from the Mosaic period, the prototypes of all psalms,—the hymnic, elegiac, and prophetico-didactic. All three are still waiting in the strophic symmetry which characterizes the later art. It has been thought strange that the very beginnings of Israel's poetry are so perfect, but Israel's history, also that of her literature, comes under a different law from that of a constant development from a lower to a higher grade. In David the sacred lyric attained its highest development. Many things combined to make the time of David its golden age. Samuel had laid the foundation of this, both by his energetic reforms in general, and by founding the schools of the prophets in particular, in which, under his guidance (1 Sam. xix. 19 sq.), in conjunction with the awakening and fostering of the prophetic gift, song and music were cultivated. In these schools, David's poetic talent was cultivated. He was a musician and poet by birth. Even as a Bethlehemite shepherd he played upon the harp, and with his natural gift he combined a heart deeply imbued with religious feeling. But the Psalter contains as few traces of David's Psalms before his anointing as the New Testament does of the writings of the apostles before the Pentecost. It was only from the time when the spirit of Jehovah came upon him at his anointing as Israel's king, and raised him to the dignity of his calling in connection with the covenant of redemption, that he sang psalms which have become an integral part of the canon. They are the fruit, not only of his high gifts and the inspiration of the spirit of God (2 Sam. xxii. 2), but also of his own experience and of the experience of his people interwoven with his own. David's way, from his anointing onwards, led through affliction to glory. Song, however, as a Hindu proverb says, is the offspring of suffering; and the Psalter is marked by vicissitudes which at one time prompted him to elegiac strains; at another, to praise and thanksgiving. At the same time he was the founder of the kingship of promise, a prophecy of the future Christ; and his life, thus typically modified, corresponded neither in typical, nor even consciously prophetic language. Raised to the throne, he did not forget the harp, his companion and solace, but rewarded it with all honor. He appointed the Levites as singers and musicians at the service, and placed over them the Levites of Asaph, Ethan-Jeduthun (1 Chron. xxiv.; cf. xv. 17 sq.). Thus others also were encouraged to consecrate their gifts to the God of Israel. Besides the seventy-three psalms inscribed le-David, the collection contains the following, which are named after contemporary and prophetic spirits: twelve to Asaph (1. lili.-lxxiii.), and twelve by the Levite family of the sons of Korah (xiiii.-xlii., xliii., xlvii., lxvi., lxvii., lxviii., including xliii.). Both the psalms of the Ezrahites (xviii., by Heman, and lxix., by Ethan) belong to the time of Solomon, whose name, with the exception of Ps. lxxii., is borne only by Ps. xcvii. Under Solomon, psalm-poetry began to decline; and only twice, and this for a short period too (under Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah), it rose to any height. With the exception of these two periods of revival, the latter part of the regal period, produced scarcely any psalm-writers, but is all the more rich in prophets, who now raised their trumpet voice in order to revive the religious life of the nation, which had previously expressed itself in psalms. It is true that in the writings of the prophets, as in Jonah (ii.), Isaiah (xii.), Habakkuk (iii.), we also find psalms; but these are more imitations of the ancient congregational hymns than original compositions. It was not until after the exile that a time of new productions set in. As the Reformation gave birth to German hymnology, and the Thirty Years' War revived it again, so the Davidean age gave birth to psalm-poetry, and the exile revived what had almost become dead. The divine chastisement did not fail to have its effect; and it is certain beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Psalter contains psalms belonging to the exile period, as, e.g., Ps. ccii. After the return, many more new psalms were composed. The harps which in Babylon hung upon the willows were tuned afresh, and a rich new flood of song was the fruit of this awakened first love. But this did not continue long. Pharisaism, traditionalism, and the service of the letter, now prevailed. Nevertheless, in the era of the Seleucids, the national feeling revived under the Maccabees in its old life and vigor. Prophecy had then long been silent, as may be seen from many passages in the First Book of the Maccabees. That psalm-poetry flourished again at that time cannot be maintained. Hitzig has endeavored to prove, that, from Ps. lxxiii., every thing belongs to the Maccabean period (Commentary of 1835-36). He also maintains this position in his Commentary of 1863-65, and even assigns to Ps. xiii., xlii., xlv., lx., a Maccabean origin. Lengerke and Olshausen, it is true, have reduced the number; but they still hold a Maccabean origin of many psalms. On the other hand, both the existence and possibility of Maccabean psalms have been denied by Hengstenberg, Haëvernich, Keil, Gesenius, Hassler, Ewald, Thesius, Dillmann, and more recently by Ehbr; but the reasons are not cogent, and Maccabean psalms are therefore not an absolute impossibility. And, if Maccabean psalms of otherwise that, they can at any rate only be few; because the redaction of the Psalter is the work, not of the Seleucide, but of the Persian period.
4. Origin of the Collection. — The Psalter, as we now know it, consists of five books; and in this it is true also of the Thora. The list it reproduces in this particular, that as in the Thora, Elohist and Jehovistic sections alternate, so here a group of Elohist psalms (xiii.-lxxxviii.) is surrounded on both sides by groups of Jehovistic (i.-xii., lxxv.-cl.). The five books are as follows: i.-xx., lxxii., lxxxv.-cl., cvi.-lxxxviii. Each of the first four books closes with a doxology, which is part of the preceding psalm (xii. 14, lxxii. 18 sq., lxxxv. 53, cvi. 48): the place of the fifth doxology is occupied by Ps. cl. as a full-toned finale to the whole. These doxologies very much resemble the language of the liturgical beracha of the second temple. The latter, we cannot see why only Ps. I. of the Psalms of Solomon is called, or whether the subscribed designation, "prayers of David," is only intended a fortiori, to the question whether the primary collection also contained only Davidic songs, properly so called, or whether the subscribed designation, "prayers of David," is only intended a fortiori, the answer is entirely wanting. By adopting the latter, we cannot say whether the present collection was preceded by the Psalter, as we now know it, or whether the Psalter was compiled of the Psalms of Solomon, which have been so faithfully preserved, furnishes us less help than we could wish. We only gather from this that the Psalter was then already divided into books: the closing doxologies had already become part of the psalms. The chronicler, however, wrote towards the end of the Persian supremacy, although a considerable time yet before the beginning of the Grecian.

Next to this application of the beracha of the fourth book by the chronicler (Ps. lxxii. 20) is a significant mark for determining the history of the origin of the Psalter. The closing words are, without doubt, the subscription to the oldest psalm collection, which preceded the present psalm-pentateuch. The chronicler certainly has removed this subscription from its original place close after lxxii. 17, by the interpolation of the beracha (lxxii. 18 sq.), but left it at the same time untouched. But unfortunately that subscription, which has been so faithfully preserved, furnishes us less help than we could wish. We only gather from it that the present collection was preceded by a primary collection of very much more limited compass, which formed its basis, and that this closed with the Solomonic psalm lxxiii.; for the redactor would certainly not have placed the subscription, referring only to the prayers of David, after this psalm, if he had not found it there already. And it leads to the supposition that Solomon himself, prompted, perhaps, by the liturgical requirements of the new temple, compiled this primary collection, and, by the addition of Ps. lxxii., may have caused it to be understood that he was composing the Thora, which also resembles in this respect, the first two stages of the origin of the Psalter. The primary collection may be Solomonic. The after-portion of the second group was, at the earliest, added in the time of Jehoshaphat, at which time, probably, the Book of the Proverbs of Solomon was also compiled. But, with a greater probability, we assign it to the time of Hezekiah, not merely because some of the psalms among them seem as though they ought to be referred to the overthrow of Assyria under Hezekiah, rather than to the overthrow of the allied neighboring nations under Jehoshaphat, but chiefly because "the men of Hezekiah" made an appendix to the older Solomonic Book of Proverbs (Prov. xxv. 1), and because Hezekiah is said to have brought the Psalms of David and of Asaph (the bulk of which are contained in the third book of the Psalms) into use again (2 Chron. xxix. 30). In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the collection was enlarged by songs composed during the exile, and still more after the exile; but a supplement of old songs has also been preserved for this time. A psalm of Moses was placed first in order to make the beginning of the new Psalter more conspicuous by this going back into the oldest time; and to the fifty-six Davidic psalms of the first three books there are seventeen more added here in the last two, being the result of the writer throwing himself into David's temper of mind and circumstances. The chief store of such older psalms were, perhaps, the historical works of an annalistic or even prophetic character, rescued from the age before the exile. It is from such sources that the historical notes prefixed to the Davidic hymns (and also to one in the fifth book of the Psalms of Asaph) were inserted in it; for this psalm is really one of the old Asaphic psalms, and might therefore have been an integral part of the primary collection. On the other hand, not all of the Korahitic psalms (xiii.-xli.) could have belonged to it; also the remaining four psalms undoubtedly xlvii., xlviii., belong to the time of Jehoshaphat, the most remarkable event of which, as the chronicler narrated, was foretold by an Asaphite, and celebrated by Korahitic singers. For this reason alone, apart from other psalms not thus placed (as lxvi., lxvii., lxix. 35 sq., lxxi.), it is absolutely impossible that the primary collection should have consisted of Ps. ii.-ixxii., or rather (since Ps. ii. must be assigned to the time of Issaias) of Ps. iii.-ixxxii.; and, if we leave the later insertions out of consideration, there is no arrangement left for the psalms of David and his contemporaries, which should in any way bear the impress of the Davido-Solomonic mind. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the groundwork of the collection that formed the basis of the present Psalter must lie within the limits of Ps. iii.-ixxii.; for nowhere else do old Davidic psalms stand so closely together as here. The third book (Ps. lxxiii.-lxxxix.) exhibits a marked difference in this respect. We may therefore suppose that the chief bulk of the oldest hymn-book of Israel is contained in Ps. iii.-lxvii.; but that its contents have been dispersed, and newly arranged in later redactions, and more especially in the last of all, preserving, however, the subscription lxii. 20 with the Psalm of Solomon. The two groups, iii.-lxvii., lxviii.-lxxxix., at least represent the first two stages of the origin of the Psalter. The primary collection may be Solomonic. The after-portion of the second group was, at the earliest, added in the time of Jehoshaphat, at which time, probably, the Book of the Proverbs of Solomon was also compiled.

5. Arrangement of the Collection of Psalms. — This bears the impress of one ordering mind; for (a) its opening is formed by a didactic pro-
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phetic couplet of psalms (i., ii.), introductory to the whole Psalter, and therefore, in the earliest times, regarded as one psalm, which opens and closes with הַיְיָנָה (shewa); and its close is formed by four psalms (cxli.-cxlix.), which begin and end with הַיְיָנָה (Hallelujah). We do not include Ps. cl., for this psalm takes the place of the beracha of the fifth book. The opening of the Psalter celebrates the blessedness of those who walk according to the will of God in redemption, which has been revealed in the law and in history. The close of the Psalter calls upon all creatures to praise this God of redemption, as it were on the ground of the completion of this great work. (b) There are in the Psalter seventy-three psalms bearing the inscription יִנְא (le-David); viz., thirty-seven in book i., eighteen in book ii., one in book iii., two in book iv., fifteen in book v. The redaction has designed the plastic effect of closing the collection with an imposing group of Davidic psalms, just as it begins with the bulk of the Davidic psalms. The hallelujahs, commencing with Ps. cxli. (after the fifteen Davidic psalms), are already preludes of the closing doxology. (c) The two Korahitic (xlii., xliii., xliv.-xlix., lxxxiv., lxxxv., lxxxvi., lxxxvii., lxxxvi., lxxxvii., xxxiv., xxxv., ix., x.), divided into groups, those beginning with יִנְא (cv.-cvii.) and those beginning and ending with הַיְיָנָה (cxvii.-cxlix.-cl.).

6. Inscriptions of the Psalms. — These are older than the final redaction of the Psalter, and are of three kinds: (a) giving the name of the author, sometimes, especially to Davidic psalms, adding also the historical occasion, thus, vii., lxxiv., lvi., lxxxiv., li., lii., cxlix., cxlxv., xcl., xxxiv., xxxv., iii., lii., xxxviii., xxxvii., xxxvi., xxxix., xxi., xxi., xvi., xlix., xlv., xxvii., xxvi., x., xi.; (b) giving the poetico-musical character of the Psalms, xc., xci., cxli., cxlv., iii.-vi., viii., ix., etc.; (c) pointing out the liturgical use of the Psalms. If we understood the inscriptions of the Psalms better, we would have more to say about them.

7. The Poetical and Musical Character of the Psalms. — The early Hebrew poetry has neither rhyme nor metre, both of which (first rhyme, then metre) were first adopted by Jewish poetry in the seventh century after Christ. True, attempts at rhyme are not wanting in the poetry and prophecy of the Old Testament, e.g., the tephilla style (Ps. cvi. 4-7; cf. Jer. iii. 21-25), where the earnestness of the prayer naturally causes the heaping up of similar flexional ends; but this assonance, in the transition state towards rhyme proper, had not taken an established form. Yet it is not mere fancy, when Philo, Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome, have detected in the Old Testament songs, especially in the Psalms, something resembling the Greek and Latin metres. Old Hebrew poetry, indeed, had a certain syllabic measure, since, apart from the audible Shewa and Chatuph, both of which represent the primitive shortening, all syllables with a full vowel are intermediate, and in ascending become long, in descending, short. Hence the most manifold rhythms arise, e.g., the anapestic, וּטַפְלוּשׂ חַתָּפֶת יִדְנֵיהָמ (ii. 3), or the dactylic, אֲנִי רְאֵה יִדְנֵיהָמ בְּאָדָם (ii. 5), and thus obtains the appearance of a lively mixture of the Greek and Latin metres. But this is the very beauty of this kind of poetry, that the rhythms always vary according to the thoughts and feelings; as, e.g., the evening song (Ps. iv.), towards the end, rises to the anapestic measure, 44-43 אֲנִי רְאֵה יִדְנֵיהָמ יִדְנֵיהָמ, in order then quietly to subside in the iambic, לְבַשֵׁב יִדְנֵיהָמ. With this alternation of rise and fall, long and short syllables, harmonizing in lively passages with the subject, there is combined, in Hebrew poetry, an expressiveness of accent which is hardly to be found anywhere else to such an extent.

Under the point of view of rhythm, the so-called parallelismus membrorum has also been rightly placed since the time of Lowth. The relation of the two parallel members is like the two halves on either side of the syllable, in the dactylic and pentameter, and this is particularly manifest in the double long line of the casusl schema; e.g. (Ps. xlvii. 5, 6), "They beheld,
A distich is the simplest ground-form of rhythm, consisting of two parallel members. But from the fact of the rhythmical organization being carried out without reference to the logical requirements of the sentence, as in the same psalm, vers. 3, 7 (**Elohim in her palaces** was known as a refuge, with an east wind thou breakest | the ships of Tarshish **)), we see that the rhythm is not called into existence as a necessity of such expansion of the thought, but, vice versa, this mode of expanding the thought results from the requirements of the rhythm. Here is no logical parallelism, but merely that which De Wette calls rhythmical, the rhythmical rise and fall, the diastole and systole. The ascending and descending rhythm does not usually exist within the compass of one line; but it is distributed over two lines, which bear the relation to one another of rhythmical antecedent and consequent, and form a distich. This distich is the simplest ground-form of the strophe, which is visible in the earliest song (Ps. cxi., cxii. The tristich is an outgrowth of the strophe formation, and even extends the network of the rhythmical period, by combining the two and three line strophe and the descending rhythm into greater strophic wholes, rounded off into themselves, the alphabetical psalm (**xxxv. 7** (the \( \pi \) of this alphabetical psalm): —

"Have not the sins of my youth and my transgressions in remembrance: According to thy mercy remember thou me, For thy goodness' sake, O Jahve!"

If we now further inquire whether Hebrew poesy goes beyond these simplest beginnings of the strophe formation, and even extends the network of the rhythmical period, by combining the two and three line strophes and the diastole and systole and the descending rhythm into greater strophic wholes, rounded off into themselves, the alphabetical psalm (**xxxv. 7** (the \( \pi \) of this alphabetical psalm): —

"About evil-doers fret not thyself; About the workers of iniquity be thou not envious: For as grass they shall soon be cut down, And as the green herb they shall wither."

But it admits of the compass of the strophe, increasing even to the pentastich (vers. 25, 26); since the unmistakable landmarks of the order, the letters, allow a freer movement: —

"Now I, who once was young, am become old; Yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, And his seed begging bread. He ever giveth and lendeth, And his seed is blessed."

From this point the sure guidance of the alphabetical psalms fails us in investigating the Hebrew strophe system. Whether and how a psalm is laid out in strophes is shown by seeing, first of all, what its pauses are, where the flow of thoughts and feelings falls in order to rise anew, and then by trying whether the same verse in such a way as to give intensity to that which is being sung. To these instruments, besides those mentioned in Ps. cl., 2 Sam. vi. 5, belonged also the flute and the trumpets. In the second temple it was otherwise. The sounding of the trumpets by the priests, and the Levitical song with its accompanying music, alternated: they were not simultaneous. The congregation did not sing with the choir, but only uttered their Amen.

In the time of the second temple, the singing of the psalm appointed for each day commenced, at a sign given with the cymbal, at the time when the ministering priest offered the drink-offering. The Levites standing upon the platform, who were both players and singers, were at least twelve in number. Of what kind this song and music were, we can hardly now have an idea; and it is nothing but a mere fiction of Anton and L. Haupt to assert that the present accentuation of the psalms represents the fixed song of the temple. We have no tradition as to the value of the notes of the so-called metrical accentuation; and what we know at present is derived from but fragmentary notices contained in older works concerning the intonation of some metrical accents.

Since Gerbert (De musica sacra) and Martini (Storia della musica), the view has become very general, that in the eight Gregorian tones, together with the extra tone (**tonus peregrinus**), used only for Ps. cxxxv., we have a remnant of the ancient temple song, and this in itself is by no means impossible in connection with the Jewish nationality of the primitive church, and its connection and intercourse from the temple and synagogue; but the Jewish tradition, if the eight tones are to be traced back to it, has been developed under Greek influence. The "eight" tones are also mentioned elsewhere (cf. Steinschneider: Jewish Literature, pp. 154, 397), and recall the sigh of the Hebrew poet in manner as the two modes of using the accents in chanting, which are attested in the ancient...
service-books, recall the distinction between the festival and the simpler aural manner in the Gregorian style of church-music.

The history of Psalmody, especially of the practical use of the Psalter, is a glorious history of blessing and victory. No other book of the Old Testament has gone so much from the heart and mouth of the people into the heart and mouth of the church as this Old Testament hymn-book. But, with all this praise, neither the real value of this hymn-book of Israel, nor the wonderful effect which it exercised upon the church, is sufficiently acknowledged. To do this we consider —

6. The Soteriological Signification of the Psalter.

When men had corrupted themselves by sin, God did not leave them to that doom of wrath which they had chosen for themselves, but visited them on the evening of that most decisive of all days, in order to make that doom the disciplinary medium of his love. This visitation of Jehovah-Elohim was the first step, in the history of redemption, towards the goal of the incarnation and the so-called protovangelium was the first laying of the foundation towards this goal of incarnation and the recovery of man. The way of this salvation, making its way in history and in the consciousness of men, runs all through Israel; and the Psalms show how this seed-corn of words and deeds of divine love has expanded with a vital energy in the believing hearts of Israel. They bear the impress of the period during which the preparation of the way of salvation was centred in Israel, and the hope of redemption was a national hope. At that period the promise of the future Mediator was in its third stage. The hope of overcoming the tendency in mankind to be led astray into evil was attached to the seed of the woman, and the hope of a blessing for all nations, to the seed of Abraham; but at this period, when David became the creator of psalm-poetry for the sanctuary service, the promise had assumed a messianic character, and pointed the hope of the believing ones towards the king of Israel, and, in fact, to David and his seed. When Solomon ascended the throne, the messianic desires and hopes of Israel were directed towards him, as Ps. lxxii. shows: they belonged only to the one final Christ of God, but they clung for a time inquiringly, on the ground of 2 Sam. viii., to the son of David. But it was soon found out that neither in Solomon, nor in that son of David referred to in Ps. xiv., the full reality of the messianic idea had yet appeared; and when, in the later time of the kings, the Davidic line became more and more inconsistent with its theocratic calling, the messianic hope broke entirely with the present, which became merely the dark background from which the image of the Messiah, as purely future, stood forth in relief. The son of David, in whom the prophecy of the later time of the kings centres, and whom also Ps. ii. sets forth before the kings of the earth, that they may render homage to him, is an eschatological character. But why is it, that, in the post-exilic hymns, Messiah is no more the object of prophecy and hope? Because, with the Chaldean catastrophe, the messianic hope had suffered a heavy shock, which made it unpopular. This we also find in prophecy; for in Isa. xi.—lxxvi., where the Messiah appears as the servant of Jehovah, the image is no more as it was before, i.e., a clear, national image of the king, but it is enriched by many points, as the expiatory sufferings and the two states, whereby it has become more universal, spiritual, and divine. Thus we find it more or less in Zechariah, Malachi, and in Daniel's Apocalypse. And although we find nowhere in the Psalms an echo of this advanced messianic prediction, yet when we turn to a few psalms, as lxxv., xci., cii., especially xcvii.—xcviii., which have been written under the influence of Isa. xi.—lxxvi. We call these psalms, in distinction from the strictly messianic ones, theocratic, i.e., such as do not speak of the kingdom of Jehovah's Anointed, but of the theocracy as such, which is complete inwardly and outwardly in its own representation of itself, — not of the advent of a human king, but of Jehovah himself, with the kingdom of God manifest in its glory. For the announcement of salvation in the Old Testament runs on in two parallel lines: the one has as its termination the Anointed of Jehovah, who rules all nations out of Zion; the other, Jehovah, sitting above the cherubim, to whom all the earth does homage. These two lines do not meet in the Old Testament: it is only the fulfilment that makes it plain that the advent of the Anointed and that of Jehovah is one and the same. And of these two lines the divine preponderates in the Psalter: the hope is directed, after the cessation of the kingdom in Israel, beyond the human mediation, directly towards Jehovah, the author of salvation. The Messiah is not yet recognized as the God-man. Jesus is in Jehovah. Jehovah is the Saviour. The Saviour, when he shall appear, is nothing but the visible manifestation of the σωτηρία (salvation) of Jehovah (Isa. xlix. 8).

As to the relation of the Psalms to sacrifices, it is true we find passages in which the legal sacrifice is acknowledged as an act of worship on the part of the individual and of the congregation (Ps. lxi. 15, li. 19); but there are many more passages in which it appears as something not at all desired by God (xlii. 7 sq., xlii. 18 sq.); but in this respect the Psalms show the progress of the history of salvation. It is a continuation of the words of Samuel (1 Sam. xvi. 22 sq.): it is not a sacrifice, it is an offering; it is not prefigured, it is the Spirit, the prefiguration is the Spirit. Thus we find it more or less in Zechariah, Malachi, as it is in the New Testament. In place of sacrifices is required contribution of heart, prayer, thanksgiving, yielding one's self to God in the doing of his will, as Prov. xxii. 17; to do right, Hos. vi. 6, kindness, Mic. vi. 6–8, acting justly, love, and humility, Jer. vii. 21–23, obedience. This is what surprises one. The disparaged sacrifice is regarded only as a symbol, not as a type: it is only considered in its ethical character, not in its relation to the history of redemption. Its nature is unfolded only so far as it is a gift to God (σώτηρ), not so far as the offering is appointed for atonement (σκληρός); the word, the mystery of the blood remains undisclosed. And why? Because the bloody sacrifice, as such, in the Old Testament, remains a question, to which only Isa. li. 13 sq. gives the only distinct answer. The prophetic representation of the passion and sacrifice of Christ is only given in direct prophetic language thus late on in the literal history of the fulfilment that shows how exactly the spirit which spoke by David has moulded that which he says concerning himself, the type,
into correspondence with the antitype. The confidence of faith under the Old Testament, as it is found in the Psalms, rested upon Jehovah, as concerning the atonement, so concerning the redemption; but the Atoner (חָוטֵא), from whom expiation is earnestly sought and hoped for (Ps. lxxix. 9, lxv. 4, lxxviii. 33, lxxv. 2, etc.). Jehovah, at the end of his course of the redemptive history, is the God-man; and the blood given by him as the medium of atonement (Lev. xvii. 11) is, in the antitype, his own blood.

As to the moral self-confidence bordering on self-righteousness, and the imprecations found so often in the Psalms, which makes it difficult to amalgamate the prayers of the Psalms with the Christian consciousness, it must be observed that the self-righteousness here is a mere appearance, since the righteousesse to which the psalmist appeals is not a sum of good works which are reckoned up before God as claiming a reward, but a godly direction of the will, and a godly form of life, which has its root in the surrender of one’s whole self to God, and regard for God, and regard for the operation and work of justifying, sanctifying, preserving, and ruling grace (lxiii. 25 sq., xxv. 5-7, xix. 14, and other passages). There is not wanting an acknowledgment of the innate sinfulness of our nature (ii. 7), of the condemnation of man before God apart from his grace (cxlii. 2), of the many, and, for the most part, unpardoned sins, even of the converted (xix. 13), of the forgiveness of sins as a fundamental condition of salvation (xxxii. 1 sq.), of the necessity of regeneration (li. 12), in short, of the way of salvation, which consists of penitential contrition, pardon, and newness of life. As for the so-called imprecatory psalms, the Christian and the Church wish the conversion of the enemies of Christ; but, suppose that they reject all means (vii. 13, ix. 21), the transition from a feeling of love to that of wrath is also warranted in the New Testament (e.g., Gal. v. 12), and, assuming their absolute and hardness of heart, the Christian also may pray for their final overthrow. Where, however, as in Ps. lxxix. and cxix., the imprecations go into particulars, and extend to the descendants of the unfortunate, and even to eternity, they have emanated from a prophetic spirit; and, for the Christian, they admit of no other acceptance, except as, reiterating them, he gives the glory to the justice of God, and commends himself the more earnestly to his favor.

As for the relation of the Psalms to the last things, the hope of eternal life after death is nowhere definitely expressed, but there are, nevertheless, passages in which the hope of not falling a prey to death is expressed so broadly, that the thought of a final destiny of all beings inevitable is completely swallowed up by the living one’s confidence of living in the strength of God (Ps. lvi. 13, and especially xvi. 9-11); passages in which the covenant relation with Jehovah is continued even to the end of the line of the present ad infinitum. On the other hand, death and life in the mind of the psalmists are such deep-rooted notions (i.e., taken hold of at the very roots, which are grounded in the principles of divine wrath and divine love), that it is easy for the New-Testament faith, to which they have become clear, even to their background of hell and heaven, to adjust and deepen the meaning of all utterances in the Psalms that refer to them. It is by no means contrary to the meaning of the Psalmist, when, as in passages like vi. 5, Gehenna is substituted for Hades to adapt it to the New-Testament saint; because, since the descent of Jesus Christ into Hades, there is no longer any limbus patrum. The way of all who die in the Lord is not earthwards, but upwards: Hades exists only as the vestibule of hell. Nor is it contrary to the idea of the poets to think of the future vision of God’s face in all its glory, in Ps. xvii. 15, and of the resurrection morn, in Ps. xlix. 14; for the hopes expressed there, though to the Old-Testament consciousness they referred to this side the grave, are future according to their New-Testament fulfilment, which is the only truly satisfying one. The innermost essence of both Testaments is one. The Old-Testament barrier contains already the germinating New-Testament life, which at a future time shall burst it. The eschatology of the Old Testament leaves a dark background, whereas the New is illuminated; divided by the New-Testament revelation into light and darkness, and is to be illumined into a wide perspective, extending into the eternity beyond time. Everywhere, where it begins to dawn in this eschatological darkness of the Old Testament, it is the first morning rays of the New-Testament sunrise which is already announcing itself. The Church, as well as the Christian, here cannot refrain from leaping the barrier of the psalmists, and understanding the Psalms according to the mind of the Spirit, whose purpose, in the midst of the development of salvation and of the perception of it, is directed towards its goal and consummation. But the scientific exposition must carefully distinguish between the times of the history of salvation, and the degrees in the perception of that salvation.

How late this object of scientific exposition has been perceived will be seen by reviewing,—

B. The History of the Exposition of the Psalms. We begin (a) with The Apostolic Exposition. The Old Testament is, according to its essence, Christo-centric: therefore the innermost truth of the Old Testament has become known with the revelation of Jesus Christ, but not at once. His passion, resurrection, ascension are the last step of this progressive opening of the Old Testa,
especially of the Psalms. Before and after his resurrection he unfolded the meaning of the Psalms from his own life and vicissitudes; he showed how what was written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets and in the Psalms, was fulfilled in him; he revealed to his disciples the meaning and significance of the Psalms, and established them as the basis of their daily life and prayer. Jesus Christ's exposition of the Psalms is the beginning and goal of Christian psalm-interpretation. It began, as that of the Church, and first of all as the apostolic, with the Pentecost; and how strongly the disciples were drawn to the Psalms, we see from the fact, that, with the exception of the Book of Isaiah, no other book of the Old Testament has been cited so often as the Book of Psalms. It is quoted about seventy times in the New Testament. (b) The Post-Apostolic, Patristic Exposition. With the exception of Origen and Jerome, the interpreters of the early Church had no knowledge of the Hebrew, and even those two were not sufficient to free themselves from a dependence upon the LXX. Of Origen's Commentary and Homilies on the Psalms, we have fragments in the translation of Rufinus. From Jerome, we have an excellent translation of the Psalter (Psalterium Iuxta Hebraeos), published in the Hebrew-Latin Psalterium Iuxta Hebraeos, translated into Latin by Tischendorf, Baer, Delitzsch, Leipzig, 1874, and by De Lagarde, after his own recension, Leipzig, 1874). This Psalterium is the most important work of the patristic period. Athanasius wrote on the contents of the Psalms in his epistle ρ̂εος Ματαιλίουν η̂ν το̂ν τρυ̂μενον το̂ν ψαλμο̂ν, translated into Latin by Reuchlin, and from the Latin into German by Jörg Spalatin (1516). About the time of Athanasius, Hilarius Pictaviensis wrote his Tractatus super Psalmodiam, with an extensive prologue. We still have his exposition of Ps. i., ii., ix., xiii., xiv., lv., lvii., lxxii., xlvii., xviii.-cxvi. (according to the numbering of the Septuagint), which is more useful for the dogmatic theologian than for the exegete. Of somewhat later date are Ambrose's Enarrationes in Ps. i., xxxv.-xl., xlii., xlvi., lxxii., xlviii., cxviii.-cxviiii. (some ii. of the Benedictine edition). The most comprehensive work of the early Church on the Psalter, that of Chrysostom, of which only the third part is still extant. It is composed in the form of homilies: the style is brilliant, the contents more ethical than dogmatic. The only representative of the school of Antioch is Theodoret; but his work is a mere beginning, and therefore defective throughout. The Western counterpart to Chrysostom's Commentary are Augustine's Enarrationes in Psalmos (in tome iv. of the Benedictine edition), the chief mine of all later exposition in the Western Church. Cassiodorus, in his Expositiones in omnibus Psalmos (tome ii. of the Benedictine edition), draws largely from Augustine, though not devoid of independence. What the Greek Church has done for the exposition of the Psalms has been garnered up many times since Photius, in the so-called Catena: one, extending to Ps. 1., was published at Venice, 1669; another, more complete, was edited, in 3 vols., by the Jesuit Corderius, Antwerp, 1643. From the Catena of Niceas Heracleota, Folckmann published extracts in 1601. But, in spite of all defects which we find in these works, it must be said that the Church has never found such rapturous delight in the Psalms, which it was never weary of singing day and night, never used them as richer results, even to martyrdom, than during the period. Instead of profane popular song as one passed through the country one might hear psalms resounding over the fields and vineyards. And how many martyrs have endured every form of torture rather than desist from singing psalms? That which the Church in those days failed to furnish in writing towards the exposition of the Psalms, it more than compensated for by preserving the vitality of the Psalms with its blood. (c) The Medieval Church Exposition did not make any essential advance upon the patristic. (d) The Medieval Synagogue Exposition is wanting in the recognition of Christ, and consequently in the fundamental condition required for a spiritual understanding of the Psalms. The midrash on the Psalms, entitledPsyq, and the midrashic Catena entitled Ḥayil, of which at present only fragments (1846), was Aben-Ezra's teacher. Compared with other works, the Psalms were less commented upon by the Jews. In later commentaries, as in that of Moses Alshech (Venice, 1601) and Joel Shoshai (Salonichi, 1869), the simplicity and elegance of the older expositors give way to a repulsive scholasticism. The simple though mystical commentary of Obadiah Sforno (d. 1590), author of Postilla perpetua, made use of the works by Jewish expositors. Lyra and Paul de Santa Maria, Archbishop of Burgos (d. 1435), the author of the Addicions ad Lyram, were both Jewish Christians. Less dependent upon tradition are Aben-Ezra (d. 1167) and David Kimchi (d. about 1250); the Karaitc Jepheth, from whose Commentary on the Psalms De Barges published some fragments (1846), was Aben-Ezra's teacher. The Reformation Exposition. With the Reformation the rose-garden of the Psalter began to breathe forth its perfumes as with renewed freshness of a May day; for, converted into imperishable hymns (by Luther, Albinus, Franck, Gerhard, Jonas, Musculus, Ringwaldt, and others), it was transferred into the psalmody of the German Lutheran Church. In the French Reformed Church, Clement Marot translated into verse fifty psalms; two were added by Calvin, and the rest by Beza; while Goudimel, the martyr of St. Bartholomew's night, and teacher of Palestrina, composed the melodies and chorals. The English Church adopted the Psalms as part of its Liturgy: the Congregational followed the example of the Continental姐妹s. And how did the Psalter moulded into Latin verse! But the exegetical functions of psalm-exposition have been more clearly apprehended and more happily discharged than ever before. Luther's interpretation of the Psalms, in spite of its deficiencies,
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exceed every thing hitherto produced, and is still a perpetual mine of wealth. M. Butzer's Commentary (1853) is distinguished by sagacity and delicacy of judgment. Calvin's exposition has many excellencies; but his deficiency consists in denying the messianic relation, even in those passages which the modern rationalistic exegesis must even acknowledge. Calvin's strict historical method of interpretation makes a caricature in E. Clemen. The exposition of the Psalms from 1600 to 1750: every thing is accumulated here; the glossarial annotations groan beneath the burden of numberless unfitted examples and parallel passages. After 1750 perch published his Gnomon to the Psalms (1740), and Christian A. Crusius, his Hypomnemata (1784): both follow Bengel's principles. To have freed the psalm-exposition from want of taste is the merit of Herder; and the merit of Hengstenberg consists in having brought it back, out of this want of spirituality, to the believing consciousness of the Church. (g) Modern Exposition is marked by De Wette's Commentary, which was first published in 1811 (ed. by G. Baur, 1856), and forms an epoch in exegesis. The negative criticism of De Wette was supplemented by the positive results of Hitzig (1835, 1836), who was followed by Lengerke (1847) and J. Olshausen (1853), but with this difference, that, while Lengerke surpasses Hitzig by asserting that no single psalm can be ascribed with certainty to David, Olshausen finds Maccabean influences wherever the opposition of the just and unjust is mentioned. But, though excellent in linguistic respect, yet Olshausen's Commentary is surpassed by that of Hupfeld (1855, 1858 sq.). Beside all these works, Ewald's Commentary (1889, 1890) has a special charm. The merit of having perceived fully the object of the expositor, and having exposed it, and the kindred spirited works of Umbreit (Christliche Erbauung aus dem Psalter, 1855) and Stier (Siebenzig Psalmen, 1854, 1858), comprises only a part of the Psalms. The Commentary of Tholuck (1843) is adapted to gain friends for the Psalms from among the educated classes. The same may be said also of Vaihinger's Commentary (1845). A second edition of Hupfeld's Commentary was published by Riehm in 1867-71: a third is to be prepared by Eb. Nestle. For Lange's Bibelwerk, Moll wrote the theologico-homiletical exposition of the Psalter, 1869-71 [Eng. trans. New York, 1872]. The German predecessors to Moll have been made use of in the excellent Commentary by the evangelist, 1882, 1885; James Morgan: The Penitent (Ps. li.), and Christian A. Crusius, his Hypomnemata (1764): both follow Bengel's principles. Ewald defends the status quo, and asserts that each and every psalm must be regarded as post-exilic, unless the contrary is proved. The critical stand-point of an Ewald and Hitzig, who, like Herm. Schultz in his O. T. Theol. (2d ed., 1878, pp. 84 sq.), acknowledges a group of real psalms of David, is thus surpassed; and freer scope is now left to the modern reconstruction of the religious history of Israel according to the Darwinistic pattern. FRANZ DELITZSCH (B. Pick.)


PSALMS, Use of the, in Worship. There are many professions of Christians not a few, who believe, that, in the exercise of praising God directly or formally, the inspired Psalter, that is, the canonical Book of Psalms, only, should be used, or at least should be used to the exclusion of all uninspired songs.

At present this position is held by the United Presbyterian Church of North America, the Associate Presbyterian Church of North America, the Associate Reformed Synod of the South (U.S.), the Reformed Presbyterians (commonly called Covenanters) of Scotland, Ireland, and America, the United Original Secession Church of Scotland,
and, we believe, the General Synod of the Christian Reformed Church of Holland. In the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, the only authorized manual of praise is the Book of Psalms; although, in many congregations of that church, “paraphrases” of other parts of Scripture, and a few uninspired songs, have never received the sanction of the Church, are also used. In the Waldensian Church, so far as the original congregations in the Piedmontese valleys are concerned, the Psalms only are used in praising God, or at least were till very recently; but, in the mission congregations of that church in other parts of Italy, uninspired hymns have been introduced. In all the Presbyterian churches of Scotland, Canada, the United States, and Australia, there is a considerable number of persons who favor the view that only the Psalms should be used in the service of praise.

Among those who advocate the exclusive use of inspired songs in praising God, some (a small minority, it is believed) hold, that, besides the Psalter, other parts of Scripture may warrantably be employed in that exercise. It is, moreover, to be observed that the advocates of Scripture Psalmody do not object absolutely to the use of uninspired hymns as a means of exciting and expressing pious feeling; their objection being to restriction to the Psalms are here subjoined.

1. To worship God otherwise than he has appointed is “will-worship,” more or less gross. The law regulative of worship is not that we may use both what is commanded and what is not expressly forbidden, but that we must be limited to the use of what is either expressly or implicitly appointed by God (Deut. xii. 32; Matt. xv. 9, xxviii. 20).

2. To the Old-Testament Church God gave inspired songs, and prescribed the use of them in worship.

3. There is no evidence that God ever authorized his ancient people to employ in the stated service of song any other hymns than those finally collected into one book, that of Psalms.

4. This book continues to be the only divinely authorized hymn-book of the church. It is more suited to the present dispensation than it was even to the past. It is full of Christ, as the early Christian writers asserted vigorously. From the most devout Christians of the last eighteen centuries the highest eulogies of the Psalms have proceeded. Of the right and obligation to use the Psalms in praise, there has been no repeal. No substitute, no supplement, has been furnished or authorized by God. At the institution of the Supper, Christ and his disciples “hymned.” It is generally admitted that the hymns used on the occasion were the Psalms, extending from Ps. cxiii. to Ps. cxviii. inclusive. Our Lord thus wedded together the Supper and the Psalms, and authoritatively transferred the Psalms to the worship of the Christian Church.

By apostolic authority the use of the Psalms in praising God is clearly enjoined in Eph. v. 19 and Col. iii. 16. It is urged, indeed, that, in these texts, the use of “hymns” and “Spiritual songs” is also enjoined, and therefore that uninspired odes may warrantably be employed in formal praise.

The reply made to this, is, that it assumes without proof that the “hymns” and “songs” meant are uninspired compositions; that the argument, if valid, would prove that it is sinful not to use uninspired hymns. The direction given is not to prepare hymns, but only to sing them; that the epithet “spiritual,” applied to the songs, marks them as emphatically the product of the Spirit, that is, as inspired, and not merely devotional (1 Cor. ii. 13, xiv. 1); that it is difficult to believe that the apostle placed inspired and uninspired compositions on the same level; that, if hymns differ materially from hymns and songs, these latter must differ from each other, whereas, no distinction is made between them practically by hymn-singers; that the advocates of an uninspired hymnology seem to admit that psalms may fitly be called hymns, or psalms may be found in many popular collections styled Hymnals or Hymn-books; and that in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, the version used by the Christians of Ephesus and Colosse, the three terms which the apostle uses are employed to designate the Psalms, while, moreover, Josephus, a contemporary of Paul, frequently styles the Psalms “hymns,” and expressly says that David wrote “θῶς εἰς θεόν καὶ ημῶν,” that is, “songs and hymns to God” (Ant., 7, 12, 5).

5. If other hymns than those of the Psalter were used in the Apostolic Church, some of them would surely have survived. But not even one has certainly come down from the first two centuries. The earliest Christian hymn extant is believed to be that to the Logos, attributed to Clemens Alexandrinus, who died about 220 A.D.; but there is no evidence that it was ever used in the express worship of God. It needs to be noted that the mere existence of a hymn, or the fact that it was sung devotionally, is no proof that it was used in formal worship. During, at least, the first four centuries, the Psalms were pre-eminently used in worship; and the earliest departures from them, so far as the Orthodox were concerned, consisted in the chanting of fragments culled from other parts of Scripture, as if, in the heart of the church, the feeling existed, that, in praising God, inspired compositions only should be employed.

6. The fact that God gave to the church a psalm-book, but not a prayer-book, seems to teach that between prayer and praise there is such a difference, that the right to make our own prayers does not warrant the conclusion that we have the right to worship God with hymns uninspired.

7. The aid of the Spirit is promised in reference to prayer, but no such aid in reference to hymn-making, a much more difficult operation.

8. The inspired reader of the true Union Hymn-book. Prepared, as it was, by the Spirit, it meets the wants of all Christians, while, moreover, it forms a golden link between the church of the past dispensation and that of the present.

Lit.—WILLIAM ANNAN: Letters on Psalmody, Pittsburgh, Penn.; Vindication of Psalmody, Pittsburgh, 1866; JOHN MUIRHEAD: The Divine Institution of singing the Psalms of David, Montrose, 1790; JOHN ANDERSON: Vindications Cantus Dominici, 1800; GILBERT MCMASTER: Apology for the Book of Psalms, Philadelphia, 1852; The
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Instrumental Music in Worship. Those churches which reject uninspired hymns, though not they only, have hitherto been noted for a repugnance to the use of instrumental music in worship: hence a brief statement of the anti-instrumental line of argument may not unfruitfully be appended to the sketch given of the arguments against uninspired hymns.

Anti-instrumentalists commonly reason thus:—

1. In the matter of worship, our great inquiry should be, "What has God appointed?" Any form of worship not appointed is forbidden.

2. That only which is necessary to the suitable observance of a prescribed form of worship can be regarded as a circumstance needing no explicit appointment. If so, instrumental music is not a circumstance of worship.

3. Though divinely prescribed in the Old Dispensation, instrumental music was not intended to form an element of New-Testament worship; hence the favor of the court after the death of Michael Dys, and retired in 1078 to a monastery, where he died after 1105. He was a very prolific writer, and wrote on metaphysics, logic, mathematics, physics, jurisprudence, medicine, etc. His principal works are, De omnifaria doctrina, a metaphysical exposition of the fundamental ideas of all science; De damnum operatione, a dialogue edited by Boissone (Paris, 1838); and, of special interest for the study of the sect of the Euchites, a comparison between the ancient Christian and Pagan orators, etc. Many of his works are found in Migne: Patr. Græcos, vol. 122; Sar- tas: Michel Psellus, Paris, 1874-5, 2 vols. Many are unprinted. Cf. Leo Allatus: Diatriba de Psalmo in Migne.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. After a careful examination of the scope of the biblical canon, the ancient church divided the mass of biblical literature, in the widest sense of the word, into three classes; viz., (1) The canonical and inspired; (2) The non-canonical, but, on account of their long use, worthy of being read in the churches (koriklygen and tawnyyongen, etc.); and (3) The other books of a biblical character in circulation (biblical name in the title, a biblical form, biblical contents, but differing greatly in spirit and truth from the canonical books), called secret, and such that should be kept secret (ἅπαχα). Virtually the same books which the ancient church called Apocrypha are embraced under the name Pseudepigrapha by the Protestant Church. Since, after the example of Jerome, the non-canonical books of the Old Testament received the name Apocrypha, it became necessary to find a term one for the third class. The name Apocryphos is indeed taken only from a single and outward mark; namely, the spurious character of the author's name which they bear. It is neither sufficiently comprehensive, nor does it distinguish sufficiently this class of writings from the legomena; nor is it applicable to all the writings of the third class. For many of them, it is probably the best term that could be found.
The pseudepigrapha are divided into those of the Old, and those of the New Testament; the former embracing all those that claim to have been written by an Old-Testament personage, whether the contents be of a Jewish or of a Christian character; the latter embracing those pretending to be gospels, epistles, revelations, etc., of New-Testament characters. The latter class could probably better be called Apocrypha of the New Testament (in the old sense of the word).

In the following will we find a bird's-eye view of the Old Testament pseudepigrapha, both of those that are still preserved, and of those whose name alone we know. We preface a few general remarks on the origin and development of this whole class of literature. The rapid growth and spread of pseudepigraphic literature among the Jews and Christians in the last century before, and the early centuries after, Christ, is a peculiar phenomenon, for which other nations (e.g., the Indian) have only distant analogies; which is all the more remarkable, because such writings are in direct contradiction to the duty of strict truth, one of the highest demands of both Judaism and Christianity. That these books were used only in sectarian circles cannot be proved. It is true that heretics in the early days of the church frequently adopted this method of promulgating their errors; but this was already the period of the decay of this literature: and we must remember, on the other hand, that, in the course of the centuries during which it flourished, it generally was employed for honorable and usually noble purposes, and by members of the orthodox church at that time. There is no doubt that their origin is not to be explained as an imitation of the secret books in possession of the priests of the Gentile temples, but that they are the outgrowth of the peculiarity and life of the Jewish congregation, and were then transferred to the Christian Church. Above all, we must remember that it was the custom of Jewish writers not to prefix their names to their productions, as these were written for the service of the congregation, and not for fame, except in the case of prophets, where the person of the prophet was guaranty for the truth of the revelation. Thus the names of the authors of nearly all other books, even of such having the literary finish of a Job, have been hidden from posterity. This custom of omitting the author's name explains, to some extent, the origin of writings under a strange name. The other weighty reason lies in the inner rupture in the spiritual life of the Jews, which began already before the captivity, but showed itself in great potency in the first centuries of the New Jerusalem. With the ruin of the old political and religious organization, and the sufferings under heathen supremacy, the freedom of the spirit was also broken, the Holy Spirit of revelation withdrew, the state of affairs among the fathers and the doctrines of former days became the decisive rule for the new; and as all this led to an asceticism, Gnosticism, in the first centuries after the exile, thus it also increased the reverence for the old history, the old persons and writings, so much, that these ruled and decided the whole spiritual life of the people. The examination, study, and application of the sacred writings, were the fundamental objects of these times. Although, through association with other nations and educational forces (Persians, Greeks, Romans), and through a more systematic and a deeper investigation of the old books, new knowledge and aims were born, and although, in extraordinary and dangerous times, prominent men would feel themselves called upon to speak to the congregation, yet the lack of personal influence always induced such authors to put their thoughts and words into the mouth of some pious hero of antiquity, and conform the shape and style of their writings to those of the Old Testament. A thorough acquaintance with these latter facilitated the application of their contents to later circumstances. Such revivification of ancient persons, and making them the bearers of later thoughts, are common to all literatures; and it was but one step farther to ascribe a whole book to them. In many respects it can be compared with the dramatic works of other nations. But to call such writings simply fraudulent cannot be justified; as they were not necessarily written with such intent, and the knowledge of their late origin was constantly present to the minds of the readers. This danger of leaving a false impression existed for the content in general, — indeed a small, but constantly growing with time, especially when Christianity brought these later spiritual productions of the Jews to nations who did not understand them. The opposition of the early Christian Church against such books can thus be easily understood. But theological science must investigate, and make all possible use of them.

The pseudepigraphical form was chiefly adopted for the purpose of exhortation, instruction, and consolation in the great trials and troubles of post-exilic days. These writings seek to be for the present what the prophets were for the past, and accordingly they mostly have a prophetic character. Some, however, appear as apocalypses, in imitation of the Book of Daniel.

In addition to this class of literature, there was one of a similar kind; namely, that of the haggadic Midrash, of which there are many representatives. These embrace a vast number of explanations, stories, narratives, and the like, concerning biblical persons, events, etc., which arose in the course of time by help of the imagination or exegetical play and tricks. The production of fables and stories began early among the Israelites, and continued down to the middle ages. The Targumim, Midrash, and Talmudic writings bear ample testimony to this fact; and our pseudepigrapha contain much of such materials.

With the rise of Christianity, a new element was introduced into this literature, and contributed to its growth and development. The Essenes were not, as it is frequently asserted, the medium which transferred this class of writings into the Christian territory. There is no historical evidence for this, not even in Josephus. But Jewish-Christian pseudepigrapha flourished most abundantly among the Judaizing sects and the Gnostics in the first centuries of the Minor and Egypt. In the hands of the sects and heretics they later became instruments for dangerous purposes, which resulted in the antagonizing attitude of the church.

The number of Jewish and Christian pseudepigrapha was undoubtedly very large. Already in the Apocalypse of Ezra (4 Ez. xiv. 46 Lat.; ziv.
The Psalms of Solomon (Greek), published first from an Augsburg manuscript (since lost) in 1628, by a Jesuit, J. L. de la Cerda; later by Fabr., i. 914 sqq., with a German translation (revised from Geiger's) is furnished by Hilgenfeld, in his *Ztschrft. f. wiss. Theol.*, xi. 134 sqq., and in *Mess. Jud.*, pp. 3 sqq.; by E. Geiger, *Der Pfalzer Salomos mit Übers. u. Erlkrt.* (Augsburg, 1871); and by Fritzsche, i. c. pp. 569 sqq. A German translation (revised from Geiger's) is furnished by Hilgenfeld, in his *Ztschrft.*, xv. 388 sqq., and by Wellhausen, *Die Phariseer und Sadd.* (Griesf., 1874), pp. 138 sqq., together with a good discussion, pp. 112–120, 131–138; [an English translation by B. Pick, in *Presbyterian Review*, October, 1885]. It is a collection of songs for the congregation, in the manner of the biblical psalms (compare especially i., ii., xvii.). It is eight in number, bearing the title σαλώμος (Σαλώμος, Cod. Aug.) Ἰσραήλ. It is probable that they were not originally issued under Solomon's name, but later received it on the basis of 1 Kings v. 12. That the original was Hebrew, and not Greek, is clear from the errors in the translation, as also from the fact, that, without doubt, they were at one time used in the worship of the synagogue (E. Geiger, 20 sqq.; Wellhausen, 132 sqq.); for they are not of Christian (Gratz: *Gesch. d. Juden*, lii. 469), but of Jewish origin. The contents determine their date. A heathen ruler has torn down the walls of Jerusalem, has entered and defiled the holy places, has spilled much blood, and has led many into captivity, even to the extreme west (Ps. ii., viii., xvii.). This was a just punishment for the wickedness of those who had hitherto been ruling: they have themselves involved the people (Ps. i., ii., viii., xi., xii., xvi., xvii., xxiv., xxvii., xxx.). The congregation of the faithful must learn the lesson, that of foreseeing and of foretelling the future, their chief object, but nevertheless endeavor to erect their prophetic building on the foundation of the inspired seers. The chief contents of these revelations are the messianic times in their relation to the present time and circumstances. Not that the messianic times would come, but when and how, was the question for the waiting congregation. The books that seek to answer these questions are called Apocalypses. Their contents are most varied and peculiar, their explanation manifold and strange; the topics discussed all referring directly or indirectly to the kingdom of God, and the future of the chosen people; the style enigmatical and highly figurative. Cf. on the whole matter LÜCKE: *Einleitung in die Offenb. des Joh.*, 4th ed., 1848; HILGENFELD: *Die jud. Apokalyp tik*, 1887; LANGEN: *Das Judenhaus in Palästina*, 1886; SCHURER: *Lehrbuch d. N. T.* Titzsch, 1874; [Dean STANLEY'S *History of the Jewish Church*, 3d series, lect. xvii.].

## II. Prophetic Writings.

(a) The So-called Apocalypses, Revelations, (b) Testaments (see below).

(a) This is the name assigned to those books of fictitious prophecy, which, after the spirit of prophecy had departed from Israel, were written, in the manner of the genuine prophetic books, to solve the problems suggested by the fate and sufferings of the people. Such is the historical origin of each one of them. They seek a solution of the intricacies of the present in predictions of the glory of the future. Accordingly they do not imitate the old prophets in their chief peculiarity, namely, to counsel and warn the people on account of their sin, but make a subordinate office, that of foreseeing and of forestalling the future, their chief object, but nevertheless endeavor to erect their prophetic building on the foundation of the inspired seers. The chief contents of these revelations are the messianic times in their relation to the present time and circumstances. Not that the messianic times would come, but when and how, was the question for the waiting congregation. The books that seek to answer these questions are called Apocalypses. Their contents are most varied and peculiar, their explanation manifold and strange; the topics discussed all referring directly or indirectly to the kingdom of God, and the future of the chosen people; the style enigmatical and highly figurative. Cf. on the whole matter LÜCKE: *Einleitung in die Offenb. des Joh.*, 4th ed., 1848; HILGENFELD: *Die jud. Apokalyp tik*, 1887; LANGEN: *Das Judenhaus in Palästina*, 1886; SCHURER: *Lehrbuch d. N. T.* Titzsch, 1874; [Dean STANLEY'S *History of the Jewish Church*, 3d series, lect. xvii.].

(b) Testaments (see below).

## 3. The Enoch and Noah Writings, combined in the Book of Enoch. This book, cited in Jude
parables, xxxvii.—lxxi. (with the exception of the style, the Old Testament is well imitated. In its genfeld). nor in the time of Bar-cocheba (Volkmar), xciv.—cvii., exhortations of Enoch to Metnusaleh lxxxiii.—xci., xciii., two dream-visions, giving a revelation to Noah of uncertain but later date. The author of “Evolution of Christianity,” London, 1868, pp. 665 sqq.; Laurence: Book of Enoch the Prophet, translated, with text corrected by his latest notes, with an Introduction by the author of “Evolution of Christianity,” London, 1869; Dean Stanley: i.e., lect. xlix. The articles in Piddington’s Dictionary of the Bible on it are mentioned in Poole’s Index, p. 419.

The book, aside from the introduction (i.—v.), embraces five parts: (1) vi.—xxxvi., narrative of the fall of the angels, and of a tour of Enoch, in company with an angel, through heaven and earth, and the mysteries seen by him; (2) xxxvii.—lxxi., parables concerning the kingdom of God, the Messiah, and the messianic future; (3) lxxii.—lxxvi., astronomical and physical matter; (4) lxxvii.—lxxxiv., two dream-visions, giving a symbolical representation of the history of the world to the messianic completion; (5) lxxv—lxxxvii., exhortations of Enoch to Methusaleh and his descendants. Then follows an appendix, lxxxviii. Enoch’s revelations embrace both Jews and Gentiles, treat extensively of the messianic kingdom and the Messiah, explain the mysteries of the visible and the invisible world, and might be called a system of biblical gnosticism, derived from a study of the sacred writings, together with haggadic matter on antediluvian affairs. They are pervaded by a deep moral tone, and in tenor and style the Old Testament is well imitated. In its present shape the book consists of three parts: (1) the groundwork, i.—xxxvi. and lxxii.—cv.; was written in the days of Hyrcanus (Dillmann, Ewald, Kistlin, Schürer), not of Alexander Jannæus (Hilgenfeld), nor in the time of Bar-cocheba (Volkmar), nor in the days of Judas Maccabeus (Lücke, Langen, and Schoelde, [see pp. 41 sqq.]); (2) the parables, xxxvii.—lxxi. (with the exception of the Nosach fragments), the best part in contents and style, treating of the Messiah and his kingdom, angelology and demonology, and dividing themselves into three distinct parables—its opposition to the sinful “kings and rulers,” as well as lvi. 6 sqq., points to the time of Herod as the probable date of writing. (3) The Nosach fragments, liv.—lxi. 25, cvi.—cvi. reveals to Noah of uncertain but later date. All these parts were originally written in Pales-tine, in Hebrew or Aramaic. Nothing in any way shows any Christian influence: it is entirely of and for the Jews. This whole matter is treated in extenso, in Dillmann’s Einleitung to his German translation, [and later by Schodde, in his General and Special Introductions, pp. 1—60].

The book claims that Moses, in his hundred and twentieth year, and the twenty-five hundredth of the creation, handed it, together with the Pentateuch, to Josue, and in it prophesied the course of Israel’s history, to the establishment of the messianic kingdom. The conclusion of the book is wanting. The book clearly speaks of John Hyrcanus, Herod in the thirty-fourth year of his reign, the invasion of Varus (c. 7), and was evidently written soon after this last event (4 A.D.). In the parts preserved, no mention is made of a Messiah; though the author is a member of the party of the Zealots, an enemy of the Ammonæans, Herodians, Sadducees, and even of the Pharisees (c. 7). Although originally a Hebrew work, the Latin has been translated from a Greek version.

5. The Fourth Book of Ezra, according to the method of numbering the Ezra books in the Latin Church, originally “Assumptio Mosis, or Ascensio Moisii” (Hilgenfeld: Mess. Jud., pp. xviii. sqq.). The original Greek text, with the exception of very few small fragments, has been lost; but in its room we have a Latin and four Oriental versions. The Latin text in the Vulgate, a very corrupt one, has been much improved by Volkmar (Handb. der Einleitung in d. Apokr., vol. ii.; Das & Buch Ezra, Tübingen, 1883), by Hilgenfeld and Fritzsche, i.e. the large latina, which, owing to a loss of a leaf in the Cod. Sangermanniænsis, had existed between vi. 35 and 36, has been filled by the discovery of an old manuscript in Amiens, by R. Bensal (The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the IV. Book of Ezra, Cambridge, 1875). The Syriac version, together with a Latin translation, has been published by Ceriani, 1866; the Ethiopic, by R. Langren, 1862; and from a poor English and Latin translation. In addition to these three versions from the Greek, we have the inaccurate Armenian translation into Latin by Petramann, in Hilgenfeld, pp. 378 sqq., and two somewhat free Arabic versions, one of which, on the basis of a manuscript in the Bodleian
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Library, was published in an English translation of S. Ockley, by W. Whiston (Primitive Christianity, London, 1711, t. 4), and in Arabic by Ewald (Abb. d. G. G., vol. xi., 1869); and the other was published complete by Gildemeister (Esra, liber iv., Arabice, Bonn, 1877, 4to), in Arabic and Latin. With the aid of the Oriental versions, we can restore the original book, which proves to be the production of a Jew in the last quarter of the first Christian century. The translation of Jerusalem by the Jews is both the historical background, as also the occasion, of the book, which seeks, from a Jewish standpoint, to explain the cause and bearing of this terrible calamity, as far as Israel is concerned. The speedy dissolution of the Roman supremacy, and the establishment of a messianic sway, is the burden of the visions so vividly and dramatically portrayed. It is written in Hebraizing Greek and in the spirit of Palestinian Judaism. Internal indices point to the existence and influence of Christianity. The famous eagle-vision, in which plumes and wings must be taken, in the same pair, is an echo of pagan emperors, and the Roman emperors, decides the date of the book.

6. The present Jewish Ezra revelation found an entrance into the church, but usually with some modifications. In the editions of the Vulgate it has, beside these, long additions in front and at the close. These in the manuscripts are independent Jewish work. Both are translations from the Greek.

7. Χρόνος καὶ ἀπόκλισις τοῦ ἁγίου προφήτου "Εσφαδή, published by Tischendorf, in Apocal. apocr. (Lips., 1866), from a Paris manuscript, has little or no merit. On other Ezra literature, cf. Lücke, p. 150; Tischendorf: Studien und Kritiken, 1851, Heft 2.


It is a revelation to Baruch concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, the following captivity, and the second destruction, to which are added visions of the messianic future. It is allied in contents and style to 4 Ezra, and called forth by the same historical events, but is a little later. The original language is Greek.

9. The epigraphon Barushi, mentioned in the Synopsis Psalmi Athanassii, is the same as above, is uncertain. We still, however, possess a Christian Baruch Book, published (in Ethiopic) by Dillmann, in Chrest. Aethiop., pp. 1—15 (Greek), in the Menarum Grecorum, Venet., 1869, and by Ceriani (Mon. Sacr., i. pp. 8 sqq.), 1868; translated into the Latin, in the Monumenta Graeca, vii. 83 sqq.; f. wiss. Theol. (1872, pp. 230 sqq.), and by E. König, in Stud. u. Krit. (1877, p. 315); [and into English by Schoedde, in Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, Penn., July, 1878], with the title in both Greek and Ethiopic, ναος ουκεσιμων τρομοι του προφητου, only that the latter substitutes Baruch for Jeremiah. It, too, treats of the captivity, and shows strong Christian influence.

10. A Πλως προφήτου is mentioned in Psalm Athanassii and in Niechorus, and Ελευθεριος et visio, in the catalogue of Apocrypha of Coteler (Patres Apost., i. p. 197) and Montfaucon (Bibl. Coelitan. p. 194).

11. Ascensio et Viaion Isaiae. The existence of an Αποκρυφά and Αναβάτων (or Θανάτος) Αποστόλης was known for a long time. (Cf. Fabr. i. pp. 1086 sqq.). In 1819 Laurence published an Ethiopic text (Ascensio Isaiae et Latine, cum proleg. et annot. (Lips., 1877) [from which Schoedde made an English translation in the October number of the Lutheran Quarterly, 1878]; soon after which the Greek Prooricia αποκρυφά και αναβατών Αποστόλης was discovered in Paris by Gebhardt, and printed in Hilgenfeld: Zuchrif., xx., 330 sqq. It is virtually an extract from the Ethiopic. The book is composed of Jewish and Christian documents, combined by a Christian hand, not later than the second half of the second century.

12. An Apocalypse, or Prophecy of Zephaniah, in imitation of the Ascensio Isaiae, is not only mentioned in the four catalogues of Apocrypha, but a fragment is also quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. 5, 11, § 78.

13. An Apocryphon of Jeremiah, in Hebrew, used by the Nazarenes, is mentioned by Jerome (Fabr. i. i. 1102 sqq.) as the source of the quotation in Matt. xxvii. 9; but this is improbable.

Concerning the Apocalypses of (14) Habakkuk, (15) Ezekiel, (16) Daniel, and (17) Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, we have no further information.

18. An Apocalypse of Moses, distinct from the Book of Jubilees (cf. No. 31) and the Assumptio Moisii, we know only from Syncellus, Photius amphil., and others (Fabr. i. 588), who mention it as the source of Gal. vi. 16.

19. A Lantech Book is mentioned in the Catalogues of Coteler and Montfaucon; and—


(b) Testaments.

21. Α διαθήκη των Πρωτοκλητων, according to Fabr. ii. 58, contained the mention that Adam was taken into Paradise when forty days old. It is probably a portion of the Vita Adami (No. 35).

22. Α διαθήκη των δύοκα Πατριαρχων (Testamenta XII., Patriarcharum), mentioned first by Tertullian and Origen. The original Greek text has often been issued; cf. in The Presbyterian Review, January, 1880.) The book is a Jewish-Christian work, in the garb of addresses made by the twelve sons of Jacob at their death, of a practical and ethical character, in the spirit of the Epistle of James. The work was probably written about the close of the first Christian century.

23. An Apocryphon, των τρεν Πατριαρχων, is mentioned in the Const. Apost., vi. 16; and (24)
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Apocryphal Testament of Jacob, in the Decretum Gelasii (Fabr. 2, i. 437, 790).


26. A דתתית מְעַטְטוֹס is found in the fourth catalogue and in the Catena of Nicephorus, i. col. 175.


28. The Testament of Adam and Noah are portions of the Vita Adami. Cf. No. 35.

(a) Other Books of and concerning the Prophets.

29. In the acts of the Nicene synod (Fabr. 2, i. 848) mention is made of a בִּבלָה לֶבֹּנְלֵמַנְט הָעָבְרִיָּא. What book is meant is uncertain. The later Jews had a work (Petitrat Mosche) on the death of Moses.

30. Liber Eldad et Medad is mentioned in Pastor Hermes, i. v. 2, 3; and later authorities mention it as an apocryphon of the Old Testament.

III. BOOKS ON HISTORICAL MATTERS AND HAGGADIC WRITINGS.

31. The Book of the Jubilees, or the Little Genesis (אַוּדֶּקְרָה, או לַעֲשָׂרָאָה, Microgenesis, Leptogenesis), of which the Greek and Latin fragments are found in Fabr. 2, i. 849 sqq., ii. 120 sqq.

32. The Testament of Adam and Noah are portions of the Vita Adami. Cf. No. 35.

33. Manasseh's conversion (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11). The story of these two sorcerers is already very old, and was early used. Cf. Hearth: Palest. Expl. Fund., October, 1881, pp. 311 sqq.

34. Manasseh's conversion (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11) early gave rise to an Apocryphon of M., used both by Christian writers and by the Targum to Chronicles (Asc. Jes. c. 1-5). It seems to have been strongly cabalistic.

35. A דתתית מְעַטְטוֹס is found in the fourth catalogue and in the Catena of Nicephorus, i. col. 175.

36. A Gnostic writing called Noria, after the wife of Noah, is mentioned by Epiphanius (Hær. 20 and 87), and an Ebionitic book, אֵ 오늘ְכֵל תֶּלָה. Bow (Gen. xxviii.), by the same (Fabr., i. 437).

The most important one is the Vita Adami, translated from the Ethiopic by Dillmann, in Éwald's Jahrbuch, v. 1853, and, with the assistance of the Arabic, by Taunke, in Acad. der Wiss., München, 1880; and English, by Malan: The Book of Adam and Eve, London, 1882. There is also a Latin Vita Ada et Eva, edited by W. Meyer, München, 1879.

The arrangement of the contents of the complete collection is as follows: first the preface; then a letter from Aurelius to Damascus, and the answer of the latter, both spurious; the Ordo de celebrando concilio, borrowed from the fourth Council of Toledo; a list of councils; two spurious letters from Jerome to Damascus and from Damascus to Jerome, after which the collection proper begins. It consists of three parts: the first part contains the fifty apostolical canons, fifty-nine spurious letters chronologically arranged, and ascribed to the popes between Clement I and Melchisedech, the treatise De primitiva ecclesia et synodo Niceno, and the spurious Donatio Constantini.

The second opens with a quotation from the genuine Spanish collection, and another from the collection of Faustus Queenell, and contains the Greek, African, and Spanish council, generally agreeing with the Hispana.
and then gives the papal decretals from Sylvester to Gregory I. (d. 731), of which thirty-five are spurious. It must be noticed, however, that many of these spurious documents were well known to the church long before Pseudo-Isidore incorporated them with his collection; as, for instance, the first two letters from Clement to James, the Donatio Constantini, the Canonum Apostolorum, etc. At present, a number of scholars hold that it was the general insincerity of society, and more especially the confusion prevalent in all church matters, which induced Pseudo-Isidore to make this attempt at forming and establishing a general code of church discipline. See Münzer: Schriften, edited by Döllinger, vol. i. p. 283. A more searching study, however, of the work itself, shows that its true purpose must have been to free the bishops from their dependence, not only on the State, but also, and more especially, on the metropolitans and the provincial synods. Knust: De fontibus et consitio Pseud. Collect., Göttingen, 1832, and Wasserschleben: Bei- träge zur Geschichte der falschen Dekretalen, Bres- sungen, 1832.

Formerly it was quite generally accepted that the real purpose of the Pseudo-Isidorian fabrication was the extension of the primacy of Rome. See Theiner: De Pseudoisid. canonum collectione, Freiburg, 1826. At present, a number of scholars hold that it was the general insincerity of society, and more especially the confusion prevalent in all church matters, which induced Pseudo-Isidore to make this attempt at forming and establishing a general code of church discipline. See Münzer: Schriften, edited by Döllinger, vol. i. p. 283. A more searching study, however, of the work itself, shows that its true purpose must have been to free the bishops from their dependence, not only on the State, but also, and more especially, on the metropolitans and the provincial synods. Knust: De fontibus et consitio Pseud. Collect., Göttingen, 1832, and Wasserschleben: Bei- träge zur Geschichte der falschen Dekretalen, Bres- sungen, 1832. It is true that the primacy of the Roman see and the authority of papal decrees are repeatedly recognized and emphasized, but that is evidently done in the interest of the bish- ops rather than in that of the pope. The sedes Romana is declared the caput, cardo, apex, mater omnium ecclesiarum; but it had evidently been placed in that position in order to be able to shield and protect the bishops. The first aim of Pseudo-Isidore was to emancipate the episcopacy from the authority of the metropolitans and the provincial synods. The decision of a synod convened and presided over by the metropolitan; but, in order to be competent, the synod must be legislime convened, that is, auctoritate sedis apostolicae. The decisions of a synod convened without the consent of the Pope must be null and void. It might thus prove difficult enough to establish a competent court, and still more to procure a competent accuser; for not only were all laymen and members of the secular clergy excluded, but also a member of the higher clergy, if in any way he seemed to be immensus, offensus, iratus, suspectus, etc. Furthermore: the accuser should be accompanied by seventy-two witnesses, each of whom should be qualified to be an accuser himself; and, finally, the bishop had the right to break off the proceedings at any stage of their development, and appeal directly to the Pope; that is, it was next to impossible to have a criminal bishop punished, unless the Pope himself consented and interfered.

The principal sources from which Pseudo-Isi- dore drew his materials were the works of Cassio- dorus and Rufinus, the Liber pontificalis and the Vulgate, the writings of the Fathers, and the theologcal literature generally down to the ninth century, the correspondence of Archbishop Boni- face of Mayence, the genuine decretales and canons, various collections of laws,— such as the Bre- viarium Alaricium, the Lex Visigothorum, the Frankish capitularies, etc. These materials seem to indicate that the collection was made in Gaul, and the indication is strongly corroborated by the circumstance that the language swarms with Gal- licisms; the style, with phrases and expressions from the juridical terminology of the Frankish Empire; and the contents, with references to the actual state of the Frankish Church at that time. At all events, those who have fixed the birthplace of the collection at Rome— Febronius, Theiner, Eichhorn, and others— have not succeeded in adding equally strong reasons for their supposi- tion. The frequent use made of the corre- spondence of Boniface shows that the archives of Mayence were at the disposal of the compiler; and Mayence was, down to very recent times, generally considered as the place of fabrication. This seems true, however, only so far as regards the older and minor collection; while the later and larger seems to have been made at Rheims. Only of the former are the oldest manuscripts (those of St. Gall and Cologne) of German origin; while of the latter, not only the oldest, but also by far the most numerous, manuscripts are French. In Ger- many the collection did not come into general use until the eleventh century. With respect to the time of the authorship of the work, it must have taken place is determined by the two facts that Pseudo-Isidore used the canons of the Council of Paris (829), while his own collection was used by the synod of Chieray (857). Since the researches of the Ballerinis and Blondel (Pseudo-Isidore et Turrianus caput, Lyon, 1728), it has also been proved that the collection was made in the fourth or fifth decade of the ninth century. But attempts have been made to arrive at a closer determination of the

18 - III
The history of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals presents the curious phenomenon, that, instead of achieving the purpose for which they were originally made, they finally came to serve the almost opposite interest. They were intended to protect the bishops against the metropolitans; but they became the means by which the Pope crushed, not only the metropolitans, but also the bishops. The Frankish clergy saw the danger, and made from time to time considerable opposition. The first pope who directly appealed to them was Nicholas I. In a brief of 863, addressed to Hincmar of Rheims, he mentions the collection of Adrian as the proper authority, without making any reference to them; but shortly after he must have had a sense of their power, for in a letter to Rothad; for, in the controversy between the latter and Hincmar, he makes copious use of them. Hincmar protested; but, from many of his utterances, it is apparent that he considered them spurious, though he did not hesitate to use them himself when they answered his purpose. See Weizsäcker: Hincmar und Pseudo-Isidor, in Zeitschrift f. hist. Theologie, 1856, p. 327. Indeed, it was the demoralization of the bishops, their religious indifferentism, and their political ambition, which finally made the Pseudo-Isidorian fraud triumph, and delivered up the church, with all its canons, to the interference of self-defence, into the hands of the Pope. From the end of the ninth century numerous extracts were made from the false decretals, the most remarkable of which was the so-called Capitula Remedi Curienis. Nothing, however, contributed more to spread them about, and secure their adoption, than the great systematical collections of canons made at that time; as, for instance, with the Collectio Anselmi dedicata, the decree of Burghard, the two works of Ivo, the collection of Anselm of Luoca, the Collectio trium partium, etc.; and, as those collections were the sources from which Gratian drew his materials, the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals thus became part and parcel of the Corpus juris canonici.

Down to the fifteenth century the genuineness of the decretals was, as above mentioned, never seriously assaulted. The most notable exceptions were: Nicholas of Cusa (De concordia cath., iii. 2) and Johannes Turrcremata (Summa eccles., ii. 101). But, when the work became more easily accessible by the Merlin edition, it proved an easy task for the authors of the Madgeburg Centuries, and the French critics, Dumoulin and Le Conte, to lay bare the fraud. An attempt at defence by the Jesuit (Torens: Adv. Magd. centuriorum, Florence, 1572) was completely refuted by Blondel; and later attempts—Bona-Ventura Malvabia (Nuntius veritatis, Borne, 1635) and Edouard Dumont (Les fausses déclarations, in Revue des questions historiques, i. and ii.—have failed as signally.
deeds. — (5) Ptolemy V., Epiphanes ("illustrious"), B.C. 205-181; alluded to in Dan. xi. 13-17; as he was on the eve of an attempt to recover the provinces. Antiochus apparently did this when he married his daughter Cleopatra to Ptolemy (B.C. 193), although they really remained under his authority. He was, however, foiled in his further designs by Cleopatra's unexpected advocacy of her husband's interests. Ptolemy was poisoned as he was on the eve of an attempt to recover the provinces from Seleucus, Antiochus' successor. — (6) Ptolemy VI., Philometor ("mother-loving"), B.C. 181-146; alluded to in Dan. xi. 25-30. So long as his mother lived (i.e., until 173), peace was preserved with Syria; but three years later Egypt had been overrun by Antiochus Epiphanes, and Ptolemy taken prisoner. The Romans again interfered, and compelled Antiochus to leave the country (168). Ptolemy V. turned his attention to his brother, Euergetes II., whose seditious attempts he suppressed, and to Syrian intrigues, by which he accomplished the ruin of Alexander Balas (see art.). It was under Ptolemy V. that the Jewish temple at Leontopolis was built. He marks the transition of the kingdom of Egypt into a Roman province. Cf. art. Ptolemuzeugma, in Smith's Dictionary of Biography and Dictionary of the Bible.

GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE PTOLEMIES.

Ptolemy I., Soter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arisinoe</th>
<th>Ptolemy II., Philadelphia = Arisinoe.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy III.</td>
<td>Euergetes I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy IV., Philopater = Arisinoe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy V., Epiphanes</td>
<td>Cleopatra (d. of Antiochus M.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy VI., Philometer = Cleopatra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy VII.</td>
<td>Cleopatra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euergetes II.</td>
<td>(2) Cleopatra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra.</td>
<td>Ptolemy K epator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Alexander Balas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Demetrius II.</td>
<td>Ptolemy VIII., Soter II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLICAN, an under collector of the Roman tribute (Matt. xviii. 17). It was an office which no patriotic Jew could hold, because it implied in the most offensive way the recognition of Roman supremacy. Publicans, being thus despised, generally revenged their insults by extortionate demands under color of law. It is remarkable, that, out of this despicable class, our Lord chose one of his apostles (Levi, or Matthew), who became the disciple of his father when he was his chief converts, Zacchaeus of Jericho (Luke xix. 2). Our Lord's association with publicans was one of the commonest taunts he received (Luke vii. 34). The system of farming the revenue then practised led directly and naturally to fraud and cruelty, from the nature of the place. PULLEN, Robert, an English scholastic and Roman cardinal; b. in England towards the close of the eleventh century, but the exact date and place are unknown; d. in Rome between 1147 and 1154. He studied in Paris, where the dialectic treatment placesman. PuLcricAn (a corruption of Pauhcian) was the name given by the French and English crusaders of the middle of the twelfth century to the Cathari of the West, because, like the Paulicians of the East, they were dualists. Several French writers of that time call the Paulicians simply Poplicans. PUFENDORF, Samuel, b. at Chemnitz in Saxony, 1632; d. at Berlin, 1694; lectured on jurisprudence at Heidelberg and Lund in Sweden, and finally settled at Berlin, as historiographer to the elector of Brandenburg. His principal work is De jure naturae et gentium (Leipzig, 1672; d. at Berlin, 1694; Amsterdam, 1715, etc.), translated into German, English, and French. Though essentially only an elaboration and systematization of the ideas of Grotius, it forms the foundation of the modern conception of the doctrine of natural and international rights. Previously that doctrine had been based on the Decalogue, and developed in accordance with the idea of the justice of God. Grotius was the first who completely severed it from theology, based it on the instinct of sociability inherent in human nature, and derived it directly from human reason. In the systematic exposition which it received from Pufendorf, it attracted great attention, but also met with great opposition: indeed, Buddeus and Wolff were the first who fully recognized it. Among Pufendorf's other works, his De habiitu religionis Christianae ad vim civilem (Bremen, 1697) has also theological interest as a defence of the collegial system. After his death appeared his Jus faciale divinum, a demonstration of the impossibility of bringing about a union between the Lutheran and Reformed creed, as long as the latter retains the doctrine of predestination. G. FRANK.

PUL. See TIGLATH-PILESER.

PULCHERIA, a daughter of Arcadius, and older sister of Theodosius II.; was in 414, though only sixteen years old, intrusted by the Senate with the title of Augusta and the guardianship of her weak-minded brother. For ten years she governed the empire with great authority, though in a narrow, monastic spirit: she actually transformed the palace into a monastery. She then married her brother to Eudoxia-Athenais, a daughter of an Athenian philosopher; but bitter jealousy soon sprang up between the two sisters-in-law. In the Nestorian controversy Eudoxia sided with Nestorius, while Pulcheria took the part of Cyril of Alexandria. Pulcheria was banished from the court; and, by the support of Eudoxia, Eutyches and Dioscorus triumphed at the synod of Ephesus. Pulcheria, however, returned before her brother's death, and regained her influence. Eudoxia was banished to Jerusalem; and orthodoxy was restored by the Council of Chalcedon, at whose sixth session (Oct. 23, 451) Pulcheria herself was present. After her return she married the general Marcianus, but died shortly after, Sept. 11, 453. She is revered by the Greek Church as a saint. See Act. Sacrae, Sept. 3, and GROZOROVUS: Athanasii, Leipzig, 1861.

PULLEYN, Robert, an English scholastic and Roman cardinal; b. in England towards the close of the eleventh century, but the exact date and place are unknown; d. in Rome between 1147 and 1154. He studied in Paris, where the dialectical treatment placesman.
PULPIT.
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PUNISHMENT.

PUNISHMENT AMONG THE HEBREWS.

The penal code, which tended towards a restoration of the order of law which had been disturbed, to uphold the authority of the law, and protect it against future infringements (Deut. xvii.13, xix.18), thus destroying the evil from the midst of the land and of the people of Israel, was among the Hebrews, as well as among other nations, originally and naturally based on the principle of retaliation. This is clearly expressed on several occasions, as Exod. xii. 24; Lev. xix. 17, 21; Num. xxxv. 16, 21, 31; Deut. xix. 21. But this principle is restricted in Israel by the law: a legally regulated and mitigated righteous compensation takes its place. The vengeance belongeth to God (Deut. xxxii.35; comp. Rom. xii.19). Although acknowledged as the legal basis, yet the law does not consider it a principle than a strict law: and in fact we find not one instance in the Bible which would prove the literal application of the jus talionis, for which Christ substituted the very opposite, the evangelical rule (Matt. v. 38 sq.).

The most common punishment was that with the stick, which was applied not only to children and slaves (Prov. xii. 24, xxiii. 13 sq., xxix. 15), but also to the offender, lying on the ground, in the presence of a judge (Lev. xix. 20; Deut. xxii. 18). In later times stripes were inflicted, whose number was not to exceed forty (Deut. xxiv. 3): whence the Jews took care not to exceed thirtynine (2 Cor. xi. 24; Josephus, Ant., iv. 8, 21).

In the synagogue this punishment was inflicted at the appointment of the Sanhedrin (Matt. x. 17, xxiii. 34; Acts v. 40, xxii. 19) for ecclesiastical offences.

Capital punishments were of two kinds,—stoning, and death by the sword. Stoning was applied for idolatry in any shape, be it actual or virtual (Lev. xx. 2; Deut. xii. 6, 10, xvii. 7-8), blasphemy (Lev. xxiv. 14, 16, 23; 1 Kings xxii. 10 sq.), witchcraft, etc. (Lev. xx. 27), sabbath-breaking (Num. xviii. 20), murder and man-slaughter (Exod. xxi. 14; Lev. xx. 23), adultery (Lev. xx. 24), incestuous and unnatural connections. Death by the sword was the general rule (Matt. v. 38 sq.). Although acknowledged as the legal basis, yet the law of retaliation was more than a strict law: and in fact we find not one instance in the Bible which would prove the literal application of the jus talionis, for which Christ substituted the very opposite, the evangelical rule (Matt. v. 38 sq.).

The most common punishment was that with the stick, which was applied not only to children and slaves (Prov. xii. 24, xxiii. 13 sq., xxix. 15), but also to the offender, lying on the ground, in the presence of a judge (Lev. xix. 20; Deut. xxii. 18). In later times stripes were inflicted, whose number was not to exceed forty (Deut. xxiv. 3): whence the Jews took care not to exceed thirtynine (2 Cor. xi. 24; Josephus, Ant., iv. 8, 21).

In the synagogue this punishment was inflicted at the appointment of the Sanhedrin (Matt. x. 17, xxiii. 34; Acts v. 40, xxii. 19) for ecclesiastical offences.

Capital punishments were of two kinds,—stoning, and death by the sword. Stoning was applied for idolatry in any shape, be it actual or virtual (Lev. xx. 2; Deut. xii. 6, 10, xvii. 7-8), blasphemy (Lev. xxiv. 14, 16, 23; 1 Kings xxii. 10 sq.), witchcraft, etc. (Lev. xx. 27), sabbath-breaking (Num. xviii. 20), murder and man-slaughter (Exod. xxi. 14; Lev. xxiv. 19 sq.), among other nations, origi-
of a future state. This is a great mistake, for a careful trial, and at the mouth of two or three witnesses of sin, and the continuation of life beyond the grave. There may be great differences of view in regard to each of these points; but, where any of these is proved, the doctrine of a future retribution is not likely to be entertained. The fact of future retribution cannot reasonably be denied by any except those who hold a pantheistic or a materialistic theory of the universe. Differences of opinion upon this subject among those who profess to believe in God, and particularly to believe in Christianity, have pertained to the mode and duration of future retribution, and not to the fact. Natural religion, as has been suggested, will suffice to create the expectation and belief in a retribution of some kind in the next life; but, for any definite belief, we are, of course, dependent upon revelation. The authority of the Bible is therefore the postulate of the Christian dogma of retribution. There has not been an absolute agreement among the students of Scripture in regard to what its teaching is. What the differences are, and what we regard as the true view, can be best exhibited, perhaps, if we deal with the subject by considering, (1) its history, (2) the church doctrine, (3) the departures from the church doctrine.

I. History. — So widespread has been the belief in a future state of retribution and punishments, that Warburton founded his great apologetic, *The Divine Legation of Moses*, on the absence of any appeal in the Mosaic legislation to the sanctions of reward and punishment in the next life. The absence of such appeals has been taken by some to imply ignorance, on the part of the Jews, of a future state. This is a great mistake, for the doctrine of future retribution is unmistakably present in the Old Testament. Before Christ and in the time of the Maccabees, belief in eternal punishment was entertained. At the time of our Lord, belief in everlasting punishment was held (perhaps not universally) by the Pharisees, as we know from Josephus. Philo, however, of the same period, is cited as an annihilationist. The Fathers of the first six centuries believed, for the most part, in the eternity of hell-torment. The early Fathers universally held this belief; though Justin Martyr and Irenæus have been claimed, but on insufficient grounds, as annihilationists. Clement and Origen were restorationists. So were Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzen, together with Theodore of Mopsuestia. Augustine defended the generally received doctrine of endless punishment. This Father held, however, that Christians not perfect at death undergo purification in the intermediate state. In this way he contributed to the development of what was subsequently known as the doctrine of purgatory,—a doctrine which Cyprian (according to Neander) first promulgated as to its germinal idea, and which Gregory the Great was the first to make an article of faith. The scholastics held that all heretics, infidels, and those who die in mortal sin, go immediately to hell; that those who die in the peace of the church, but imperfect, experience the purifying pains of purgatory; and, finally, that the souls of all unbaptized infants go to the limbus infantum, a place distinct from the limbus patrum, which was the abode of the Old Testament saints.

Protestants and Roman Catholics agree respecting the doctrine of hell. The points of difference between them, so far as eschatology is concerned, grow out of an attempt to answer the question, "What is the condition of the redeemed during the period between death and the resurrection?" Some taught that the soul was unconscious; some, the doctrine still held by many, which is known as that of the intermediate state. Roman Catholics believed in purgatory. The Reformers denied the doctrine of purgatory, and affirmed that all men at death go either to heaven or hell. They differed respecting the salvation of infants. The Anglesburg Confession makes baptism essential to salvation. This Calvinists denied. They held to the guilt of original sin, to the ill-desert of infants, to the doctrine that the area of the saved is defined by that of sovereign election, and that regeneration is not conditioned by ordinances. Elect infants dying in infancy were saved, whether they were baptized or not. Calvinistic theologians did not say that there were no non-elect infants who died in infancy: indeed, they commonly believed that there were. Whether this common belief shall govern the construction of the Westminster Confession, or whether the cautious words in which the subject of elect infants is expressed shall lead us to believe that the Assembly declined to say dogmatically that there were non-elect infants, is a question that cannot be discussed here. See INFANT SALVATION.

Those who now subscribe to the Westminster Confession of Faith do not believe that any infants dying in infancy are lost. Some dislike the phraseology employed regarding the subject; while others see in it no necessary implications regarding non-elect infants. The Confession says that the saved are the elect. It tells how the elect are saved. Those elect who are capable of being outwardly called are required to repent, and exercise faith. Elect infants dying in infancy, and other elect persons incapable of being outwardly called, are regarded as the sovereign exercise of the power of the Holy Ghost, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth. The antithesis is not between elect and non-elect infants, but between elect persons who can, and who cannot, exercise faith. Infants dying in infancy fall into the latter category. That all such infants...
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were elect, the writers of the Confession did not know, whatever they might hope and believe; but neither did they say that some such infants were non-elect.

It is not strange that a doctrine which puts such a strain upon our sympathies as that of everlasting punishment should meet with opposition. In modern, as in ancient times, therefore, we find representative men who are at variance with the orthodox belief. Locke taught the doctrine of conditional immortality, which has been favored by Watts, Whately, and Isaac Taylor. Rothe also held this view, though restorationism is more in favor with the German theologians who diverge from confessional orthodoxy. Nitzsch and Müller show their strong leanings toward restorationism by affirming the possibility of eternal damnation as the result of persistent obduracy in the future state. Tillotson hoped for an ultimate restoration of all men, and John Fosten confidently believed in it. Organized opposition to the doctrine of eternal punishment, at the beginning of this century, consisted, for the most part (in this country), of a denial of all post mortem punishment for sin. This extreme type of Universalism (that of Ballou), however, has few representatives at the present day. It has succumbed to the merciless criticism to which it was subjected. But it is to be feared that belief in restorationism and annihilationism is increasing within orthodox communions. This is evident in the increase of the literature advocating one or the other view, and in the fact that either view is being freely tolerated in some denominations. That subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles does not bind Anglicans to hold the doctrine of eternal punishment was decided by the Privy Council (1863-64), in the case of Fendall vs. Wilson.

A less serious departure from the Protestant position regarding retribution is found in the disposition of some leading divines, like Dörner and Martensen, to hold that the period between death and the resurrection may be a probationary period for those who did not embrace the gospel in this life, and especially for those who were in need of purgation. When they die: they go to paradise. The 'Westminster divines rejected purgatory, and refused to assign a locality and a name to the intermediate state. The Protestant doctrine is: (1) that there is no probation after death; (2) that no personal satisfaction for sins is demanded, either in this life or the next, from those who believe in Christ; (3) that the punishment of hell is everlasting.

The punishments of hell are set forth in Scripture under the strong imagery of fire and brimstone. It is not necessary to interpret these passages literally, yet care must be taken not to empty them of their terrible meaning. Whatever the nature of hell-torment may be, it is something so terrible that only the strong language of the Saviour's description will represent it. The punishments of hell must not be regarded as merely the natural consequences of wrong-doing; though these are serious enough, and they constitute a strong argument in support of the doctrine of eternal punishment. We see the natural segregation of men in this world according to character, the hardening effect of sin, and the suffering that always associates itself with persistent wrong-doing. It is therefore fair to suppose that the sinner's separation from God and the suffering consequent therefrom will be eternal.

These considerations, together with the view of some, that sin is an infinite evil and demands a punishment of infinite duration, and the view of others, that eternal suffering is the result of eternal sinning, constitute what may be called the rational argument for eternal retribution. The great reason why believers in the doctrine, however, is the fact that it is taught with such terrible plainness in Scripture.

II. CHURCH DOCTRINE.

There is a general agreement among the confessions of Christendom, that after the judgment all men go either to heaven or hell, and that the punishments of hell are endless. Confessional differences concern the condition of the dead during the period between death and the resurrection. Roman Catholics teach that the atonement of Christ only delivers men from eternal punishment, and that temporal punishments, especially the pains of purgatory in the next world, remain to be endured as satisfaction for sin. Protestants reject the doctrine of purgatory, because it is not taught in Scripture. It is true that nothing that defileth can enter heaven: it is also true that men are not perfectly sanctified in this life. But this, though it is the ground of the inference, does not justify the inference, that there must be some process of purgation in the next life. The doctrine of purgatory is rejected also, because it rests upon the false assumption that Christ has not made a complete satisfaction for sin. It contradicts, moreover, the distinct statement of Scripture, that there is now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus.

Some Protestants teach what is known as the doctrine of the intermediate state. This is a harmless doctrine, however, and consists mainly in the emphasis given to what all Christians believe; namely, that the state of the blessed dead, though one of complete happiness during the period after death, is yet inferior to that upon which they are to enter after the resurrection. The advocates of this view will not say that the righteous go to heaven when they die: they go to paradise. The Westminster divines rejected purgatory, and refused to assign a locality and a name to the intermediate state. The Protestant doctrine is: (1) that there is no probation after death; (2) that no personal satisfaction for sins is demanded, either in this life or the next, from those who believe in Christ; (3) that the punishment of hell is everlasting.

The punishments of hell are set forth in Scripture under the strong imagery of fire and brimstone. It is not necessary to interpret these passages literally, yet care must be taken not to empty them of their terrible meaning. Whatever the nature of hell-torment may be, it is something so terrible that only the strong language of the Saviour's description will represent it. The punishments of hell must not be regarded as merely the natural consequences of wrong-doing; though these are serious enough, and they constitute a strong argument in support of the doctrine of eternal punishment. We see the natural segregation of men in this world according to character, the hardening effect of sin, and the suffering that always associates itself with persistent wrong-doing. It is therefore fair to suppose that the sinner's separation from God and the suffering consequent therefrom will be eternal.

These considerations, together with the view of some, that sin is an infinite evil and demands a punishment of infinite duration, and the view of others, that eternal suffering is the result of eternal sinning, constitute what may be called the rational argument for eternal retribution. The great reason why believers in the doctrine, however, is the fact that it is taught with such terrible plainness in Scripture.
that the end of God's government is the promotion of happiness; but, if we were, we do not know that in such a world the conditions necessary to the promotion of the greatest happiness do not make the eternal misery of some antecedently possible.

(4) Eternal punishment is said to militate against the end of punishment. But this is based on the belief that all punishment is intended to be reformatory, whereas every true philosophy of punishment must recognize the deterrent, and especially the vindictive element, as well as the reformatory element, in the infliction of penal suffering.

(5) And it is finally said that the eternal dualism of good and evil which the orthodox doctrine implies is contrary to the use of the universal terms of Scripture respecting the putting away of evil, the reconciliation of all things in Christ, the subjugation of every thing in heaven and earth, and under the earth, to him. But again, it is urged in reply, that the general must be defined by the specific, the vague by the more distinct; and that, while these passages might have the meaning put upon them by those who deny the orthodox doctrine, if they stood alone, they cannot bear it when interpreted in the light of the specific statements regarding the fate of the wicked.

The specific arguments against the orthodox doctrine differ according to the different forms which the divergence from the symbolical statement of the doctrine has assumed.

1. Universalism Proper. — The old form of Universalism in this country (that of Ballou) taught that there is no punishment in the next life. The general principle contended for was, that this life is not one of probation, but of retribution; and that sin receives its full punishment in this world. The proof of this was supposed to rest upon the following grounds: (a) the rational character of this view, (b) the absence of all reference to future punishment in the Mosaic code, and (c) the claim that the passages supposed to teach future punishment do not have this meaning. This form of Universalism was proved, (1) to be immoral in its tendency (this has been admitted by leading Universalists; see Brookes's New Departure); (2) to be inconsistent with the infliction of the death-penalty in the Old Testament; and (3) to be contrary to the unmistakable teaching of three classes of passages: to wit, (a) those which speak of a place of punishment, (b) those which mark an antithesis between the present life and the life to come in respect to punishment, and (c) those which associate punishment with the final judgment.

2. Restorationism. — It is affirmed by some that the punishment of the impenitent is limited, and that eventually all will be saved. In addition to the rational arguments already referred to, reliance is also placed upon certain considerations based upon the assumption that the specific teaching of all men, (a) the promise that God will reconcile all things to himself, (c) the prophecy regarding the universal reign of Christ, (d) the apokatastasis, (e) the casting of death and hades "into the lake of fire."

In no one of these passages, however, is there any warrant for the belief that all men, in the sense of "every man," will be saved, or any thing to contradict the plain teaching of Matt. xxv.

(2) It is said that the passages relied upon to prove eternal punishment do not teach it. Thus it is said that the word alaveso ("a groaning") points in the direction of ultimate restoration, and that alaveso means "age-long." If it is not better to regard it as having a non-temporal significance, and as indicative of the quality of the punishment, — seontian punishment. But whatever these words, when put together, may be made to mean under the stress of a theory, the plain meaning which they carry upon their face is that which the church has always put upon them. This is what Meyer, not to mention other exegetes, thinks they teach, and what harmonizes with the strong passage in the Apocalypse (xx. 10), eis hronothpma poyen kai eis avotes: "The tombs shall be opened again, and the dead shall come forth into judgment;"

(3) The third mode of defending restorationism consists in the endeavor to reconcile the passages that teach eternal punishment with those that are alleged to teach universal restoration. This assumes several forms; one of the principal being the allegation that the doctrine of eternal punishment is only regulative, and that God has not made plain his purpose to save all men ultimately, because he wishes men to feel the legitimate influence of the doctrine of eternal punishment. This raises the question, which it ought not to be hard to answer, whether a belief can be regulatively true, but really false. But, if this be the true view of the matter, it is certainly presumptuous to undertake to deliver men from the influence of this salutary belief, by holding out the hope of an unrevealed salvation.

Aside, however, from the special exegetical difficulties of restorationism, it is contrary to the whole analogy of faith, if it be taught on any other basis than that the offers of salvation conditioned only by faith and repentance are made to those who have not embraced the gospel in this life. The objections to the doctrine of a second probation rest upon other grounds. But every doctrine of restorationism which teaches that believers must suffer for sin in the next life, before being admitted to heaven, or that any punishment of finite duration will pay the penalty of sin, is irreconcilably opposed to the teaching of Scripture regarding the satisfaction of Christ, the exemption of all believers from the condemnation of the law, and the necessity of an atonement.

3. Annihilationism, or, as some prefer to call it, Conditional Immortality. — It is said by yet another class that eternal life is the lot of Christians only, and that eternal punishment means a punishment consisting of, or at least ending in, extinction of being. Some have said that there is no suffering after death, but this view is too glaringly in conflict with Scripture to find many supporters. More plausible is Constable's position, which was substantially Rothe's, that the wicked suffer after death, but that the sufferings finally wear out by the universal reign of Christ, (il) the apolatastasis, (e) the casting of death and hades "into the lake of fire."
It must be admitted that the most plausible form of opposition to the orthodox doctrine is that presented by Rothe, above referred to. The strength of the position is, that it does least violence to the plain meaning of Scripture in the attempt to get rid of the eternal dualism of good and evil. But the plain meaning of Scripture, after all, is the old doctrine of the ecclesiastical symbols. It was our Lord himself who said, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." These words cannot be explained away by speculation, or deprived of their obvious meaning by exegesis.

Besides those who deny the doctrine of the symbols in regard to eternal punishment, there are those who prefer to take an agnostic position in the matter. Thus, while Julius Müller, that while it may be open to the intelligent person to believe in impossibility of an absolutely good and evil, he is also said that Paul hoped for the resurrection of the dead, and that this implies that resurrection was a boon that only a limited number would enjoy.

To these arguments it is common to oppose the instinctive impulse to believe in immortality, and the indubitable teaching of the New Testament, that the wicked, sharing the fate of the fallen angels, suffer pain, being tormented, ις τοις αιωνιω τοις αιωνιω.


Francis L. Patton.
PURCELL, John Baptist, D.D., Roman-Catholic prelate; b. at Mallow, County Cork, Ireland, Feb. 26, 1800; d. at St. Martins, Crown County, O., July 4, 1883. He emigrated to America in 1818; studied theology in America and France; in 1825, at Paris, was ordained priest; returned to America, and was a professor, and afterwards president, of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. In 1839, he was consecrated bishop, and in 1850 archbishop, of Cincinnati. When he came to his see, there were only 16 Roman-Catholic churches in all Ohio, and many of these were mere sheds. In 1876 there were 460 churches, 100 chapels, 3 theological seminaries, 6 colleges, 6 hospitals, and 22 orphan-asylums. For many years Archbishop Purcell consented to receive the savings of his parishioners, spent them upon ecclesiastical buildings of various kinds, and in 1876 failed for $4,000,000, whereupon he retired permanently to a monastery. He was the author of Lectures and Pastoral Letters, a series of school-books, a Life of X. D. McLeod (New York, 1886), and held public debates (afterwards published) with Alexander Campbell (1888), Thomas Vickers (1888), and others. In the Vatican Council he spoke and voted against the infallibility dogma, though he accepted it. See Gilmour: "Pulmonary Oration on Archbishop J. B. Purcell, New York, 1883."

Purgatory. The doctrine of purgatory, which the Roman-Catholic Church has fully elaborated, strikes its roots in the early Christian centuries. It is connected with the doctrine of an intermediate state, where the imperfect are made fit for paradise by a system of punitive and refining sufferings. This process of refining was not always ascribed to fire. The later rabbins held to a purification by water (Eisenmenger: Endteckes Judentum, ii. 397). The general view, however, was, that paradise was encompassed by a sea of fire, in which the blemishes of souls were consumed before their admission to heaven. The Mohammedans held that a wall (Koran, sura vii.) is built between heaven and hell, to the top of which all are assigned whose good works and evil works are equal, and from which they can look both into heaven and hell. The doctrine of purgatorial fire was developed from texts of Scripture and the church's teaching concerning penance. Fire is frequently referred to in the Bible as a symbol of purification (Mal. iii. 2; Matt. iii. 11; 1 Pet. i. 7, etc.), as well as a symbol of punishment and damnation (Matt. xxv. 4; Mark ix. 44, 49, etc.). There is no allusion to any process of purification in the period intervening between the death of the individual and the general resurrection. The doctrine of purgatorial purification first began to be broached in the third century. Clement of Alexandria (Ped. 3, Strom. 7) speaks of a fire in the world; and Origene held that it continues beyond the grave (Hom. in Num. xxxv.), and says that even Paul and Peter must pass through it in order to be purified from all sin (Hom. in Ps. xxxvii.). Augustine, relying on Matt. xii. 32, regarded the doctrine of purgatorial fire as the cleansing away of the remainder of sin as not incredible; and Gregory the Great established the doctrine. Its further history is associated with the doctrine of masses for the dead, and penance in this life. Thomas Aquinas (qu. 70, 3), Bonaventura (Comp. theol. verit., 7, 2), Jerson (Serm. 2, De Defunctis), and other great men of the middle ages, held that the fires of purgatory were material. The Greek Church, refusing to go as far as the Latin, laid down the doctrine of purgatorial fire as one of the irreconcilable differences between them at the Council of Florence, 1439. Wiclif opposed the doctrine. The Reformers raised their voices against the whole theory of purgatory. The Council of Trent, on the other hand, pronounced an anathema against those who reject the dogma. Bellarmin elaborated the doctrine in his extensive work on purgatory (De Purgatorio), proves it from the Old Testament (1 Kings xxxi. 13; 2 Kings i., iii., etc.), the Apocrypha (2 Macc. xii. 40 sq.; Tob. iv. 18), the New Testament (Matt. xii. 32; 1 Cor. iii. 11 sq., etc.), the Fathers, the councils, and reason, and comes to the conclusion that the fire of purgatory Letters ed. supremum."

The doctrine of purgatory in the Greek-Catholic Church is thus stated in the Longer Catechism of the Eastern Church:—

"Q. 376. — What is to be remarked of such souls as have departed with faith, but without having had time to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance? This, that they may be aided towards the attainment of a blessed resurrection by prayers offered in their behalf, especially such as are offered in union with the oblation of the bloodless sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and by works of mercy done in faith for their memory. Q. 377. On what is this doctrine grounded? On the constant tradition of the Catholic Church, the sources of which may be seen even in the Church of the Old Testament. Judas Maccabæus offered sacrifices for his men who had fallen (2 Macc. xii. 43). Prayer for the departed has ever formed a fixed part of the divine Liturgy, from the first Liturgy of the apostle James. Jerusalem says, 'Very great will be the benefit to those souls for which prayer is offered at the moment when the holy and tremendous sacrifice is lying in view' (Lect. Mys., v. 9). St. Basil the Great, in his Prayers for Pentecost, says that 'The Lord vouchsafes Prayers to receive from us propitiatory prayers, and to bless them for those that are kept in Hades, and allows us the hope of obtaining for them peace, relief, and freedom.'"


The Roman-Catholic doctrine of purgatory is stated in the eighth article of the Profession of the Tridentine Faith (see art. TRIDENTINE), and also thus in the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent:—

"Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, from the Sacred Writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught in sacred councils, and very recently in this ecclesiastical Synod, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the sacrifice of the altar: the holy Synod enjoins on bishops that they diligently endeavor that the sound doctrine concerning purgatory . . . be believed, maintained, taught, and everywhere proclaimed by the faithful of Christ."

—Bosio xxv.: cf. SCHAFF: Creeds.

"Catholics hold that there is a purgatory, i.e., a place or state where souls departing this life with remission of their sins as to the guilt or eternal pain, yet not likely to some temporary punishment still remaining due, or not perfectly freed from the blemish of some defects which we call venial sins, are purged.
PURIFICATIONS.

1. What defiles, according to the Old Testament? How, whom, how much, and how long, does it defile?

A. Certain animals, when eaten by men, defile.

B. The woman, after childbirth. The defiling element in her is not the giving birth to a child, or the fact that she gave birth, but her condition, which is like the "uncleanness of her being unwed" (Lev. xii. 2); i.e., the impurity of her monthly illness.

C. Leprosy. It defiles not only the person affected by it, and his dress, but also every other person with whom he comes in contact during the time of the disease (Lev. xiii. 46). Every one who enters a house which the priest has pronounced as leprous becomes unclean for one day (Lev. xiv. 46).

D. Certain secretions of the human body (Lev. xv).

(a) In a man. (a) Gonorrhea renders unclean not only the patient himself, but every couch, seat, or object on which he lies or sits; and all persons he spits upon, or touches with his body, are unclean till the evening (1-12). (b) Nocturnal emissions of a man render him unclean till the evening, and so all stained garments, and his wife, in case she lies at his side. It is important to know, that, according to the context in verse 18, the nocturnal accident is the primary object of discussion in the section: whereas the fact that he lies by a woman is secondary, just as accidental as the garment or skin which happens to be near the man having the discharge. We must also notice, that concerning the garment or skin, it is said, "whereon is the discharge of seed" (17); whereas of the woman (18), nothing is said in connection with the discharge. Thus garment or skin becomes unclean, when coming in immediate contact with the discharge of seed; whereas a human being becomes unclean, if he only comes in immediate contact with the man having the discharge. The possibility that a man may have a nocturnal emission without having any sexual intercourse with the woman lying at his side, must be regarded as known to the lawgiver. And the possibility becomes a reality, when we consider that the same phrase, "to lie with" (יִרְאֶשׁ), is also used in verse 24, where a man lies by the side of his wife being in her monthly impurity, and where it cannot have the meaning of sexual intercourse, since the intercourse with such a woman did not render the man unclean for seven days, but was a crime punished with death (Lev. xx. 18). We thus see that from Lev. xv. 18 it cannot be inferred that conjugal intercourse rendered unclean, and that our passage treats only of involuntary emission of semen has already been indicated by the Massoretes.

(b) In a woman. (a) Her courses, which render her unclean seven days, and so all things which she touches, and which, on their part, defile any object in which no physical contact occurs; whereas a human being becomes unclean, if he only comes in immediate contact, in what manner the suffrages made on their behalf be applied, — whether by way of satisfaction, intercession, etc., — are questions superfluous, and imperiously not as to faith." — Berrington and Kirk: Faith of Catholics, London, 1846, vol. 3, 3d ed., pp. 140-207, where the appropriate passages from the Fathers, Liturgies, etc., are given at length. See Louvet: Le purgatoire d'après les révélations des saints, Paris, 1880.

E. A dead body defiles. (a) Touching the carcases of unclean beasts renders unclean for one day (Lev. xi. 8, 24, 25, 28; Num. xix. 22). (b) The carcases of such clean beasts as had not been regularly slaughtered, or had died of themselves, when eaten, or even touched, make unclean for one day (Lev. xi. 39 sq., xxii. 8). (c) A human corpse when touched makes unclean for seven days (Num. xix. 11); and it imparts its uncleanness to the tent, and this again to all persons entering the same, and to every uncovered vessel (14 sq.). To touch one that is slain with a sword in the open field, or a dead body, or a bone of a man, or a grave, makes one unclean for seven days (16).

2. What is the nature of the unclean phenomena enumerated above? Is it a physico-aesthetic, or a religio-ethical, or both? And what is the source of perception that such impurity exists?

A. In defining the character of the impurities treated above, we have to consider, (a) The etymology of the Hebrew word tameh ("unclean"), which, whatever signification we attach to the word, denotes from the very beginning an external, esthetical impurity; (b) The usage of tameh — this denotes, on the one hand, physico-aesthetic impurity (Ezek. iv. 12-14; Deut. xxiii. 12-14), on the other hand, an ethical impurity (Lev. xxii. 4; Isa. vi. 5; Ezek. xxii. 5; Zech. xiii. 2); and even if we take the word in its wider sense, as denoting "abomination" or "inmorality" (in the highest sense), we have not yet the character of all impurity; (c) The synonyms of Tameh, but these do not help us in deciding the character of the impurity in question: (d) We have no direct indication, and "we can only arrive at a result by examining indirectly what the Old Testament understands by an "ethico-aesthetic" impurity." The following possibilities have been
Purifications.

1877

Purifications.

Purification is a common question in a common physical one, intended to prevent persons afflicted with it from visiting the temple (Maimonides: More nebuchim, iii. 47; Heng: Geschichte Moses, iv. 4, 8 sq.).

Thus, (a) Those who make them sanitary precautions (Michaelis, iv. § 207 sq.; Saalschütz, i. 217, 223; Winer, ii. 310); (b) Those who make disgust (Winer, ii. 310), or natural aversion (Knobel: Com. on Ezekiel—Leviticus, 1857, on Lev. xii. 15), or an instinctive horror (cf. Baudissin, p. 101; Ewald, p. 125; combines a and b), the original source of this conception.

(3) Religious, ethical, and aesthetic, since "the two factors of the final being, birth and death, procreation and corruption, beginning and end, when contrasted with divine infinitude, are sinful and impure" (Bahr, ii. 492). But to this must be objected, (a) that two objects which serve to develop one and the same phenomenon become thereby in no way related; on the contrary, they may, in spite of this external or formal relation, be essentially unlike, yes, oppose each other: birth and death, procreation and corruption, because presenting the beginning and end of human existence, are therefore not yet materially related.

(3) The empiric matter of fact of the Hebrew purificatory laws is also against Bahr's hypothesis, since the Hebrews never looked upon the new-born child as unclean. These arguments hold good also against Kurtz (Opfercultus, p. 387). H. Schultz (pp. 396 sq.), and Oehler (§ 142), who in the main follow the hypothesis of Bahr.

(4) The impurity is a religio-ethic-aesthetic one, because it was regarded as a more distant or nearer effect of death. Thus Sommer, pp. 248 sq.; Keil, § 87; A. Koehler, i. pp. 409, 412, 418; Dillmann on Leviticus, 1. xi. 16; F. W. Schultz, in Zöckler's Handbuch, i. p. 241; Hamburger, i. p. 874.

This view can not only be established by the Old Testament in general, but also can be applied to the single impurities. This direct source of the Old Testament conception of an ethico-aesthetic impurity is also not put aside by a direct source of this conception outside of the Old Testament, because there is

(b) No indirect source of the Israelitish conception of the ethico-aesthetic impurity outside of the Old Testament.

To make this assertion good, we must

(a) Show since when the conception of an ethico-aesthetic impurity existed in Israel. From those prophetic writings the date of which is given with certainty, we learn the following, putting, however, those passages where unclean (i.e., abominable) is taken in a mere religious-ethical sense, and as not immediately belonging here, in brackets. [Amos: unclean is the land outside of Palestine in Amos vi. 7; the Israelites in Assyria (ix. 3 sq.); [Israel is defiled on account of irreligion and immorality (3)]. [Micah: uncleanness (i.e., abomination) causes destruction (ii. 13). Isaiah: the Israel of the time of salvation will defile his former idols (xxx. 22)]. Jeremiah: the Israel of the time of destruction shall be defiled as the place of Tophet (xix. 13). This defilement was probably brought about by Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 10), since he defiled the high places in the cities of Judah in general (8), not by physical defilement (as 2 Kings x. 27), but as, in the case of the altar at Bethel (2 Kings xxiii. 15), not by bones, but by bones of the sepulchres [Israel has polluted himself by idolatry (Jer. ii. 3), and his land (ii. 7, vii. 36, xxxiii. 34. Lamentations: polluted with blood (iv. 14 sq.)]. In Ezekiel we have parallels to I. 1: food baked with dung that come out of man is unclean (iv. 14 sq.); the menstruating woman with her pollution is mentioned (xxii. 10); the defiled land is compared to her uncleanness (xxxvi. 17); that which dieth of itself, or is torn in pieces, is unclean (iv. 14); Jahve's house is defiled by bones out of the sepulchres (ix. 7, xiii. 7); priests can only defile themselves for five dead persons (xiv. 25); [the sanctuary and Jerusalem are defiled by the presence of idols (v. 11, xiv. 11, xx. 7, 18, 30 sq., xxi. 3 sq., 15, xii. 7, 30, xxxvi. 17 sq., xiii. 7); ancient Jerusalem is defiled by blood (xiv. 9, 11); uncleanness and apostasy together (xxxix. 24); to defile the neighbor's wife by adultery (xviii. 23 sq., xiv. 15); God pronounces Israel unclean because of his sins (xx. 26); but God will cleanse Israel (xxxvi. 25, 29, xxxvii. 28); finally, it is worthy of notice that the soul becomes polluted by uncleanness (iv. 14)].

Ezekiel laments also over the priests who hitherto made no difference between the unclean and the clean (xxii. 26), and puts it down as a special duty of the priest to teach this difference (xiv. 23). Deutero-Isaiah: the uncleaimised and unclean shall henceforth come no more into Jerusalem (Isa. lii. 1); "touch no unclean thing" (11); the unclean shall not be in the land in the messianic time (xxxv. 8). Haggai: a dead body defiles according to the dictum of the priests (ii. 13). Since in the non-disputed oldest literary monuments of Israel we have essentially the same laws of uncleanness as contained in Lev. zii.—Lev. zum., it can be no question that Israel's views concerning purifications are, for the most part, very old. When, nevertheless, Israel is said to have taken those ideas from another source, this can only be supposed to be found in the perceptions of those nations with whom Israel at a very early period is said to have come in contact, or, in fact, has been in contact.—Aryans, ancient Babylonians, Egyptians; but

(b) A foreign origin of the idea in question could only be supposed on the ground that a nation being in a more distant or nearer relation to Israel could show a purificatory law which agreed in principle and detail with that of the Old Testament. From what we know, this is not the case. When, concerning the outcast origin of the Old Testament ideas of purification, the question is still to be answered, why Ezekiel has made the ideas of uncleanness more prominent than the leaven thing, while he himself has been but little more given notices show, that, in the prophetic writings, references to the idea of uncleanness are more and more increasing, it will be admitted that the same cause (viz., the growing seriousness of God's governing the world since the appearance of Isaiah) which led to a deeper knowledge of sin and a stronger accentuation of expiatory
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II. 1. What Purifications were enjoined for removing the enumerated impurities? — For A is no purification. For B — For seven or fourteen days respectively (i.e., after the birth of a boy or a girl) the woman is as thoroughly unclean as in the time of her menstruation; and, after washing herself and her clothes, she is clean from her positive impurity, but not from her negative impurity (i.e., her keeping aloof from holy things and from sleep or eat in it must wash his garments (47)).

For C — He who has shown a doubtful symptom of leprosy on his body has only to wash his garments (Lev. xiii. 6, 34); garments affected with the mixed blood and water, together with cedar-wood, hyssop, and a crimson thread or band. The fluid is then sprinkled upon the convalescent seven times, and the living bird is allowed to fly away over the fields (Lev. xiv. 4-7). The convalescent then washes his garments, shaves off all his hair, bathes in water, as he is to do again on the seventh day (8 sq.). Of the blood of the lamb killed as trespass-offering, the priest sprinkles upon the top of his right ear, upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot; then some of the oil is sprinkled seven times towards the holy place of the sanctuary (10 sq.). Next the ewe-lamb is presented as a sin-offering, and the second he-lamb as a holocaust (Lev. xii. 6 sq.); but, if she be poor, a pigeon or a turtle-dove suffices for the burnt offering also (8). For D — He who has shown a doubtful symptom of leprosy on his hair, bathes in water, as he is to do again on the seventh day (8 sq.). For E, (a) — Whoever carries the carcass of an unclean animal must wash his garments (Lev. xi. 21, 28); the objects upon which a carcass accidentally falls, such as utensils of wood, garments, or skins, require cleansing by being left in water till the evening (32); earthen vessels, ovens, and stoves must be broken (33, 35). For E, (b) — Carrying the carcass of a clean animal requires washing of garments (40). For E, (c) — Defilement at a dead person requires a red heifer without spot, and upon which never came yoke, etc. (Num. x. 8 sq.). The ashes of the burnt heifer are put into running water (17), which becomes the water of abomination, i.e., the water appointed for the purification of uncleanness: in this sense the word נדנדה (may tidduh) is to be taken with. This water, those who have become defiled directly or indirectly for a dead person, as well as the dead itself and its vessels, are to be sprinkled, by means of hyssop, on the third and seventh day after the defilement; and on the seventh day the person shall purify himself, and wash his clothes (15 sq., 17-19). The officiating priest, as well as the man who burnt the red heifer, have, besides, to bathe their flesh in water (7 sq.). As for the Nazarite who defiled himself by a sudden death, see Num. vi. 9-12. Of the booty taken from heathenish nations, every thing that may abide the fire is to go through it, and must be purified with the water of separation: all that abideth not the fire is to go through the water; and a person touching such booty must wash his clothes on the seventh day.

2. Upon what perceptions is the purifying power of the objects used, and actions performed, at the purifications, (a) present? (a) The destructiveness of the objects, (b) the fluid used for removing the ethico-aesthetic impurity is a matter of course; and it is possible that "living" water, even where it is not expressly stated, is meant. (d) The sin and burnt sacrifices required of the woman after childbirth, the leper, the man having a running issue, and the woman having an issue of blood, have their usual signification. (c) In the purification of the objects, the materials used show the great step which the person to be purified took from the awful nearness of death to the gladsome communion of untroubled life. (f) In removing the impurity caused by the touch of a dead person, the red color of the coat, as symbol of the source of life, being in a natural accident be considered. As a yoke had never come upon her, she was the emblem of virgin energy. Cedar-wood, crimson thread, and hyssop, which were also used, represent emblems of incorruptibility, medicine against impurity, and symbol of life.
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III. Post-canonical Development, and Time of Validity, of the Old-Testament ideas of impurity and purificatory ceremonies. — 1. Later Development. When, in the time of Ezra, Israel took upon himself to observe even the laws concerning clean and unclean according to the Pentateuch, that is, the laws concerning the ritual defilements of the body and soul, there was a kind of purifying effort, not only the laws laid down in the canon, but also those inferences which were deduced from them. These rules and regulations are found in the treatises, Chullin, Niddah, Tebul jom, Okolath, Abodah zarah (ii. 6), Mekaoth, Yadaim (comp. the art. TALMUD). But not all Israelites took part in these rigorous purificatory efforts. Religious indifference led on the one hand to laxness (Job i. 10 sq.); while over-scrupulousness on the other hand led to the formation of special societies, the most rigorous of which was that of the Chasidim (q. v.). 2. Time of Validity. That the Old Testament purificatory laws and purifications existed before and after the time of Christ, we see from 1 Macc. i. 62 sq.; 2 Macc. vi. 18, vii. 1 sq., xi. 31; Tacitus: *Hist.*, v. 4, 5. The sixth part, or seder, of the Mishna (compiled about 180 A.D.), shows a development of the Old-Testament ideas of impurities and purifications. But partly in consequence of the declarations of Christ — though he did not abolish the ideas of his times concerning clean and unclean (Matt. vii. 4; Luke xvii. 14) when dealing with unconverted persons — concerning the spirituality of the Old-Testament religion and morals (Matt. v. 17, 21 sq.—vii. 12, xii. 30, xii. 8, xv. 11); partly in consequence of the work of the Holy Ghost, who reminded the disciples of the new spiritual foundation of the Christian religion (John xiv. 26), and showed to Peter in a vision that the difference of food has lost its authority in the Christian son of history of salvation (Acts x. 15). — Jewish Christians were already at a very early period converted to eat with Gentile Christians, by receiving Christ as the new living law-giver into their souls (Gal. ii. 20). The departure of the mikva, the bath where the part of the first Israelites from Jerusalem, and the destruction of the temple, became, at least to the less rigorous among them, a guide to regard the lexi called parencence — on the appearance of starlight the 14th of Adar, during which, at every mention of Haman, the first convert, his name be blotted out. The name of the wicked shall rot.” On the next morning (still the 14th of Adar) another synagogue service is held; for eighty-five elders, including thirty prophets, ridiculed the idea (cf. Lightfoot on John x. 21). But by Josephus’ time (cf. Ant. XI. 6, 18), it was universally observed. It is observed on the 14th and 15th Adar, i.e., exactly a month before passover, preceded by the “fast of Esther” on the 13th, which was the actual day of the delivery. It was not a temple, but a synagogue festival, and observed in public by the reading of the entire Book of Esther — called Megillah (“the roll”) — par excellence — on the appearance of starlight the 14th of Adar, during which, at every mention of Haman, the first convert, his name be blotted out. The name of the wicked shall rot.” On the next morning (still the 14th of Adar) another synagogue service is held, and the Megillah read; but the rest of the day and the next are given up to merriment and gift-making. In leap-year, Purim is celebrated in the intercalary month (Vedadar); but formerly it was twice celebrated, — both in Adar and Vedadar. If the 14th of Adar falls on a Sunday, then, since there can be no fasting on sabbath, the “Esther fast” falls on Thursday. Ewald conjectured, that originally Purim could be celebrated on the 13th of any month; but, by connecting it with the delivery from Egyptian bondage, it was put before the passover, as a sort of preparatory festival. OEHLER.

PURITAN, PURITANISM. The Reformation in England was begun by Henry VIII., and consolidated by Elizabeth. It was an unhappy thing for the interests of a Reformation that the movement from the first, the movement was in the hands of those who subordinated it to personal caprice and state policy. Most of the principal agents employed to effect it were animated by strong Protestant principle, and desired that it should be
thorou:; and though, at first, they were not able to
do all they desired, they rejoiced in what they
had been permitted to accomplish, and hoped the
work would continue to advance. With regard
to this advance, they were doomed to disappoint-
ment; but in the end they concluded that what appeared
to them to be "the inevitable."

The first Puritans were men who could not
accept the work as complete, nor rest satisfied
with it in its imperfection. They wished to make
the church as perfect an instrument as possible
with it in its imperfection. They submitted to
those regulations which they approved; but,
whether consistently or inconsistently we do not
now inquire, they resisted those which appeared
to them inexpedient, or contrary to the interests
of Protestant truth.

The spirit of Puritanism had appeared in the
reign of Edward VI. Bishop Hooper refused to
be consecrated in the papal vestments and to
take the papal oath. The latter was altered,
his refusal he was imprisoned, but eventually
be consecrated in the papal vestments and to
that countenanced Roman error and superstition.
They had no objection to the connection of the
Church with the State, nor to some regulation
of it by the civil authorities. They submitted
to those regulations which they approved; but,
whether consistently or inconsistently we do not
now inquire, they resisted those which appeared
to them inexpedient, or contrary to the interests
of Protestant truth.

The spirit of Puritanism had appeared in the
reign of Edward VI. Bishop Hooper refused to
be consecrated in the papal vestments and to
take the papal oath. The latter was altered,
his refusal he was imprisoned, but eventually
be consecrated in the papal vestments and to
that countenanced Roman error and superstition.
They had no objection to the connection of the
Church with the State, nor to some regulation
of it by the civil authorities. They submitted
to those regulations which they approved; but,
whether consistently or inconsistently we do not
now inquire, they resisted those which appeared
to them inexpedient, or contrary to the interests
of Protestant truth.

There is no doubt that Elizabeth, feeling the in-
security of her position and the magnitude of the
dangers which encompassed her in the beginning
of her reign, acted from policy, and endeavored
to mark out a via media between Protestantism
and Popery. This may partly account for her
severities towards the Puritans, who strongly op-
posed this course, but cannot excuse them. The
Puritans, on the other hand, were jealous for the
honor of Christ, the true Head of the Church,
and would conform to nothing which tended to
endanger Protestant truth. They acted, more
over, under the advice of the Continental Re-
formers, who urged them "not to hearken to the
counsels of those men, who, when they saw that
Popery could not be honestly defended nor en-
tirely restrained, would use all artifices to have
the outward face of religion to remain mixed, un-
certain, and doubtful; so that, while an evangelical
religion is pretended, those things should be ob-
truded on the church which will make the returning
back to Popery, superstition, and idolatry, easy." Gualter, the writer of the advice, says,
"We have had experience of this for some years
in Germany, and know what influence such per-
sons may have." "I apprehend that in the first
beginnings, while men may study to avoid the
giving of small offence, many things may be suf-
ered under this color for a little while; and yet
it will scarce be possible, by all the endeavors that
can be used, to get them removed, at least without
great struggles. On the contrary, it is thought that the wis-
edom of this advice. It is not to be sup-
posed that the Puritans refused to use the vest-
ments as vestments merely, but as symbols; and
their motto was Obsta principis.

The parochial clergy at the commencement of
this reign were almost entirely the Marian mas-
s-priests who had conformed to the new order. Not
more than three hundred in the ten thousand
parishes of England had vacated their livings: the
rest had a great influence in the Convocation
of 1562, which met to review the doctrine and
discipline of the church. Notwithstanding this
influence, Bishop Sandys introduced a petition for
reformation, which went very far to satisfy the
demands of the Puritans, and which was only re-
jected by the proxies of absentees, and then only
by a majority of one. This fact will show the
strength of the Puritan party at that time. But,
though an sth negle I and her ecclesiastics
determined to suppress them.

The Court of High Commission, constituted
by virtue of the royal supremacy, was empowered
to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and
amend all errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, con-
temples, offences, and enormities whatsoever; and,
with its oath ex officio, was the means of inflicting extreme suffering on the Puritans.

In order to insure uniformity, "advertisements" were issued by the bishops in 1564, by which it was ordained that "all licenses for preaching, granting of private orders, and the like, by the bishops within the province of Canterbury, bearing date before the first day of March, 1564, be void and of none effect." Thus all preachers were silenced. And, further to complete the work, it was ordained that only "such as shall be thought meet for the office" should receive fresh licenses. Thus only conformable ministers were restored. But, whilst some of the best and most conscientious of the clergy were cast out of their office, thousands of parishes were destitute, and had no ministers to preach to them the word of life; this, however, in the estimation of the queen and her ecclesiastical advisers, was a less evil than a ministry without the Roman-Catholic vestments.

Archbishop Parker seconded the queen in all her severities; the consequence of which was, that in 1567 some of the laity resolved to meet privately and to worship God, as the Protestants did in Queen Mary's days. About a hundred of them met in Plumbers Hall in London. But they were surprised, some of them apprehended, and imprisoned for more than a year. These rigorous measures tended rather to the increase of Puritanism than to its destruction. The people continued to meet privately; and the clergy began to look beyond the vestments, and to question the constitution of the church itself. Their leader was Thomas Cartwright, who, as Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, unfolded his views of ecclesiastical order, which were in harmony with those of the Presbyterian churches on the Continent and in Scotland. A severe controversy hereupon arose. Cartwright was deprived of his professorship and fellowship, and was forbidden to teach or to preach. He retired to Geneva, where he was chosen professor of divinity; but he afterwards returned to England. In 1572 John Field and Thomas Wilcox (two ministers of the Puritan party) prepared the famous A Second Admonition to Parliament for the Reformation of Church Discipline. They presented it themselves, and for doing so were committed to prison. Whitgift replied to the admonition, and took the Erastian ground, which Hooker afterwards maintained, and said that no form of church order is laid down in the New Testament, and that the government in the apostles' days cannot now be exercised. Mr. Cartwright, who had published A Second Admonition, was chosen to reply to Whitgift. Both his books gave such offence to the queen and archbishop, that it was resolved he should be brought to trial; but he escaped to Heidelberg. During Cartwright's exile, Whitgift published his Defence of the Answer to the Admonition; and Cartwright then published his Second Reply. This exile continued eleven years; after which he returned home, to experience yet further molestation and suffering.

It has been frequently said, that in 1572 a Presbyterian church was formed at Wandsworth; Field, the lecturer of Wandsworth, being the first minister, and Travers and Wilcox among the founders. The facts are, that the first distinct practical movement to secure a Presbyterian or organization began with a secret meeting at that place. Wilcox and Field convened a few of their ministerial brethren and others to sketch an outline of the ecclesiastical polity they wished to see in operation. Some of their papers fell into the hands of Bancroft; from which it appears that the only presbytery erected was on paper, and was immediately demolished by Bancroft. Field and Wilcox were thrown into prison. The leaders of the party succumbed, and their meetings were discontinued (Waddington's Surry Congregational History, p. 5).

In 1575 Archbishop Parker died, and was succeeded by Grindal. He found the country morally and religiously in a deplorable condition, in consequence of the ignorance and incapacity of so many of its clergy. This state of things did not distress the queen, for she thought one or two preachers in a diocese was enough; but the Puritans thought otherwise. In the year 1571 these clergy, in some districts, with the permission of the bishop, engaged in religious exercises called "prophesying," which were meetings at which short sermons were preached on subjects previously fixed. These were good exercises for the clergy, and cultivated the art of preaching. The laity were admitted, and derived instruction and benefit from them. In 1574 Parker told the queen that they were only auxiliaries to Puritanism and Nonconformity, whereupon she gave him private orders to suppress them. When Grindal became Archbishop of Canterbury, he not only inherited the office, but also the task of suppressing the prophesying; but, approving of them, he set himself rather to repress any irregularities, and to guard them against abuse. The queen, on the other hand, disliked them, and determined that they should be suppressed. On Dec. 20, 1576, Grindal wrote a very respectful but very faithful letter to the queen, in which he said, "I am forced with all humility, and yet plainly, to profess that I cannot with safe conscience, and without the offence of the majesty of God, give my assent to the suppressing of the said exercises: much less can I see the manner of the utter and universal subversion of the same." For this boldness, Grindal was suspended from his office; his see was placed under sequestration for six months; and he was confined a prisoner in his own house.

Grindal died in 1588, and was succeeded by Whitgift, who, during the first week of his archiepiscopal rule, issued his famous articles:—

(1) That all preaching, catechising, and praying in any private house, where any are present besides the family, be utterly extinguished. (2) That none do preach or catechise, except also he will read the whole service, and administer the sacraments four times a year. (3) That all preachers and others in ecclesiastical orders do at all times wear the habits prescribed. (4) That none be admitted to preach unless he be ordained according to the manner of the Church of England. (5) That none be admitted to preach, or execute any part of the ecclesiastical order, unless he subscribe the following articles: (a) That the queen hath, and ought to have, the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within her dominions, of what condition soever they be; and that none other power or potentate hath, or ought to have, any power, ecclesiastical or civil, within her realms or dominions. (b) That the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering bishops, priests, and deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the
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word of God, but may be lawfully used; and that he himself will use the same, and none other, in public prayer, and administration of the sacraments. (c) That he alloweth the Book of Articles agreed upon in the Convocation held in London in 1562, and set forth by her Majesty's authority; and he believe all the articles therein contained to be agreeable to the word of God."

Wielding almost absolute power with a despotic severity, we are not surprised to find that he suspended many hundreds of the clergy from their ministry. Petitions and remonstrances were in vain: Whitgift could not yield. And for twenty years this man guided the affairs of the Established Church. Only the records of the High Commission Court can tell the havoc he made, and the misery he inflicted on some of the holiest of the clergy and the people of their charge. A new commission was issued at Whitgift's instigation: its jurisdiction was almost universal, embracing heretical opinions, seditious books, false rumors, slanderous words, abstaining from divine service, etc. A jury was selected, and the court might convict by witnesses alone: if they were wanting, "by all other means and ways they could devise," — by the rack and ex officio oath, etc.; and, if the oath was declined, then the court might inflict "fine or imprisonment according to its discretion." (By the ex officio oath a man was compelled to bear testimony against himself, and to tell what he knew of others.) Whitgift drew up twenty-four articles to guide the commissioners when examining delinquent clergymen. The privy council remonstrated with him; and Lord Burleigh described the articles thus: "I find them so curiously penned, so full of branches and circumstances, that I think the Inquisition of Spain use not so many questions to comprehend and entrap their prey." Whitgift's reply to remonstrances was, that he had undertaken the defense of the rights of the Church of England, to appease the sects and schisms therein, and to reduce all the ministers thereof to uniformity and due obedience. "And herein," said he, "I intend to be constant, and not to waver with every wind." And so true to his determination was he, that at one time, towards the close of Elizabeth's life, no less than a third of the whole beneficed clergy of England were suspended; and this involved at least destitution and penury. The story of Cartwright's troubles given in more extended histories is a sad illustration of the spirit of Whitgift's rule. Cartwright died Dec. 27, 1603, and Whitgift within three months after. The Parliament on several occasions manifested a disposition to legislate for the relief of the Puritans. In 1570 they enacted that ministers who had received a Presbyterian ordination might qualify for service in the English Church by declaring the bishops and subscribing their assent "to all articles of religion which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the sacraments contained in the Book of Articles, 1562." Many of the Puritans attempted to shelter themselves under this act, but in vain. In 1572, Field and Wilcox presented their Admonition, and the Parliament lent an ear, the queen issued a proclamation against it, and forbade the Parliament to discuss such questions as were mooted in it. Again, in 1584, 1587, and 1592, the queen interfered, and at length charged the speaker "that henceforth no bills concerning religion should be received into the House of Commons, unless the same should be first considered and approved of by the clergy;" well knowing that the clergy would only act in such a matter under her direction. Peter Wentworth remonstrated in the House against this dictation, but only to be committed to prison.

In 1592 an act was passed, entitled "An Act for the Punishment of Persons obstinately Refusing to come to Church." It was decreed that "all persons above the age of sixteen, refusing to come to church, or persuading others to deny her Majesty's authority in causes ecclesiastical, or dissuading them from coming to church, or being found present at any conventicle or meeting, under pretense of religion, shall, upon conviction, be committed to prison without bail till they shall conform, and come to church;" and that, should they refuse, "they shall be disposed of as the court shall direct;" and that they shall abjure the realm, and go into perpetual banishment; and that if they do not depart within the time appointed, or if they ever return without the queen's license, they shall suffer death without benefit of clergy." Under the provisions of this cruel act, Barrow, Greenwood, Penry, and others suffered death, and many of the Brownists left the kingdom.

It is not pretended that all the Puritans were always wise, or always moderate in the expression of their sentiments. The oppression to which they were subjected was severe enough to goad them on to the use of strong language, which some of them sometimes employed. But in 1588 a series of tracts was issued from a secret press, by an unknown writer who called himself Martin Marprelate. (Dr. Dexter, in his Congregationalism, has devoted a lecture to the controversy connected with these tracts, to which the reader is referred.) They were bitter and caustic enough, and unquestionably excited the wrath of the bishops, and brought down further afflictions upon the heads of the Puritans; though it is probable that the Puritans properly so called had nothing to do with their publication. On the other hand, many of them greatly disapproved of the tracts, and regretted their publication. They most likely had their origin among the Brownists, whose opinions and practices were even more obnoxious to the bishops than those of the Puritans themselves. These Brownists may be classed among the Puritans, and by many persons are confounded with them; but they were a distinct species of the order, and, during the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth, suffered the severest afflictions.

Elizabeth died in 1603, and James VI. of Scotland succeeded her. The Puritans hoped that from him they would receive a milder treatment than they had experienced from his predecessor. He had praised the Scottish Kirk, and disparaged the Church of England, saying that "its service was but an evil-said mass in English, wanting nothing but the liftings." But Whitgift, agent to Scotland, assured the king of the devotion of the English ecclesiastics to his interests; and he, in return, gave them entirely his patronage. The Puritans presented a petition to
The doctrines of the Reformers and of their successors, Conformists and Puritans alike, had been hitherto Calvinistic. But Whitgift, the king, who prided himself on his theology, had maintained Calvinism; and the representatives of England at the synod of Dort were of the same opinions. But a change came over the Established clergy, and many began to set forth Arminianism. The Puritans held fast to the old faith, and now in 1620 were forbidden to preach it. And from this time, and through the primacy of Laud, Puritan doctrine, as well as Puritan practice, was obnoxious to those in power.

James died in 1625, and was succeeded by Charles I. Under this monarch "the unjust and inhuman proceedings of the Council Table, the Star Chamber, and the High Commission, are unparalleled." Nonconformists were exceedingly harassed and persecuted in every corner of the land. These severities were instigated by Laud, soon after made bishop of London, and prime minister to the king. Lecturers were put down, and such as preached against Arminianism and the Popish ceremonies were suspended; the Puritans were driven from one diocese to another, and many were obliged to leave the kingdom. In 1633 Laud succeeded to the archbishopric of Canterbury, on the death of Abbot, when the Puritans felt the whole force of his fiery zeal; and during the next seven years multitudes of them, ministers and laymen, were driven to Holland and America. The Book of Sports was re-published, with like consequences as at the first publication. Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick suffered their horrible punishments. Ruinous fines were imposed, superstitious rites and ceremonies were practised and enjoined, and the whole church appeared to be going headlong to Rome. In 1640 the Convocation adopted new constitutions and canons, extremely superstitious and tyrannical, which the Long Parliament condemned as being "contrary to the fundamental laws of the realm and to the liberty and property of the subject, and as containing things tending to sedition and dangerous consequence." The nation could bear the unmitigated political and ecclesiastical tyranny no longer. Those who had suffered from the king's arbitrary rule joined with those who were groaning under the despotism of the bishops, and with one vast effort overthrew absolute monarchy and Anglican Popery together. A new era now commenced. [Puritanism properly so called had been hitherto Calvinistic. But Whitgift, the king, who prided himself on his theology, had maintained Calvinism; and the representatives of England at the synod of Dort were of the same opinions. But a change came over the Established clergy, and many began to set forth Arminianism. The Puritans held fast to the old faith, and now in 1620 were forbidden to preach it. And from this time, and through the primacy of Laud, Puritan doctrine, as well as Puritan practice, was obnoxious to those in power.
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the Bishop of Worcester. In 1390 he was in prison, and while there compiled from Wiclif's writings a "Book of the Commandments," and in 1391 began to preach his Lollardy, at St. Paul's Cross, London; was by the Archdeacon of Canterbury admitted to the vicarage of Westhite, Kent, but resigned Oct. 8, 1403, and was again in prison in 1421. He is chiefly remembered for his share in Wiclif's version of the Scriptures, and for his revision of the same, 1398. On this revision he wrote a Prologue of great length and interest. See Forshall and Madden's edition of Wiclif's Bible, Oxford, 1850, 4 vols., vol. i.; Mombert: The English Versions, chap. iii.; and art. Wiclif.

PUSEY, Edward Bouverie, D.D., Church of England; b. 1800; d. at Asect Priory, Oxford, Sept. 16, 1882. He was graduated 1822, with high honors in classics, in 1828 elected fellow of Oriel College, Oxford; during 1826 and 1827 he studied languages and theology in Germany, under the direction of Dr. Tholuck in Halle, and his first book was on German rationalism. In 1828 he was appointed Regius-professor of Hebrew, and canon of Christ Church. In 1833 the Tracts for the Times were started. Pusey sympathized with this Anglo-Catholic movement, and wrote the eighteenth tract, entitled "Thoughts on the Benefits of the System of Fasting enjoined by our Church," the fortieth, "Baptism," and the sixty-seventh, "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism." In 1839 he delivered a sermon on Matt. xxvi. 28, entitled "The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent," which caused his suspension by the vice-chancellor from preaching in the University pulpit for three years. In 1845 Newman joined the Roman Church; but Pusey remained, and for the rest of his days was the recognized head of the High-Church party. He resided almost constantly at Oxford. Those who held his views were styled "Puseyites," an epithet he earnestly repudiated, insisting that he and they recognized head of the High-Church party. He was a voluminous author. Among his works may be mentioned: An Historical Inquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalistic Character lately prevalent in the Theology of Germany, London, 1828-30, 2 parts; A Course of Sermons on Solemn Subjects, Oxford, 1845; Parochial and Diocesan Sermons, London, 1849-60, 3 vols.; The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers of the Church, Oxford, 1855; The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Doctrine of the English Church, 1857; The Councils of the Church (51-381 A.D.), 1857, new ed., 1878; Nine Sermons preached before the University of Oxford 1843-55, 1859, new ed., 1879; God's Prohibition of the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, 1860 (also 1849); The Minor Prophets, with a Commentary Explanatory and Practical, and Introductions to the Sacred Books, 1860-77 (the best of his theological works); Daniel the Prophet, Nine Lectures, 1864, 4th thousand, 1868; The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church — an Eirenicon, 1865; What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment? 1860 (against Canon Farrar); Parochial and Diocesan Sermons, 1860-94, 4th hundred;" etc. Among his followers from secession. Apparently the Oxford theology is a reaction and a backward movement; but it has received a vast churchly activity in every direction, and there is now more life and energy in the Church of England than ever before. The future must decide the providential aim and true value of that revival of Anglo-Catholicism with which the name of Dr. Pusey is so prominently connected.

PYM, John, the great leader of the Parliament party at the commencement of the civil wars; b. of a Somersetshire family in 1684; d. in London, Dec. 8, 1643. During the latter part of the reign of James I. he vigorously opposed the measures of the court, and, after the accession of Charles I., came further into public notice through the prominent part he took in impeaching the Duke of Buckingham. At the opening of the Long Parliament, by common consent he assumed the leadership of the popular party; and his attack on the Earl of Strafford, once his friend, can never be forgiven. It was a masterstroke of policy, as it deprived the king, and arrested the movement of the age. The impeachment of Strafford has been pronounced "a masterstroke of genius," and of the original masters, with John Keble and Charles Marriott, of the "Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church," (see Patristics), for which he edited the opening volume, St. Augustine's Confessions, 1840, 4th ed., 1859, and "the History of Anglo-Catholic Theology." See B. W. Savile: Dr. Pusey, an Historic Sketch, with Some Account of the Oxford Movement during the Nineteenth Century, London, 1883 (a sharp criticism, from an evangelical standpoint, of Dr. Pusey's doctrines on the Lord's Supper, baptism, justification by faith, and communism of property); F. Rigg: The Character and Life-Work of Dr. Pusey, a Sketch and Study, 1883 (94 pp.); his Life, by Canon H. P. Liddon, in preparation; also arts. Ritualism, Tractarianism.

Dr. Pusey was personally a pure, humble, and devout man. His piety was of the ascetic or monastic type, and corresponded to his theology, which was essentially Catholic, although opposed to Romanism. He was the moral, as J. H. Newman was the intellectual, and Keble the poetical, leader of the Anglo-Catholic movement which has agitated the Church of England and all her branches for the last fifty years, and exerted such influence as the Wesleyan movement, which sprang from the same university a hundred years before, although in the opposite direction. Methodism strengthened the cause of Protestantism, and revived practical religion among the lower classes of the people. Oxford Tractarianism undermined Protestantism, and developed a Romanizing tendency among the clergy and higher classes. Newman followed the logical consequences of the system, and submitted his powerful intellect, weary of freedom, and anxious for rest, to the infallible authority of the Pope, and drew several hundred of the clergy and nobility after him. Pusey and Keble died in the Church of England, and kept a larger number of their followers from secession. Apparently the Oxford theology is a re-action and a backward movement; but it has received a vast churchly activity in every direction, and there is now more life and energy in the Church of England than ever before. The future must decide the providential aim and true value of that revival of Anglo-Catholicism with which the name of Dr. Pusey is so prominently connected.
The biography of Pym includes the history of the Long Parliament down to the end of 1643. He was ever at his post in the House of Commons, swaying the members in the main particulars of his policy. He was not a republican: he preferred a limited monarchy, and was moderate in many of his counsels. He was the Mirabeau of the great English Revolution which led to the execution of Charles; but, if he had lived, perhaps the issue would have been different. But he died in the midst of his days, and was buried, with something like royal pomp, in the Abbey of Westminster.

John Stoughton.

PYNCHON, William, b. in Essex, Eng., about 1590; d. at Wraisbury, Buckinghamshire, opposite Magna Charta Island in the Thames, near Windsor, Oct. 22, 1662. He was one of the original patentees of the Massachusetts Bay Company; came to America, 1630; settled at Roxbury, Mass.; founded Springfield on the Connecticut River, 1636, naming it for his English home. In 1650, at London, he published *The meritorious price of our redemption, justification, etc., clearing (sic) it of some common errors* (4to, pp. xii. 152, 2d ed., 1855). Scarcely were copies of it brought to Boston, in October, 1650, than heresies it contained attracted attention; and the General Court then assembled quickly took action upon such a flagrant violation of the law passed in Massachusetts (1646), which forbade such erroneous teaching, and banished perpetually such teachers. The “heresies” were, (1) That Christ did not suffer for us the torments of hell; (2) That Christ did not bear our sins by God’s imputation, and therefore did not bear the curse of the law for them; (3) That Christ hath not redeemed us from the curse of the law by suffering that curse for us. The third heresy had been expressly forbidden. The court directed that Mr. John Norton should answer the book, and that it should be burned by the executioner in the market-place in Boston. In May, 1651, Pynchon appeared before the court with a partial recantation, which, however, was not satisfactory, and he was cited to appear the next session, in October. Not coming, he was, under penalty of a hundred pounds, enjoined to appear before it the following May, but, to the relief of all, went back to England ere the set day came. Mr. John Norton’s answer was entitled *A discussion of that great point in divinity, the sufferings of Christ; and the questions about his righteousness, active, passive, and the imputation thereof*, London, 1653, 8vo, pp. xiv. 270. In 1655, in London, Pynchon published his answer to Norton, *A further discussion of that great point in divinity, the sufferings of Christ, and the questions about his righteousness*, 4to, pp. iii. 439. Besides these volumes, Pynchon wrote, *The Jews synagogue*, 1652, and (1) *The time when the first sabbath was ordained*; (2) *The manner how the first sabbath was ordained*, pt. ii., A treatise of holy time, 4to, pp. xvi. 143, xvii. 120. See J. G. Palfrey: Hist. N. E., vol. ii. pp. 395, 396; Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., viii. 2d series; Dexter: Congregationalism, Appendix, Nos. 1552, 1638, 1642, 1705.

PYX (from πυχ “a box”) denotes, in the terminology of the Roman-Catholic Church, the box or vessel, of various but often very elaborate form, in which the consecrated elements of the Eucharist are preserved. Its use was prescribed by Innocent III. in 1215. See Augusti: Christ. Arch., iii. 522, and Smith and Cheetham, ii. 1766.
QUADRAGESIMA. See Lent.

QUADRATUS. In the second century of our era there were three persons of the name Quadratus. One was the apologist. He presented his work to the Emperor Hadrian in 125, and it seems to have been in existence in the seventh century (Protius : Cod., 102); but it afterwards perished. Eusebius gives a fragment of it (Hist. Eccl., IV. 3), in which Quadratus appeals to the miraculous healings of Christ, and mentions that persons healed by him were still living. — Another Quadratus is mentioned, in the Epistle of Dionysius of Corinth to the Athenians, as the successor of Bishop Publius, as a man of great merit with respect to the re-organization of his congregation, and as having suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius. An extract from the epistle is found in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., IV. 23). Jerome (De script. eccl. 19, and Ep. ad. Magn.) identifies him with the apologist, but without sufficient reason. — A third Quadratus is mentioned in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V. 17), as a prophet beside Agabus, Judas, Silas, and others. He, too, has been identified with the apologist. See A. Harnack: Die Ueberlieferung d. christl. Apologeten, Leipzig, 1882, pp. 100 sqq.

QUAKERS. See Friends.

QUARLES, Francis, b. at Stewards, Essex, 1592; d. in London, Sept. 8, 1644; ranks next to Herbert (Photius : Cod., 102); but it afterwards perished. His purity and sincerity were beyond question. His life, or rather character, was ably, but far too briefly, sketched by his widow. — His son, John Quarles (b. in Essex, 1624; d. of the plague in London, 1665), wrote Fons Lachrymarum, 1649, Divine Meditations, and other poems, a brilliant fragment from one of which has sometimes been used as a hymn. F. M. Bird.

QUARTERLY MEETING. See Friends.

QUARTODECIMANI. See Paschal Controversy.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY. See Taxes.

QUEENSTEDT, Andreas, b. at Quedlinburg, 1617; d. at Wittenberg, 1688. He studied at Helmstedt under Calixtus; went then to Wittenberg, became a pupil of Calovius, and was in 1649 appointed professor of theology there. His principal work is his Theologia didactica polemica, which appeared in 1685, and is the last comprehensive, systematic exposition of Lutheran orthodoxy, appearing just as the process of dissolution began to take effect. — F. M. Bird.

QUESNEL, Pasquier (Paschasius), b. in Paris, July 14, 1634; d. in Amsterdam, Dec. 2, 1719. He studied theology at the Sorbonne; entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1657; was ordained a priest in 1659; and appointed director of the seminary of the Congregation in Paris, 1662. Shortly after, he began the publication of his celebrated work, Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament, and in 1675 appeared his edition of the works of Leo the Great. As the former proved him to be a Jansenist, and the latter a Gallicanist, a conflict with the Jesuits was unavoidable. He left Paris, and settled at Orleans; but, when he refused to sign the famous anti-Jansenist formula in 1685, he was compelled to flee for his life, and went to Brussels. There he continued the publication of his Réflexions, of which the first collected edition appeared in 1687; the second, much augmented, in 1685-90; later edition, Amsterdam, 1796, 8 vols.; [Eng. trans., The New Testament, with moral reflections upon every verse, London, 1719-25, 4 vols. There is another translation of a part of this work under the title, The four gospels, with a commentary and reflections, both spiritual and moral: translated, and the Popish errors expunged, by a Presbyter of the Church of England, Bath, 1790, 2 vols.; new ed., revised by Rev. H. A. Boardman, D.D., N.Y., 1867, 2 vols.]. In 1703, however, he was arrested, and put into the dungeon of the archiepiscopal palace; but he escaped, and fled to Holland, out of the reach of the Jesuits. Among his other works are, Traditio de l'Eglise romaine, 1687; La discipline de l'Eglise, 1688; La vie de M. Arnauld, 1895, etc. His letters were edited by Le Courayer, Paris, 1721-23, 3 vols.

QUETIF, Jacques, b. in Paris, Aug. 6, 1618; d. there March 2, 1698. He entered the Dominican order; was, in 1642, and in 1652 appointed librarian in the Jacobin convent in Paris. He published Con-
QUIETISM. See Molinos; Guyon.

QUIRINIUS (Κυρίνιος), the governor of Syria at the time of Christ's birth (according to Luke ii. 2, "this was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria"). His full name was Publius Sulpicius Quirinius. He is the second of that name mentioned in Roman history. He was made consul 12 B.C., and was probably twice governor of Syria and Cilicia,—from 4 to 1 B.C., and from 6 to 11 A.D. Tacitus (Annals, iii. 48) supplies us with most of our knowledge of the man.

"About this time he (Tiberius) asked of the Senate that the death [21 A.D.] of Sulpicius Quirinius might be celebrated with public obsequies. Quirinius was in no way related to the old and patrician family of the Sulpicii, but was born at Lanuvium, a municipal town. In recognition of his military and administrative ability, Augustus made him a consul [with M. Valerius Messala 742 A.U.C., 12 B.C.]. Soon afterwards he obtained the honor of a triumph for having taken the stronghold of the Homonadenses in Cilicia. While attending Gaius Caesar as rector, when the former was campaigning in Armenia, he secretly cultivated Tiberius, who was then at Rhodes. Tiberius mentioned the fact in this letter, praised him for his good offices, and found fault with Marcus Lollinus for sowing dissensions between himself and Gaius Caesar. But to other people the memory of Quirinius was by no means dear, because of his persistence in the trial of Lepida [his wife, whom he had convicted of adultery, attempted murder, and other crimes, but who yet succeeded in gaining the people to her side; cf. Annals, iii. 23], and also of his sordid avarice in his old age, although very powerful."

He is mentioned also in Dion Cassius (liv. 28), Strabo (xii.), Suetonius (Tiberius, 49), and Josephus (xviii. 1, 1 sqq.). Putting all these statements together, the relations of Quirinius to Palestine and Syria may be thus determined. Quirinius headed an army in Africa, perhaps as proconsul of that province, in 7 B.C., and was in the East between 2 B.C. and 2 A.D., because Gaius Caesar went thither late in 2 B.C. or early in 1 B.C., and Tiberius returned to Rome 2 A.D. His position as head of an army in Cilicia proves that he must have been a governor of a province, or a legate of the emperor's legate. But Cilicia was probably under the jurisdiction of the legate in Syria. There is a break in our list of governors of Syria from P. Quintilius Varus (B.C. 6-4) to C. Sentius Saturninus (4 A.D.). Quirinius may therefore, chronologically speaking, have been governor in 4 B.C., the year of our Lord's birth. If so, he was governor again 6-11 A.D. Much support of the supposition of a double governorship has been derived from the mutilated inscription, first published in 1765, to the effect that some one (name missing) was governor of Syria twice. But, even if Quirinius be assumed to be the one intended, he was not governor until autumn 4 B.C., or after Christ's birth. Luke probably mentions Quirinius in connection with the census, because it was completed by him, and therefore bore his name. The problem in the passage in question is not yet solved; but by the hypothesis of a double governorship its solution is measurably approached. The census, first conducted by Quirinius, was accompanied with a registration of property, for the object was taxation. A census of the Roman Empire has been reasonably inferred from the known fact that Augustus prepared a list of all the resources of his empire, which was read in the Senate after his death. Herod could not resist the execution of the emperor's order, because he was a tributary king; besides, if the census was made by Jewish officers, it would not greatly differ from a similar registration made by Herod, and need not have alarmed the Jews if proper care was taken. Because of Quirinius' experience in such matters, he was sent into Syria 6 A.D., to superintend an assessment; and it was then the rising under Judas of Galilee (Acts v. 37) took place. His vigorous efforts brought it to an end. Cf., besides the commentaries upon Luke ii. 2, the art. "Cyrenius," in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible; by Schürer, in Riehm's Handb. d. bib. Alt.; and especially A. W. Zumpt: Das Geburtsjahr Christi, Leipzig, 1899; and Schaff: Hist. Christ. Ch., vol. i., rev. ed., 1892, pp. 121-125.
RABANUS MAURUS.

RABANUS MAURUS, b. at Mayence about 776; d. there Feb. 4, 856. He was educated in the cloister-school of Fulda, and afterwards in the school of Tours, under the tutelage of Alcuin, who gave him the surname Maurus, after the friend of St. Benedict. Recalled from Tours, he was put at the head of the school in Fulda, which he soon brought to a very flourishing condition, and in 822 he was elected abbot of the monastery. Political circumstances, it would seem, induced him to resign his position as abbot in 842, and to retire to the neighboring Petersberg; but in 847 he was made archbishop of Mayence, and thus once more called to take active part in public life. An excellent administrator. Under his government, his monastery and his diocese flourished. His fame, however, he owes chiefly to his literary activity. He wrote Commentaries on the Old Testament, on the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John, and on the Pauline Epistles; devotional books; two collections of homilies; hymns (De eicendo Deo, De modo panentia, etc.); text-books for his school (De clericorum institutione, De computo, De universo, etc.); polemics (De oblat. procerum) against the synod of Mayence, which permitted Gotteshalt to leave his order (Ep. ad Egi. de eucharistia) in the controversy caused by Radbertus Paschasius, etc. There is a collected edition of his works by Colvenrius, Cologne, 1827, reprinted by Migne, vols. 107-112; but it is not complete. See his life by the monk Rudolf; Kunstmann: Hrabanus M., Mayence, 1841; Spengler: Rob. M., Ratisbon, 1836. Hauck.

RABAUT, Paul, b. at Bédarieux, in the department of the Hérald, Jan. 9, 1718; d. at Nimes, Sept. 25, 1794; one of the most celebrated preachers of the Church of the Desert. He went in 1740 to study theology in the seminary of Lauzanne, and was in 1744, by the General Synod, made pastor of Nimes. The Protestant Church in France, after the fearful calamities which had overtaken her by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the wars of the Camisards, and the horrible edicts of March 8, 1715, and May 14, 1724, was again rallying. Persecutions continued. The decrees of Feb. 1 and 16, 1743, punished participation in the assemblies with the galleys, and imposed heavy fines on the congregations in which a minister was found. In 1752 a price of a thousand livres was set on the head of Rabaut; and as he always escaped, often in a miraculous manner, his wife and children were for some time imprisoned, and otherwise annoyed. Nevertheless, lulls of peace and quiet occurred. When the Prince of Conti, in 1755, retired from the court to his estates in Provence, Rabaut presented to him a memorial setting forth the demands of the Protestants; namely, that in place of those who were sent to the galleys, restoration of the children sent to the monasteries, legal recognition of their baptism and marriage, etc. When, in 1761, the Governor of Guienne proposed to compel by force the Protestants to have their children baptized, and their marriages consecrated by a Roman-Catholic priest, and Rabaut published his Lettre pastorale, in which he advised his flock to emigrate rather than submit to such tyranny, the government, remembering the financial difficulties caused by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, dropped the matter. Meanwhile the execution of Rochette, of the three brothers Grenier, of Jean Calas, La colonnie confondue of Rabaut, and, more than any thing else, the denunciations of Voltaire, drew the attention and the sympathy of the public to the condition of the Protestants; and with the accession of Louis XVI. in 1774 a milder practice became prevalent, though the Edict of Toleration was not issued until 1787. The last part of his life Rabaut spent in peace, at Nimes. Two of his sons, St. Etienne (b. at Nimes, in April, 1743; executed in Paris during the reign of terror, Dec. 5, 1793) and Pommier (b. at Nimes, Oct. 24, 1744; d. in Paris, March 16, 1829), were also ministers of the Reformed Church. See Borrel: Biographie de Paul Rabaut et de ses trois fils, 1854, and Histoire de l'église reformée de Nimes, 1856; [Maccracken: Lives of the Leaders of our Church Universal, 1879, pp. 486-492. TH. SCHOTT.

RABBINISM. 1988

RABBINISM denotes that form of Judaism which developed after the return from the Babylonian captivity. It falls into two great divisions, — from the fifth century before Christ to the fifth century after Christ, and from the fifth century after Christ to the present time, each of which comprises several subdivisions; the former, four; the latter, five;—from Ezra to Simeon the Just (the period of the Sopherim), from Simeon the Just to Hillel I. (the period of the Chachamim), from Hillel I. to Jehudah the Saint (the period of the Tannaim), from Jehudah the Saint to Ashe (the period of the Amoraim); the latter, three,—from the conclusion of the Babylonian Talmud to the victory of Islam, from the victory of Islam to the destruction of the rabbinical schools in the East (1040) and in the West (in the thirteenth century), from that point of suppression to the beginning of the emancipation in the eighteenth century, to which may be added a survey of the present state.

When the Jews returned from the Babylonian captivity, they felt that they were not a Mosaic people, but had, in order to become one, first, to learn what Mosaic law was, and, next, to re-organize their social, moral, and religious life in accordance with its precepts. The problem thus set before them demanded a union between school and government, and that union forms the very characteristic of rabbinism. In the schools the Mosaic law was rendered into the popular Chaldean tongue either by literal translation or by more copious paraphrasing, and to this rendering were added explanations, instructions, admonitions, etc. But the transition from a purely theoretical teaching of the law to a practical application of it was, of course, easy to make; and soon the teachers formed, in Jerusalem and other great cities, courts, into which all cases of litig-
RABBINISM. 1989. RABBINISM.

In the time of Simeon the Just, who lived under Alexander the Great, or a little later, the institution attained its perfection and final establishment. With Simeon the Just, however, begins the second stage in the development of rabbinism. It was quite natural, that, in the interpretation of the law, a tradition should be formed, comprising the opinions of the oldest and wisest interpreters, the Chachamim; and soon this tradition was dated back beyond the Babylonian captivity, even up to Moses. But where there is tradition, there will come schools. Antigonus, a pupil of Simeon the Just, formed the first school, and from that branched off afterwards the school of the Sadducees; for the Sadducees were a sect before they became a sect. About the same time a circle of men gathered from among the mass of the people, and pledged themselves to the strictest observance, even of the most minute prescripts of the law; and from this circle of men, the Chassidim, afterwards developed the sect of the Pharisees. Of still greater importance than the formation of the whole class of law-teachers into a corporation, which also took place in this period, owing to the introduction of the semichah, or ordination by the laying-on of hands. Though the semichah was not legally established until the language, they were not slow in taking possession of the boundaries of Palestine, and only with the consent of the president of the sanhedrin, and any one who had received a law-teach was eligible to that assembly.

The principal event of the third period was the revising of the Mishnah. It was begun by Hillel I. at the opening of the period, and finished by Jehudah at its close. Previously the Mosaic law had been treated by the rabbis under six hundred and thirteen different heads,—two hundred and forty-eight commandments and three hundred and sixty-five prohibitions, two symbolical numbers; the former referring to the parts of the human body, the latter, to the days of the year. Hillel reduced the heads to eighteen, and Jehudah to six: namely, on seeds, women, festivals, property, sanctuaries, and clean and unclean. Hillel also established certain rules for the interpretation of the law: for these, his great services, he was by the Talmud styled "the restorer of the law after Ezra." When the Jewish state was dissolved, and the priesthood abolished, after the destruction of the temple, rabbinism was adopted by the Sadducees, a secretly bond which till held the Jewish nation together. After the destruction of Jerusalem, the sanhedrin moved to Jamnia, and afterwards, in the middle of the second century, to Tiberias, where for several centuries it continued to exercise its double function of a court and a school. Under Jehudah a great number of students gathered there, and returned, when their studies were finished, to their native places with their written certificates as the teachers and judges of their people. Meanwhile a sharp rivalry sprang up between the school of Tiberias and the Babylonian. During this controversy, rabbinical academies had been founded at Nahardea near Nisibis, at Sura on the Euphrates, and at Pumbeditha on the left bank of the Lower Euphrates; and so richly were those academies endowed, that Sura could support and instruct eight hundred pupils at a time. Gradually the Babylonian academies assumed the same rights and the same authority as the school of Tiberias, and, during the latter part of the fourth century, Rabbi Ashe actually stood as the centre of the whole rabbinical world. His greatest service was the final redaction of the Babylonian Talmud,—a work which occupied fully sixty years of his life. Thirty years he spent in collecting the materials; thirty others, in sifting and arranging them. For the first purpose he used his pupils. Not only had great differences developed in the exposition of the Mishnah, especially in the different schools, but variations had crept into the very text. All these were carefully collected; each pupil bringing along from his native place what was found there of interpretation of the text, of recollections from the past, and expectations with respect to the future, of rules, maxims, parables, etc. The material thus collected was then critically sifted and revised by Ashe, and arranged into sixty-one treatises. The story that the work, when completed, was accepted and sanctioned by a synod, is probably a fable; but the circumstance that the rabbinical schools were closed shortly after throughout the Persian realm gave to the Babylonian Talmud the character of being something final and perfect, which it would be sacrilegious to meddle with.

The second epoch of the history of rabbinism, from the fifth century of our era to the present times, has less interest to Christian theology than the first, and is partially treated under other heads,—CARALA, MIDRASH, ABRABANEL, ABEN- EZRA, MAIMONIDES, etc. In the fifth century the rabbinical schools were closed, not only in Persia, but also in the Byzantine Empire, and yet no schools had been founded in the West. It was the suppression of the Visigoth rule, and the establishment of the Arab dominion in Europe, which first called forth the literary and scientific activity of the Jews in Europe. They studied Arabic with great eagerness, and, having mastered the language, they were not slow in taking possession of the great literary and scientific treasures to which it opened the way. They studied Arabic medicine, natural science, mathematics, and astronomy, and began to translate, not only from Arabic into Hebrew and Latin, but also from Hebrew into Arabic. Meanwhile the Babylonian Talmud was brought to Europe, and its study was taken up with great zeal, and it was translated into Arabic. But under the influence of the Arabian civilization, there developed a liberal form of rabbinism in Spain, in the schools of Cordova, Granada, and Lucena, a strictly orthodox form was developed in Gaul and Italy. In the schools of Narbonne, Toulouse, Bari, Otranto, and Mayence, philosophy was loured up as something dangerous, and the study of the Talmud was pursued...
with an indescribable pedantry. It was the great problem of Maimonides to reconcile these two tendencies; and he succeeded, though it became a mark of his piety that he disdained to study philosophy until he had filled his twenty-fifth year. In the thirteenth century the persecutions of the Inquisition began to tell on the character of rabbinism. The schools were closed, and only the study of the Cabala flourished. No doubt the roots of the Cabala were as old as rabbinism itself; but, while the Cabala had hitherto existed as a branch only, it now became the principal stem. To some it was a Christian garment, beneath which they concealed the genuinely Jewish ideas; to others, it became the bridge which led them into the Mohammedan mosque or into the Christian Church; others, again, used it as a means of magic and fraud. An influence of an opposite character was derived from the invention of the printing-press, which once more brought rabbinism into living contact with the general stream of civilization. The Talmud was printed in Venice, 1523; the works of Rabbi Jacob ben Chajim of Tunis, in the edition of the second Bomberg Bible, Venice, 1523; the works of Elias Levi, in Venice, 1538; and schools were opened in Venice, Amsterdam, Brody, Lemberg, Lublin, Cracow, Prague, Furth, and Francfort. In these schools the two different tendencies, the liberal and the orthodox, could still be observed, and were known under the names of the Portuguese-Italian and the Polish-German. But there was no direct contest between them; and in many places, as, for instance, in Amsterdam, they existed peaceably beside each other, until in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the opposition disappeared altogether, and gave room for the development of other school-differences. See the art.assel, and for literature, besides that article, those mentioned above.

PRESSEL.

RABBULA. See Rabulas.

RABBARIS. Not a proper name, but the title of an Assyrian mentioned in 2 Kings xviii. 17, Jer. xxxix. 3, 13. The meaning is commonly given as "chief eunuch:" but Schrader questions whether סֵאָשִׁים, which in Hebrew means "eunuch," has this sense in Assyrian, and thinks, that, if the name in the Hebrew Bible were a translation, it would be in the plural (רָבָּשִׂים). See Kirhm's Wörterbuch in loco.

RAB'SHAKEH, the title of an Assyrian officer who was sent by Sennacherib to Hezekiah to demand the surrender of Jerusalem. According to the Hebrew form, the title would mean "chief cup-bearer:" but, as it is a transliteration of the Assyrian title rab-sak, it means "chief officer." In the inscriptions the title rab-sak is used particularly in connection with a military officer sent by Tiglath-pileser II to Tyre. See SCHRADER: Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament, 2d ed., 1852.

RABULAS, more correctly Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa, the predecessor of Isba; d. Aug. 8, 435. He governed his diocese with great authority, and successfully kept down the various heretical sects until the Nestorian controversy began. Some of his letters, some rules for monks, some hymns, and a sermon delivered in Constantinople, are still extant. See J. J. OVERBECK: Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae Edesseni, aitiorumque Opera Selecta, Oxford, 1865. His prose works were translated into German by Bickell for the Kempten Bibliothek of church fathers, 1874.

RA'CA (Matt. v. 22), a term of contempt frequent among the Jews in Christ's time and since. It is the Aramaic rē qa ("empty"), and expresses, therefore, folly, but is not so opprobrious a term as "fool," which brands one as wicked and blaspheous.

RACOVIAN CATECHISM. See Socinianism.

RACHEL. See Jacob.

RADBERTUS, Paschasius, Abbot of Corbie in Picardy, and one of the most prominent ecclesiastical writers of the Carolingian age. Of his personal life, only very little is known; and that little is gleaned exclusively from scattered notices in his own works, and from the panegyrics of Engelmodus, bishop of Soissons, printed in Migne, Patr. Lat., vol. 120. The vita found in Mabillon (Act. Sanct., IV. 2) dates from the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century, and has no independent value. He was born towards the close of the eighth century, in Soissons or near by, and, as his mother died soon after his birth, he was brought up by the Benedictine nuns of the place. In 814 he entered the monastery of Corbie, and became one of the most intimate pupils of the Abbot Adalhard, a relative of Charlemagne. In due time he advanced to the teachership (among his pupils were the younger Adalhard, Ansarius, Hildemann, Odo, Warinus, and others); and in 844, after the death of Abbot Isaac, he was himself elected abbot. As such he was present at the synod of Paris (846) and of that of Chieresy (946); but the gradual collapse of discipline which had begun immediately after the death of Adalhard, and his own inability to restore order, led him to resign his position in 851. He lived long enough after that time to write several important works; but, with the exception of this one fact, nothing is known of his life in retirement.

Ten works by him have come down to us; namely, Expositio in Mattheum, of which the first four books were written before he became abbot, while the rest, like the Expositio in Psalmonum XLIV. et Expositio in lamentationes Jeremiae, date from after his abication. De Fide, Sper, et Charitate belongs to the earlier part of his life. De vita Adalhardi was written in 828; De corpore et sanguine Christi, in 831; Epistola Asereni, in 838; De parte virginis, on the contrary, he wrote as an old man. De passione S. Rufini et Valerii, was written while abbot; and Epistola ad Frudgerdum, after his retirement. A complete and critical edition of his collected works does not exist. The best is that by Sirmond, Paris, 1818, which has been reprinted in Bibl. Patr. Max., vol. xiv., Lyons, and in Migne, Patr. Lat., vol. 120, in a revised and augmented form.

The most important of the writings of Radbertus is his De corpore et sanguine Domini, the first comprehensive treatise produced in the Christian Church on the Lord's Supper, and also the first to call forth a controversy concerning that doctrine. Previously two almost diametrically opposite or at all events contradictory views had run peaceably beside each other: considering the consecrated elements of the Lord's Supper as mere symbols, or tokens of the body and blood of...
Christ, while the other saw in the bread and wine a physical transformation of the actual body and blood of Christ,—a transubstantiation. Radbertus gives an account of both these views: and, to the eyes of the later Roman-Catholic Church, Radbertus stands as the champion of true Catholicism. His book was attacked, however, by Ratramnus and by Rabanus Maurus. In another of his works (De partu virginis) he also sided with those tendencies of coarse and sensuous mysticism which at that time were spreading in the church, anticipating the declaration of the dogma of the immaculate conception by more than ten centuries. See EBERT: Das Dogma vom heil. Abendmahl, i. p. 406; THOMASIUS: Dogmengeschichte, ii. p. 201; [EBERT: Gesch. d. lat. Lit. d. Mittelalters, ii. 230. See also art. TRANSUBSTANTIATION]. STEITZ.

RAFFLES. Thomas, D.D., LL.D. a distinguished Congregationalist: was b. in London, May 17, 1788, and from 1812 till his death, Aug. 18, 1863, was pastor in Liverpool. He published Life and Ministry of Thomas Spencer, 1818, A Tour on the Continent, 1817, Lectures on Christian Faith and Practice, 1820, and some poems. Eight of his hymns were printed by Dr. Colyer in 1812, though most of them were written in later years. A few of them have been widely used. His memoir, by his son, T. S. Raffles, appeared, 1864. F. M. BIRD.

RAFFLES, Robert, founder of Sunday schools; b. at Gloucester, Sept. 14, 1735; d. there April 5, 1811. His father was a printer, and also publisher of the Gloucester Journal, "scarcely larger than a sheet of foolscap." Robert, as a youth, manifested a benevolent disposition, and used to visit the jail of the city, not only from pity to the prisoners, but from a desire for prison reform,—a department of usefulness in which John Howard became so conspicuous. But to prepare for the establishment of Sunday schools in England and America was the great work to which he was destined by Divine Providence. When this kind of agency became popular, curiosity was excited respecting one, who, if not the only, was certainly the chief, author of modern Sunday schools. He was asked about the manner in which he commenced his enterprise; and anecdotes respecting it, derived from his contemporaries, were carefully treasured up. He wrote a letter relating how he was struck with the miserable state of children in his native city; and that, hearing of a clergyman who had sent some outcasts to school, he employed "four decent, well-disposed women" to gather round them boys and girls, that they might teach them to read, and repeat the Catechism; for which each of the instructors was to receive a shilling a week. This was something very different from our present Sunday-school system, as elaborate as it is voluntary; but it was the seed out of which sprung the goodly tree which now spreads its branches over the world. This simple, unostentatious act has made Robert Raikes a hero, and his name a household word throughout Christendom. An article is preserved, bearing date June 27, 1788, in which he says ladies of fashion at Windsor passed their Sundays in teaching poor children. The Queen sent for him, saying she envied those who had the power of doing such good. Raikes died suddenly, in his seventy-sixth year, and was buried in the church of St. Mary de Crypt, Gloucester; his funeral was attended by his Sunday-school children, each of whom, by his direction, received a shilling and a plum-cake. See A. Gregory: Robert Raikes, new ed., London, 1881.

RAINERIO SACCHONI, b. at Piacenza; d. in 1259; was for seventeen years one of the most active preachers of the Franciscans in Lombardy, but was converted, entered the Dominican order, and became one of the most zealous adversaries of his former co-religionists. The Pope made him inquisitor of Lombardy. In 1250 he wrote a Summa de Catharistis et Leonistas, not polemical, but probably intended only for the inquisitor of Lombardy, but was composed of historical and statistical notices of great interest. Copies were made of it in Italy, France, Ger-
many, and England, and in each country pertinent additions were made. The original text was edited by J. STOUT (1722); and by D'ARGENTÉ (Collectio judiciorum, iii.). A text interpolated in Germany was edited by GRETER: Liber contra Waldenses, Ingolstadt, 1613. See GIESLER: De Rainerii summa, Göttingen, 1884.

### RAMACHE

RAMACHE is the name of several German theologians more or less noticeable. — August Jakob Rambach, b. at Quedlinburg, May 28, 1777; d. at Giessen, Feb. 24, 1814. He was appointed pastor in Hamburg in 1802. He distinguished himself as a hymnologist, and published Martin Luthers Verdienst um den Kirchen- gesang, Hamburg, 1813; and Anthologie christlicher Gesänge, Leipzig, 1817-18. He was professor at Giessen in 1831; and exercised a

### RALEIGH

RALEIGH, Alexander, D.D., Independent, b. in Kirkcudbright, Scotland, Jan. 3, 1817; d. in London, Monday, April 19, 1880. After a village-school education and a brief business experience in Liverpool (1835-40), he studied theology in Blackburn College, and was ordained pastor of the Independent Chapel at Greenock, Scotland, 1844.

### RAMADAN

RAMADAN (from ramida, "to glow with heat"), the ninth month of the Mohammedan (lunar) year, observed as a fast. In the Koran Surah ii. (The Cow), §180, it is written:—

"As to the month Ramadan, in which the Koran was sent down to be man's guidance, and an explanation of that guidance, and an illumination, as soon as any of you observeth the moon, let him set about the fast; but he who is sick, or upon a journey, shall make it up afterward. You are allowed on the night of the fast to . . . eat and drink until ye can discern a white thread from a black thread by the daybreak: afterwards fast strictly till night, and the pass the time in the mosques." — Rodwell's Translation, 2d ed., p. 389.

When Ramadan comes in midsummer, the long fast is severe. It is usual to turn the nights during the fast into seasons of feasting, revelry, and dissipation, and the days into sleeping times. The fast celebrates the giving of the Koran. According to Arabic tradition, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus also received their revelations during this month. The month is followed by three days of feasting, called the Little Beiram. Thus Mohammed imitated the Christian Lent and Easter.

### RAMBACH

RAMBACH is the name of several German theologians more or less noticeable. — August Jakob Rambach, b. at Quedlinburg, May 28, 1777; d. at Giessen, April 19, 1875; studied at Halle; and was appointed professor at Giessen in 1871; and exercised a

RAMECH, Alexander, D.D., Independent, b. in Franche-Comté 1857 or 1858; d. at Norridgewock, Me., Aug. 12 (23 N.S.), 1724.

He arrived in Quebec, Oct. 13, 1689, and after laboring in the Abnakis ("men of the East") mission of St. Francis, near the Falls of the Chaudière, seven miles above Quebec, and in the Illinois country, among the Algonquins (1691 or 1692), he returned to the Abnakis (1693 or 1694), and finally settled at Norridgewock on the Kennebec. There he built a chapel (1698), and acquired so much influence among the Abnakis, that he was popularly believed to have incited them to attack the Protestant settlers on the coast. A price was set upon his head. In 1705, 1722, and 1724 Norridgewock was attacked by the settlers, with the result, that the first time the chapel was burnt; the second time the rebuilt chapel and Rale's house were pillaged, and his papers carried off, and finally the third time, he and seven Indians who had undertaken to defend him were killed.

See his Memoir by Convers Francis, in Sparks's Popular Passages of American History, 1833; and, the third time, he and seven Indians; b. in Franche-Comté 1057 or 1658; d. at Norridgewock, Aug. 12, 1724. He was a man of talents, heroic character, adventurous life, immense services to civilization, and flagrantly unjust condemnation, are abundantly known. At least five biographies of him have appeared; e.g., by Edward Edwards, London, 1885. His Poems were collected by Sir Egerton Brydges, 1814; and his Complete Works, in 8 vols., at Oxford, 1829.

**RAMESSES.** See Exodus.

**RAMMohan Roy**, Rajah, Hindu religious reformer; b. in the district of Burdwan, province of Bengal, 1772; d. at Stapleton Park, near Bristol, Eng., Sept. 27, 1833. He was a Brahman, and strictly educated; but, under the influence of the Koran, he early renounced polytheism. He translated the *Vedanta* or *The Resolution of all the Veda*s, the theology of the Vedas, from Sanscrit into Bengalee and Hindostanee, prepared also an abridgment of it, and in 1816 published an English translation of it, the *Cena Upanishadas* (1816), and the *Isopanishad*. In 1820 he published, at Calcutta and London, selections from the New Testament, *The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Indifference*. In 1820 he published the Brahmiya Somaj, from which came the Brahmo Somaj (which see). He strenuously advocated through the Bengal Herald, of which he was part proprietor, the abolition of infanticide. In 1830 he founded, at Stapleton Park, the Brahmo Soiuaj (which see). He strenuously advocated through the Bengal Herald, of which he was part proprietor, the abolition of infanticide. In 1830 he published, at Calcutta, the Brahmiya Somaj, from which came the Brahmo Somaj (which see). He strenuously advocated through the Bengal Herald, of which he was part proprietor, the abolition of infanticide.

**RANDOLPH.**

**RANDALL, Benjamin.** See Freewill Baptists.

**RANDOLPH MACON COLLEGE,** located at Ashland, near Richmond, Va., is under the control of the Methodist-Episcopal Church South. It bears the name of two honored American statesmen,—John Randolph of Roanoke, and Nathaniel Macon of North Carolina. It enjoys the patronizing territory, it was removed to its inaccessibility of its location and a change in its patronizing territory, it was removed to its
present location at Ashland. Although it suffered heavily by the late war, losing almost its entire endowment, it has yet prospered since its removal to its present commanding location, having reached a patronage of 255 students. Its moral and religious tone tends to fill their property in common; but by so doing he fell into the disfavor of the government, and therefore, with a portion of his followers, emigrated to the United States in 1803. They settled first on Conque-nessing Creek in Butler County, Penn., and called the village Harmony. Prospering through their industry and economy, they were able to purchase, in 1815, a tract of twenty-four thousand acres upon the Wabash, Ind., and thither they removed. New Harmony was, however, sold to Robert Owen in 1824; and the Rappists emigrated to Economy, seventeen miles north-west of Pittsburgh, on the right bank of the Ohio.

RASHI, the celebrated Jewish commentator; b. at Troyes in Champagne, France, 1040; d. there July 13, 1105. (See De Rossi: Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, Parma, 1802.) He is often spoken of simply as Yarchi; and how that name arose from a misunderstanding he did not belong to that circle of rabbins who assumed the surname of Yarchi from their native place, Lunel in Perpignan ("luna," לְנָה). He spent seven years in travelling through Italy, Greece, Palestine, Egypt, Persia, and Germany, and was well versed in philology, philosophy, medicine, astronomy, law, etc. Besides commentaries on twenty-three treatises of the Talmud, commentaries on the Midrash Rabbah, a book on medicine, etc., he wrote commentaries on all the books of the Old Testament, giving both the literal sense and the allegorical explanations of the older rabbins. These commentaries, written in Hebrew mixed up with Latin, Greek, and Old-French words, and in a condensed, obscure style, attracted, nevertheless, much attention, both among Jews and Christians. The first book printed in Hebrew was his commentary on the Pentateuch, Reggio, 1475. The later editions are quite numerous: and there is a complete Latin translation by Breithaupt, — Prophets, Psalms, and Job (1713), the historical books (1714), the Pentateuch (1740). See J. Chr. Wolf: Biblio. Hebraea, 1718–33, 4 vols. quarto; I. M. Jost: Geschichte des Judenthums, 1807; Bloch: Lebensgeschichte d. Salomo Jizchaki, 1840.

The name Rashi is the combination of the initial letters, שָׁשֶׁ, of the full name and title, ר' יְשֵׁי חָכִי, i.e., Rabbi Shelomoh ben Yitz’haki. De Rossi’s Dizionario, referred to above, has been translated into German by Dr. Hamburger, Leipzig, 1839. Rashi’s Commentary on the Pentateuch was translated into German by Lucas Prague, 1835–38. Wilhelm Preszel.

RASCOLNIKS. See Russian Sects.

RATHERIUS, b. at Liege about 890; d. at Namur, April 25, 974. He was a monk in the monastery of Lobach (German) or Lobbes (French), in the Hainaut, and became possessed of what was still left, from the Carolingian age, of education and scholarship. Through his incidental connections with King Hugo of Provence he became bishop of Verona in 934, but was deposed and imprisoned on account of...
RATHMANN, Hermann, b. in Lübeck, 1585; d. at Danzig, June 30, 1682. He studied theology at Leipzig, Rostock, and Cologne, and was in 1612 appointed pastor at Danzig. In 1621 he published Jesu Christi Gnadenreich, in which he asserted that God willed no inherent power to instruct man, and make him better, but must be supported and supplemented by the activity of the Holy Spirit. The book was vehemently denounced by Johann Corvinus; and a controversy broke out which lasted to the death of Rathmann, and in which many of the first theologians of the time took part. See Möllers: Cimbria literata, iii. p. 563. L. Heller.

RATIONALISM and SUPRANATURALISM, two terms of great prominence in modern theology, are aptly defined by Fr. V. Reinhard, in his Geistabdnisse, Sulzbach, 1810. He says,—

In rationalism, reason is the sole arbiter. What reason cannot comprehend and accept can never form part of the rationalist’s conviction. His consciousness is homogeneous, and his intellect consists not of a single, but of many faculties. To him, Scripture is like any other book. He accepts it, only when it agrees with his opinions, and then only as an illustration and affirmation, not as an authority. The supranaturalist, on the other hand, is, no less in harmony with his fundamental maxim. In matters of religion, Scripture is to him what reason is to the rationalist. Though he, too, employs reason, he employs it only to search and judge those claims to a divine origin which Scripture puts forth; and as soon as that point has been decided, he becomes convinced that Scripture contains the direct teachings of God, it becomes his highest, his sole authority. The only office of reason is to search and explain the true meaning of Scripture; but the doctrines themselves, even though they may seem strange and hard, must be recognized, and accepted unconditionally.

Of the two terms, rationalism is the older. It was first used by Amos Comenius, in his Theologia naturalis, 1661, where it was applied to the theologians of the Socinian school, to naturalists and deists. It is probable, however, that Comenius was not the inventor of the name “rationalists,” as the form “rationists” occurs before his time, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, when it was applied to the Aristotelian humanists of the school of Helmstäd. At its first appearance the opposite of rationalism was not designated as supranaturalism, but simply as protestantism (see Gabler: Neuestes theolog. Journal, Nuremberg, 1801). As the champions, however, of the rationalist idea, were those who attacked the authority of Scripture, and demanded an absolute authority of the king as the sole foundation of positive Christianity, while Locke (d. 1704) charmed them by his demonstration of the reasonableness of Christianity; but both contributed, each in his way, to strengthen the dominion of that common sense in accordance with which Toland (d. 1722) could proclaim that Christianity contains no mystery, and Tindal (d. 1733), that the Gospel are simply a republication of the religion of nature. But the curious fact is, that this relation between Christianity and natural religion was recognized by the apologists: yes, Butler (d. 1751) even accepted Tindal’s proposition concerning the republication of the religion of nature. Indeed, by accommodating themselves to the views of their adversaries, and confining their defence of the authority of Scripture to a strictly scientific demonstration, the English apologists came to point nearly in the same way as their antagonists; and the representatives of the type of supranaturalism must be sought for among the dissenters. In the Netherlands two currents may be observed; one issuing from a purely philosophical, and the other from a pietistic, religious principle, but both setting directly and with vigor against orthodox Calvinism.

The term “supranaturalism” was brought into use is not known; but it is found in Gabler.

About the middle of the eighteenth century the two opponents stood fully developed, confronting each other, and the contest began. The finishing strokes, both in the philosophical and theological controversy, were given by Leibnitz and Hobbes. The former was the founder of monistic rationalism, and placed reason on the same footing as God; the latter was the founder of the philosophy of Wolff; but long preparations preceded the consummation, and it is interesting to notice the different characteristics which the incipient movement exhibits under the different national conditions. In England the rapidly increasing deism called forth a long series of apologetical writings, though without thereby producing any sharp and decisive contrast. Herbert of Cherbury (d. 1648) taught that the innate ideas of reason and the general contents of revelation were identical, but that the latter was, nevertheless, necessary in order to restore the original but almost ruined natural religion. Around this idea of a natural religion, deism gathered its champions; and the prevailing latitudinarianism, emphasizing that which is common to all confessions, and willing to sacrifice that which is specifically Christian for that which is common to all religions, almost brought the same standard. Hobbes (d. 1679) disgusted people by representing the absolute authority of the king as the sole foundation of positive Christianity, while Locke (d. 1704) charmed them by his demonstration of the reasonableness of Christianity; but both contributed, each in his way, to strengthen the dominion of that common sense in accordance with which Toland (d. 1722) could proclaim that Christianity contains no mystery, and Tindal (d. 1733), that the Gospel are simply a republication of the religion of nature. But the curious fact is, that this relation between Christianity and natural religion was recognized by the apologists: yes, Butler (d. 1751) even accepted Tindal’s proposition concerning the republication of the religion of nature. Indeed, by accommodating themselves to the views of their adversaries, and confining their defence of the authority of Scripture to a strictly scientific demonstration, the English apologists came to point nearly in the same way as their antagonists; and the representatives of the type of supranaturalism must be sought for among the dissenters. In the Netherlands two currents may be observed; one issuing from a purely philosophical, and the other from a pietistic, religious principle, but both setting directly and with vigor against orthodox Calvinism.

From the first proposition of Descartes (d. 1650), De omnibus dubitandum est (“everything must be doubted”), even the confession of the Established Church could not hope to vindicate itself as an exception; and his second proposition, cogito ergo sum (“I think, consequently I am”), gave to all speculation a merely subjective basis, from which the objectivity of a denominational creed could never be reached, except by a leap, or surreptitiously. Still worse, in his Tractatus theologico-politicus Spinoza openly attacked the authority of Scripture, and demanded the whole question of religion, from a religious point of view, to be submitted to a historical court. No wonder, therefore, that, towards the close of the seventeenth century, the Netherlands swarmed with atheists, and critical questions rose to the surface even within theological circles, especially since the other current, the
Dutch Pietism, rapidly developing from a cautious emphasis on life as against doctrine (Cocceius, d. 1689), into an open tendency of separation from the Established Church (Labadie, d. 1674),— ran in an almost parallel direction. Pietism generally took root in the lower sphere of life that is to say, the result of which is that it often allows science to shrink into a mere formal demonstration. On account of this indifferentism to the extension of truth for truth's own sake, Pietism may come to consider Scripture simply a practical means to a practical end, and not keep the source of all truth ever flowing, and ever renewing and refreshing life; the practical end of Pietist life so often shrinks into a narrow brotherhood of the faithful, with no interest for, but perhaps even antipathy against, the church universal. Thus Pietism is never well fitted to take up arms in defence of supranaturalism; on the contrary, in its further development it generally shows a tendency towards rationalism. But in France, in the middle of the eighteenth century, even this semblance of an opposition to rationalism disappeared, and the whole movement was directed by the encyclopedists. Pascal's influence had died out; and the adversaries of the encyclopedists were either petrified in mere externals, or lost in indifferentism. But the finest fruits, in a religious aspect, which the encyclopedists produced, were the very affected enthusiasm of Rousseau for Christ and the Gospels, and Voltaire's very natural passion for toleration.

What has been said of Pietism in the Netherlands is true also of Pietism in Germany. Though it was only the eccentricities and excesses of some enthusiasts which actually led into apostasy and free-thinking, even in its noblest form Pietism could not help acting on orthodoxy as a dissolvent. It was adverse to the scholastic form in which the orthodox system was presented; it was lukewarm to the idea of pure doctrine for purity's own sake; it was well disposed to those who labored for a union between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches; and it was firmly determined to shun the dogma of a practical issue: that is to say, Pietism was indifferent where orthodoxy was passionate, and passionate where orthodoxy was indifferent. At the same time, orthodoxy underwent certain changes which actually weakened it. It is true that Georg Calixtus (d. 1658) occupied a somewhat insulated position. It is also true that Musseus (d. 1681), so famous for his attack upon Herbert of Cherbury and Spinoza, was compelled to abjure all syncretism. But the Carpzovs and the Calvenses, nevertheless, soon ceased to sound the keynote. Distinctions were adopted between "against" and "above" reason (non contra, sed supra rationem), between regenerated and unregenerated reason (ratio renata and ratio irregenta), between a mechanical and a normal use of reason (usu organicus and usu normativus); and, though these distinctions did not actually shake the authority of Scripture, they certainly modified the connection with which that authority rested. The old professors fought valiantly against the approaching danger; but they saw with regret and anxiety how the young students dropped off, and fell into Pietism, or disbelief of various kinds. Such was the state of German theology when the period of enlightenment (Aufklärung) dawned upon it. It was double-faced,— at once popular and philosophical. The popular light was at first introduced from England, France, and the Netherlands; but it soon found in Friedrich II. of Prussia its social guaranty, in Camisard (d. 1714) its theological exponent, and in Gellert and a swarm of co-workers its literary propagators, who, in a light, genteel, half-satirical manner, swept away all pedantry, scholasticism, and other forms of old-logicism. Wolff was the bringer of the philosophical light. He established a sharp distinction between theologia naturalis and theologia revelata. In the former, nothing is admitted but that which can be logically demonstrated and scientifically proved: in the latter any thing is accepted which is taught in Scripture. And the relation between those two dominions is this: all that is valid in theologia naturalis must be found in theologia revelata, but not all that is found in theologia revelata is valid in theologia naturalis. To this distinction corresponds that between rationalism and supranaturalism; and the contest between the two latter is, so to speak, symbolized by Wolff's own life. In 1729 he was driven away from Halle with threats of the gibbet: in 1740 he was brought back in a triumphal chariot.

In the group of supranaturalists which formed under the direct influence of the philosophy of Wolff, S. J. Baumgarten (d. 1757) occupies the most prominent place, and by his side J. D. Michaelis (d. 1781). In Germany as in England the relation in which supranaturalism placed itself to the advancing rationalism was apologetical; and it cannot be denied that the Wolffian school, with its elaborate method of demonstration, its many new cosmological and anthropological ideas, and its bright, ethical optimism, furnished the apologists with much excellent material; though, on the other hand, it is evident, that, by its perpetual harping on the principium rationis sufficiens, it often drew the whole subject down into a lower sphere by teaching people to content themselves with the probable and the useful, instead of demanding truth and goodness. (See Zorn: Petinotheologie, 1742.) More independent of Wolff are Mosheim (d. 1755) and the Württemberg school of theology, Matthiaus Pfaff (d. 1760), Öttinger (d. 1782), and others. The Württemberg school is thoroughly biblical in its character, and its work was principally exegetical. Pfaff concedes that natural religion is held in high esteem by Scripture; but he adds that it is utterly insufficient to salvation, because it knows nothing of Christ: it has only a usu pedagogicorum. Exegesis, he asserts, is the only foundation on which true theology can be built up; and he laments, when seeing how people's hearts have been turned away from Scripture "since theology put on the cloak of philosophy." Öttinger brought into the school a mystico-theosophical element; and he, too, complained of the meagre reasonableness of the Wolffian demonstrations. Entirely without any connection with them, belonging to the supranaturalist group, stand the two great apologists of the period,— Bonnet (d. 1739) and Haller (d. 1777).

Between supranaturalism and rationalism, Lessing (d. 1781) forms the transition. His fundamental idea, that God educates the human race by revelations, every supranaturalist will accept.
RATIONALISM.

But when he adds that the contents of the divine revelations are essentially identical with the contents of human reason, and would easily be recognized as such but for the peculiar form which had invested it with a reality, "the dogmatic" to the "theoretical," a pressiveness, hesitation begins. And when he goes on, and declares that none of the historically given religions is or can be the absolute religion, because its dogmas, though they may contain eternal truth, must be set forth in expressions belonging to a certain time and place, and consequently transitory, he has arrived at the threshold of rationalism. By the decisive distinction he makes between that which is eternal in a religion and that which is historical, he is connected directly with J. S. Semler (d. 1794), the father of modern biblical criticism, and the representative of rationalism in its first stage. In his critical exhibitions of the transient features of the Christian revelation, Semler entirely lost sight of the eternal kernel, which he replaced with a somewhat vague idea of a sublime teaching, conducive, if not indispensable, to the social and moral development of man. He was without piety, and in all practical relations he was quite conservative. He attacked Base dow, the Wolfenbiittel Fragments, and Bahrdt, though, perhaps, not without a feeling that he fought against disagreeable consequences drawn from his own premises; and he held that the State had a right to decide what should be taught in the school and in the pulpit, and what not. It was only in the theoretical questions of theology that he was liberal in the application of the principle of "accommodation," his own invention, according to which any idea set forth in Scripture could be put quietly out of the way as a mere accommodation, from the side of the author or of Christ, to reigning circumstances. There was a long distance between him and the Wolfenbiittel Fragments, whose publication began in 1774, and, again, between the Wolfenbiittel Fragments and Bahrdt (d. 1792). Semler saw in the moral character of Jesus and the apostles. It was the Wolfenbiittel Fragments which led the way in that field, representing Christ as simply a reformer of Judaism, as a mere enthusiast, as a visionary, whose other aspirations, and soon dropped the whole question of rationalism and supranaturalism. Still more affinity rationalism now showed to the Kantian philosophy; and all the more serious rationalists among the theologians accepted the Kantian deduction of morality as a true liberation from the vulgar eudemonism, in which they felt half suffocated. But rationalism had at this time spent all its power of production. It could do nothing but repeat its old proposition,—that reason is the highest arbiter, even in matters of religion; that Christianity is perfectible, etc. The fundamental principle of rationalism he finds in the non-exclusion of intermediate causes. "No experience," he claims, "has ever found evidence of a direct, immediate interference of God: nay, the very notion of the supranatural causes a feeling of disgust. The religion of Jesus is considered one of the universal religions, only so far as it is the religion of pure reason; and only those of its propositions can be accepted as universal truth which have been recognized by the collected reason of the human race. Not so very different from this is Wegscheider: Institutiones theol. dogm., 1816. But though, in the second decade of the 19th century the rationalists were still in possession both of the
church and the school, they not only produced nothing new, but they actually began to pine away, from inanition; and the new theological schools which arose beside them (those of Schleiermacher and Hegel) were as indifferent to the question of rationalism and supranaturalism as were the successors of their supranaturalist adversaries Cornelius and Hegel. 

LIT. — HAHN, De rationalismo in dole, 1827; STAUDLIN: Geschichte des Rationalismus und Supranaturalismus, 1826; THOLUCK: Vorgeschichte d. R., 1853; and Geschichte d. R., 1885; HÜNDENHAGEN: Der deutsche Protestantismus, 1850, 3d ed.; F. DE ROUGEMONT: Les deux cités, 1874; [histories of rationalism by Lecky (Lond., 1865, 2 v.), and HURST (N.Y., 1865); CAIRNS: Unbelief in the 18th Century, Edinb., 1881; and THOLUCK: art. in Herzog. J. xii. 537-554]. ROBERT KÜBEL.

RATISBON, The Conference of (April 27-May 25, 1541), may be considered as a continuation of the Conference of Arras, 1540, and as the last attempt by Charles V. at solving the religious conflict of Germany without arms. The interlocutors were Gropper, Pflug, and Eck on the one side, Butzer, Pistorius, and Melanchthon on the other. Besides the presidents, Count-palatine Friedrich and Cardinal Granvella, six witnesses were present, among whom was Jacob Sturm. As basis, was used, not the Confessio Augustana, but the so-called Ratisbon Book, in twenty-two articles. In spite of Eck's opposition, an agreement was arrived at concerning the article on justification; and the Roman Catholics granted that faith, with the addition of efficax, was the principal, and indeed the sole, condition of justification. But with respect to the articles on the doctrinal authority of the church, the hierarchy, discipline, sacraments, etc., no agreement was possible; and the only real result of the conference was the general conviction that the religious split in Germany was not to be healed by a theological formula.

LIT. — Reports of the conference were published in Latin and German by Butzer and Melanchthon, 1540; further documents are found in Notizen der Reformationszeit, 1613; and Dittrich: Regesten u. Briefe d. Kardinals A., Braunb., 1851. H. SCHMIDT.

RATRAMNUS, a contemporary of Paschasius Radbertus, and one of the most prominent writers of the Carolingian age; was monk in the monastery of Corbie in Picardy, which he seems to have entered while Wala was abbot (828-835). Of his personal life nothing is known, but he enjoyed great authority and a great literary fame in his time. Charles the Bald often appealed to his opinion on ecclesiastical questions. By the bishop of Corbie Ratramnus wrote two works, — De praedestinatione Dei and Trinitatis. In the former he defends the double predestination; though, at the time he wrote, both the synod of Mayence (848) and that of Chieri (849) had condemned that idea. His most famous work is his Contra Gratianum oppositum, a refutation of Photius, in which he defends not only the Filioque, but the whole liturgical, dogmatical, and disciplinary development of the Western Church. In his curious Epistola de Cynocephalis ad Rimbartum he maintains that the cynocephali are the offspring of Adam. His works are found collected in Migne: Patro. Lat., vol. 121.

RATZEBERGER, Matthäus, b. at Wangen in Württemberg, 1501; d. at Erfurt, Jan. 3, 1559. He studied medicine at Wittenberg, and was successively body-physician to the Elector of Brandenburg, the Count of Mansfeld, and the Elector of Saxony. He was a relative of Luther, his house-physician, and an intimate friend of his. The best edition of his Life of Luther is that by Neudecker, Jena, 1860.

RAU (RAVIUS), Christian, b. at Berlin, Jan. 25, 1813; d. at Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, June 21, 1877. He was graduated at Wittenberg, 1836. In 1838 he visited Turkey. After a stay in Germany he was in the East, acquiring Turkish, Persian, Italian, Spanish, and Romainic. On his return he taught Orientalia at Oxford (1642-44), Utrecht (1644), Amsterdam (1645), Upsala (1650), Kiel (1669), Frankfurt-on-the-Oder (1671). He was also at Stockholm for several years, under Charles Gustave, as interpreter and librarian to the king. His most useful work is perhaps his epitome of Buxtorf's Hebrew and Greek Concordance, Berlin and Frankfurt, 1877; but besides it he published, among other works, Chronologia infallibilis biblica, Upsala, 1689; De adventualis plenitudine temporis Jesu Christi in conc. F. Noguer, 1710. FRANTZ.

RAUCH, Frederick Augustus, Ph.D., first president of Marshall College, Mercersburg, Penn.: b. at Kirchbracht, Hesse-Darmstadt, July 27, 1806; d. at Mercersburg, Penn., March 2, 1841. The son of a minister of the Reformed Church, in his childhood the real boistrousness of his training. At the age of eighteen he entered the university of Marburg, and subsequently studied philosophy and theology in Giessen and Heidelberg. Thereupon he was appointed extraordinary professor of philosophy in the university of
Giesen, and at the end of one year was complimented with an appointment to an ordinary professorship in the university of Heidelberg. But on some public occasion, before leaving Giesen, he expressed political sentiments which brought upon him the displeasure of the government. A friend warned him of danger, and urged him to escape. He had at midnight a final interview of two hours with his father, and then took refuge in America, 1831. He located at Easton, Penn., and, being a total stranger, earned a livelihood for some months by teaching music. But his abilities as a scholar, and his high character, soon becoming known, he was made professor of the German language in Lafayette College.

In June, 1832, he removed to York, Penn., and took charge of the high school, which in 1829 had been established by the German Reformed Church in connection with her theological seminary. In the annual meeting held in October of this year he was elected professor of biblical literature. The high school was removed to Mercersburg in the fall of 1835, and incorporated as Marshall College. Dr. Rauch was chosen president; and in the twofold capacity of president of Marshall College, and professor of biblical literature in the theological seminary, he labored with zeal and enthusiasm for the last five years of his life.

As a scholar, Dr. Rauch excelled in classical literature, in natural history, in moral philosophy, and in mental science. He was at home, also, in the sphere of aesthetics, and had his mind richly stored with the creations of genius as they belong to the fine arts generally. The German philosophy, with all its bewildering abstractions, was for him the subject of familiar knowledge; while it commanded, also, his general confidence and respect. He saw in its different cardinal systems, not contradiction and confusion so much as the unity of one and the same grand intellectual movement, borne forward from one stage of development to another. In Heidelberg he was a student and friend of the eminent theologian and philosopher, Charles Daub, who represented the right or conservative wing of the Hegelian school, and had firm faith in the organic growth and development to another. At Heidelberg he was the first man who introduced into the educational system of America what is known as the organic method. The parts of a subject were not regarded as externally, but ever as internally related. Mind was not a conglomerate of faculties, but a vital unity. History was not merely a sequence of events, but a growth, a process advancing agreeably to the nature of life. No question in philosophy was to be discussed or settled according to an arbitrary plan or standard, but was to be considered and solved agreeably to principles and laws which were inherent in the idea itself. The truth of a dogma was to be tested or determined by any number of Bible passages, but by its organic connection with that living economy of which Jesus Christ was the author and the animating soul. Rauch, whilst living, was understood and appreciated by few only. The systems of moral and mental philosophy then taught were to him superficial and meagre. He believed it to be his mission to labor for the union of German with Scotch and American modes of thought, or Anglo-German philosophy as he termed it. To accomplish this end he planned a series of works, the most needful of which he believed to be, one on psychology, another on ethics, and a third on aesthetics. But his premature death frustrated this scheme. During the last year of his life he wrote and published his Psychology, and he had completed his plan and preparation of a work on ethics.

Dr. Rauch was properly the founder of Marshall College. This was the principal achievement of his short life. He prepared, organized, and trained the first five classes (1837-41); and in doing this he breathed a soul into the institution. The characteristic features of his philosophical genius and organic method he infused so effectually, that his educational work survived his death. The distinguishing spirit unbreathed by him has lived and flourished in the philosophy and theology of the college and seminary (now located at Lancaster, Penn.), though modified, developed, and matured, by his successors, onward to the present time. See MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY.

LIT. — RAUCH: Psychology, or a View of the Human Soul, including Anthropology, New York, 1840 (3d ed., rev., 1844, with Preface by Dr. J. W. Nevin); The Inner Life of the Christian (a series of sermons published after Rauch’s death by E. V. GERHART; Dr. J. W. NEVIN: Eulogy (on occasion of the removal of Rauch’s remains from Mercersburg to Lancaster, 1859), in MERCERSBURG REVIEW, vol. xi. p. 456. E. V. GERHART.

RAUHE, HAUS. See WICHERN.

RAUTENSTRAUCH, Franz Stephan, b. at Plat- ten, Bohemia, 1794; d. at Erlau, Hungary, 1785; entered the Benedictine order, taught philosophy, canon law, and theology, at Braunau, and was in 1774 made director of the theological faculty in Vienna. He was a zealous defender of the re-forms of Joseph II., and drew up the edict of 1776 concerning the re-organization of the theological study in Austria. Among his writings are, Institutio juris ecclesiastici, Prague, 1769, and Synopsis jur. ecci., Vienna, 1776.

RAVENNA, an important city of Gallia Cispa- dana, forty-three miles south-east from Bologna, and originally situated on the Adriatic, from which, owing to the deposits from the delta of the Po, it is now distant between five and six miles.

It was founded by the Thessalians, according to Strabo, who describes it as traversed by canals, abounding in bridges and ferries, and noted for the abundance of its wine.

Late in the history of the Roman Republic it was the chief military station of Cisalpine Gaul,
and a frequent resort of Julius Caesar during his Gallic administration. Augustus made it one of the three principal naval stations of the empire, and the headquarters of the Adriatic fleet. He constructed a new and spacious harbor, about which a town grew up, known later as the suburb Classis; and between this and the city proper arose, at one time, another suburb, under the name of Cesarea.

From this time until far on in the history of the later empire, the city appears as an important military and naval station, and as a place of confinement for state prisoners. About 400 A.D. it became the residence of the Emperor Honorius, who fled thither at the approach of Alaric, and continued to be the seat of government until the fall of the Western Empire, in 476. Galla Placidia, the sister of Honorius, and mother of Valentinian III., resided there as regent from 425 to 450, and contributed largely to the adornment of the city. Theodoric bequeathed it in 487; and the murder of Odoacer placed in his hand the sceptre, which he wielded for thirty-three years. He was succeeded by a series of elective kings, until 539, when Justinian undertook to bring Italy under the Byzantine Empire, and Ravenna opened its gates to Belisarius. Then followed, for a hundred and eighty-five years, the rule of the exarchs or viceroys of the Byzantine court, the last of whom, Eutychius, was expelled by the Lombards in 752.

The chief interest of Ravenna is ecclesiastical. According to a questionable tradition, the gospel was preached there as early as 79 A.D., by a disciple of Peter, Apollinaris, who suffered martyrdom for the destruction of a temple of Apollo. Monumentally the city falls into the line of ecclesiastical history with the era of the Theodosian family; and, within less than a hundred and fifty years, Galla Placidia, Theodoric, and the representatives of the Byzantine Empire, successively enriched it with the Christian monuments which now constitute its principal attraction. Its chief monuments belong to the transitional period, when the Roman and the Teutonic elements of the western world were in being, and when the mingling of the two had not yet formed a third whole different from either. It was the seat of the first settled Teutonic dominion beyond the Alps.

The monuments fall into three classes, marking three periods,—the Theodosian, the Gothic, and the Byzantine.

Of the Theodosian era, the principal relics are the church of San Giovanni Evangelista, erected by Placidia, 425; the church of SS. Nazaro e Celso, better known as the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia (450), where her huge sarcophagus is still preserved, the only one of at least two Roman emperors; the baptistery of San Giovanni in Fonte (451), one of the most interesting ecclesiastical structures in the world, containing the earliest known mosaics of the fifth century.

The Gothic or Arian era is represented by the basilica known as Teodore, a fragment of the original structure, or an addition to Theodoric's actual work; the Mausoleum of Theodoric, a cylindrical stone edifice of two stories, with a cupola formed of a single enormous stone; the two Arian churches remaining of the six erected by Theodoric,—San Spirito, noteworthy only for its baptistery, Santa Maria in Cameredin, with its sixth century mosaics,—and San Martino in Casto Auroe, afterwards changed to S. Apollinare Nuovo, in honor of the first bishop of Ravenna, whose remains are said to be interred there.

The series of colossal mosaic figures occupying the whole length of the triforium on both sides of the nave may safely challenge the competition of any similar works in the world. The church of S. Apollinare in Classe, in the ancient suburb Classis, was begun eight years after Theodoric's death (526), and consecrated fifteen years later. It now stands almost alone in a desolate marsh. The original mosaics of 671 are interesting as marking the point where the ecclesiastical sentiment begins to rank with the purely Christian. The figure of Apollinaris in the midst of a flock of sheep is on a level with that of Peter, thus asserting the equality of the Eastern and Western churches.

The great illustration of the Byzantine period is the church of San Vitale, begun in 526, and consecrated 547, to the memory of Vitalis, the patron saint of Ravenna. Here the oblong basilica gives place to the octagon, and the lines of columns are replaced by tiers of arches. The mosaics are of the time of Justinian and Theodora. Among them are portraits of the emperor and empress as patrons of the church.

When Honorius chose Ravenna for his residence, the see of Ravenna was raised to metropolitan dignity, increased in importance under the Ostrogothic rule, and remained so until the end of the seventh century. Galla Placidia (450), where her huge sarcophagus is still preserved, is the only one of at least two Roman emperors; the baptistery of San Giovanni in Fonte (451), one of the most interesting ecclesiastical structures in the world, containing the earliest known mosaics of the fifth century.

The struggle was renewed between Pope Hadrian and Archbishop Leo (770-779), and again, after nearly a century of quiet, between Pope Nicholas I. and Archbishop John, and was finally ended by the complete submission of John at a synod called by Nicholas at Rome, 861.

Ravenna has been the seat of twenty-five synods, few of which are deserving of special mention. Among the decrees of the synod of 877 it was enacted that bishops must be consecrated within three months after their appointment, on penalty of excommunication. At the synod of 877 the Emperor Stephen and Pope John XIII. met at Ravenna, and established the office of exarch for the Adriatic fleet. The synod of 998 condemned the custom of selling the holy Eucharist and chrism; and that of 1314 pronounced against the excessive freedom and luxury of nuns, and the too frequent use of excommunication, and revoked the permission to monks to preach indulgences.

Ravenna holds the ashes of Dante, who removed thither in 1320. There he completed the last cantica of the Divina Commedia, and died on the 14th of September, 1321. The twenty-eight

**RAVIGNAN. RAYMOND OF SABUNDE.**

Raymond of Sabunde, or Sabiende, a native of Spain; taught medicine and philosophy at Toulouse, and became finally professor regius there in theology. From 1434 to 1486 he wrote his *Liber naturae sive creaturarum*, etc., the only monument he has left of himself, but a work which occupies a most prominent place in the history of natural theology. Augustine was the first who made the distinction between *lumen naturae* and *lumen gratiae*; that is, between the truth which may be acquired by natural experience and the truth which is given us only by divine revelation. But after him the distinction was repeated over and over again; and through the whole course of medieval theology it was treated as one of the most important principles, — one laboring to establish an impassable barrier between the two sources of truth, and another which considered it possible to combine them into one single stream. After the overthrow of nominalism in the twelfth century, and more especially after the formation of the grand systems of Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, the latter tendency, that of reconciliation and combination, became prevalent. It was supported by the ruling realism, and capable of assimilating a considerable amount of Platonic elements. Revelation and redemption continued to be considered as indispensable links in the divine scheme of salvation; but it was at the same time generally held that the idea of God could be reached by natural ratiocination, and that nature herself had implanted in man the principle of morality. In the beginning of the fourteenth century, however, a complete change took place. From the influx of the Arabico-Aristotelian philosophy, philosophical speculation received a new impulse; but as it was compelled to confine itself to systematic theology without making any fresh researches or any new conquests, and as systematic theology already stood fixed with the character of unquestionable authority, needing no testimony from reason, and even unwilling to accept any, it came quite naturally to pass that reason and faith, philosophy and theology, were placed over against each other as irreconcilable opponents. (See William Ockham.) It was against this tendency that Raymond wrote his *Liber naturae sive creaturarum*, which may be said to contain the first construction of a system of natural theology. The book of nature, he says, and the book of the Bible, are both revelations, — the former general and immediate, the latter specific and mediate; and the reciprocal relation between them is this: by the light which the book of nature sheds on the idea of God, the latter not only become more comprehensible, but they prove also the indispensableness of the former. The manner in which this ideal is carried out may not be above criticism; but the work exercised, nevertheless, a considerable influence, as may be inferred from the number of persons who found in it a valuable manual of instruction in natural theology.
of imitations it found. The editio princeps of it is without date or place, but belongs probably to the year 1484. The best edition is that by Rych. Pfaffendorf, Ditzfurter, 1485. The latest is that by J. F. von Seidel, Sulzbach, 1852; but it lacks the Prologus, which in 1595 was put on the Index, because it declares the Bible to be the only source of revealed truth. See Fr. Holberg: De theologia naturali R. Sabunde, Halle, 1843; D. Matzke: Die natürliche Theologie des R. S., Breslau, 1846; M. Hütter: Die Religionphilosophie R. S., Augsburg, 1851; Kleiber: De R. S., Berlin, 1856. 

RAYMUNDUS LULLUS. See Lullus.

READER. See Lector.

REALISM. See Scholastic Theology.

REAL PRESENCE. See Lord's Supper, p. 1848.

RE'CABITES, the descendants of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, whose obedience to their father's command not to drink wine, build houses, sow seed, plant vineyards nor have any, but to dwell always in tents, is held up by Jeremiah as a model for Judah (Jer. xxxv.), and is recollected of both sexes. Hezekiah. In the latter part of the seventeenth century, there were recluses of the Rechabites, because the promise which God gave after the fall (Gen. iii. 15) was renewed to the children of Israel in various forms, as a deliverance from the hand of the ungodly (Ps. xxi., xxii., xxx. 15), a conception which still prevailed in New-Testament times (Luke i. 71), and from guilt and sin (Ps. ii.; Isa. xliii. 24, 25, lii., etc.). Jehovah is expressly called the Redeemer of Israel (Isa. xlii., lxv.), and from guilt and sin (Rom. v. 9; 1 Thess. i. 10, v. 9). This is the juridical side of redemption. It has also an ethical side, and includes deliverance from the power and dominion of sin. In this sense, Christ has redeemed us from all unrighteousness, as his own possession, purifying us unto good works (Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 19 sq.), and has overcome the world, whose temptations lead us into evil (John xvi. 33; 1 John v. 4, etc.), and has broken the power of the prince of this world, — the Devil (John xii. 31; Col. ii. 15). Redemption also has a physical aspect; and, when Christ returns again to raise the quick and the dead, there will be no more pain and death for the believing (Rev. xxi. 4), but eternal life (Rom. v. 10, vi. 22).

The original motive of redemption was the love of God, which wills not the death of the sinner (John iii. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 4). In order to accomplish this, God sent his Son into the world, who gave himself as our ransom, even unto death (Matt. xx. 28; John x. 11, 15; 1 Tim. ii. 6), becoming a curse on the cross to deliver us from the curse of the law (2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 13). What he began in his humiliation on earth, he is consummating in his state of exaltation. Christ is himself redemption (John xiv. 6), and is offered to all men, on condition of their repent-
REDEMPTION. 2003

REDEMPTORISTS.

ance, and turning from their evil ways (2 Cor. vii. 10; Jas. v. 20, etc.), believing in the Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. i. 16; Eph. ii. 8), and confessing his name (Rom. x. 9, 13). The sinner must work out his own salvation with fear and trembling (Phil. ii. 12), despising sin, and living unto righteousness (1 Pet. ii. 24).

The post-apostolic writers bring out the different aspects under which the work of redemption is presented in the New Testament; but the majority of the Fathers (Irenæus, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Augustine, etc.) treated it as a judicial transaction, in which Jesus gave up his life to the Devil in payment for mankind. Gregory Nazianzen, opposing this conception, treated it as a conflict between Christ and Satan for the possession of man (Orat., xiv.). As heathenism, the manifestation of sin’s dominion began to be overcome, the church began to regard redemption more from the stand-point of its power and effects upon the soul itself. Athanasius carried out the idea that the Logos assumed human nature, and gave himself up unto death, because the justice and veracity of God demanded the death of mankind, as he had threatened for sin. Basil the Great, Cyril of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary, and John of Damascus, held to this conception. It was Anselm of Canterbury who laid the most stress on man’s guilt, and worked out his doctrine in the famous treatise, Why God became Man ("Cur Deus homo").

Starting with the conception of the divine justice and the majesty of the law, he asserted the necessity of an equivalent for the violation of the law. This could be furnished only by the innocent and infinite Son of God. This doctrine of the atonement was further developed by Hugo of St. Victor, Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus. The Reformers, accepting this view, developed the doctrine in such a way as to render its practical workings very different from what they are in the Roman-Catholic Church, which imposes burdens and penances upon the sinner, admits works of supererogation, and gives him the power to choose and execute works of righteousness. Christ redeems us from the world, the flesh, and the devil; and faith in him overcomes the world (1 John v. 4). Redemption also affects man’s physical nature by delivering him from sin; and endowing it with the power to choose and execute works of righteousness. Christ redeems us from the world, the flesh, and the devil; and faith in him overcomes the world (1 John v. 4).

The Redemptorists have often been identified with the Jesuits on account of their fourfold vows; and in parts of Italy, Austria, and Bavaria, they have taken the place of the Jesuits during the period of the latter’s suppression. On account of the resemblance in certain matters of practice, they have shared the same fate with the Jesuits in Germany, France, and Belgium, and been suppressed or banished. And when Christ returns, our vile bodies shall be changed into the likeness of his glorious body (Phil. iii. 21), and we shall be translated into the communion of the blessed. This is redemption in its narrow sense (Rom. viii. 28; 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. i. 14). [For a still further treatment of the subject, and its literature, see art. Atonement.]
RED SEA.

RED SEA, the Inlet of the Indian Ocean, 1,450 miles long, 330 miles broad, separating Egypt from Arabia; begins at Bab-el-Mandeb, in latitude 12° 42' 50' north, and stretches, in the direction of north-west, to Ras Mohammed, in latitude 27° 44' north, where it separates into two arms,—the Gulf of Suez to the west, and the Gulf of Akabah to the east. Its name among the ancient Hebrews, Syrians, and Egyptians, was "The Sea of Reeds," and, which Sesostris led his army to the conquest of the Hamites, reached Africa after the destruction of the Tower of Babel, and across the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, was the bridge of importance as the connecting link between the East and the West. The Island Purim, situated in the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, was the bridge across which the Hamites reached Africa after the destruction of the Tower of Babel, and across which Sesostris led his army to the conquest of the East. 'Akabah was the harbor of Solomon, Joseph, Pharaoh, Azar, Rezin, the Romans, and the Byzantines. Rameses II. connected the Gulf of Suez with the eastern arm of the Nile by a canal, and the Poëmnes deepened and widened the canal, but very little was known of the Red Sea until quite recently. The western coast was first explored by Niebuhr, 1783; the eastern, by Holfrid, 1772. The Sinaic Peninsula and the Gulf of 'Akabah remained unknown till the days of Rüppell, 1810, and Moreby, 1829-33. [See art. in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible; and Ebers: Durch Gosen zum Sinai, Leipzig, rev. ed., 1881 passim.]

PRESSEIL.

REED, Andrew, D. D., an eminent philanthropist and divine; was b. in London, Nov. 27, 1788, and d. there Feb. 25, 1862. Nearly all his life was spent in Arabia; begins at Bab-el-Mandeb, in latitude 12° 42' 50' north, and stretches, in the direction of north-west, to Ras Mohammed, in latitude 27° 44' north, where it separates into two arms,—the Gulf of Suez to the west, and the Gulf of 'Akabah to the east. Its name among the ancient Hebrews, Syrians, and Egyptians, was "The Sea of Reeds," and, which Sesostris led his army to the conquest of the Hamites, reached Africa after the destruction of the Tower of Babel, and across the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, was the bridge of importance as the connecting link between the East and the West. The Island Purim, situated in the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, was the bridge across which the Hamites reached Africa after the destruction of the Tower of Babel, and across which Sesostris led his army to the conquest of the East. 'Akabah was the harbor of Solomon, Joseph, Pharaoh, Azar, Rezin, the Romans, and the Byzantines. Rameses II. connected the Gulf of Suez with the eastern arm of the Nile by a canal, and the Poëmnes deepened and widened the canal, but very little was known of the Red Sea until quite recently. The western coast was first explored by Niebuhr, 1783; the eastern, by Holfrid, 1772. The Sinaic Peninsula and the Gulf of 'Akabah remained unknown till the days of Rüppell, 1810, and Moreby, 1829-33. [See art. in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible; and Ebers: Durch Gosen zum Sinai, Leipzig, rev. ed., 1881 passim.]
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monographs on Wiclif, Hus, Wessel, Savonarola, Erasmus, etc., mentioned under these titles.

II. PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION. — It was originally neither a political, nor a philosophical, nor a literary, but a religious and moral movement; although it exerted a powerful influence on all the branches of Protestantism went farther in their antagonism to the received traditions than the Lutheran and the Anglican Reformation; but all united in rejecting the authority of the Pope (Melanchthon for a while was willing to concede this, but only *jure humano*, as a limited disciplinary superintendency of the church), the meritoriousness of good works, the indulgences, the worship of the Holy Virgin, of saints and relics, the seven sacraments (with the exception of baptism and the Eucharist), the dogma of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory and prayers for the dead, auricular confession, celibacy of the clergy, the monastic system, and the use of the Latin tongue in public worship, for which the vernacular languages were substituted.

(1) The objective principle proclaims the *categorical* dogmas of Protestantism,— the *absolute* sovereignty of the word of Christ and the *absolute* supremacy of the grace of Christ, and the *absolute* right of private judgment in bondagae. It brought the believer into direct relation and union with Christ as the one and all-sufficient source of salvation, in opposition to traditional ecclesialism, and priestly and saintly intercession. The Protestant goes directly to the word of God for instruction, and to the throne of grace in his devotions; while the pious Catholic always consults the teaching of his church, and prefers to offer his prayers through the medium of the Virgin Mary and the saints.

From this general principle of evangelical freedom, and direct individual relationship of the believer to Christ, proceed the three fundamental doctrines of Protestantism,— the absolute supremacy of the word of Christ, the absolute supremacy of the grace of Christ, and the general priesthood of believers. The first is called the *formal*, or, better, the *objective* principle; the second may be called the *social*, or *ecclesiastical* principle. German writers emphasize the first two, but often overlook the third, which is of equal importance.

(2) The subjective principle of the Reformation is *justification by faith alone*, or, rather, by free grace through faith operative in good works. It has reference to the personal appropriation of the Christian salvation, and aims to give all glory to Christ, by declaring that the sinner is justified before God (i.e., is acquitted of guilt, and declared righteous) solely on the ground of the all-sufficient merits of Christ as apprehended by a living faith, in opposition to the theory—then prevalent, and substantially sanctioned by the Council of Trent— which makes faith and good works the two co-ordinate sources of justification, laying the chief stress upon works. Protestantism does not, on that account, by any means reject or depreciate good works; it only denies their value as sources or conditions of justification, but insists on them as the necessary fruits of faith, and evidence of justification.

(3) The social and ecclesiastical principle is the universal priesthood of believers. This implies the right and duty of the Christian laity, not only to read the Bible for the spiritual nourishment, but also to take part in the government and all the public affairs of the church. It is opposed to the hierarchical system, which puts the essence and authority of the church into an exclusive priesthood, and makes ordained priests the necessary and only mediators between God and the people.

LIT. — On the principles of the Reformation, see Dorner: *History of Protestant Theology* (Eng. trans., Edinb., 1871, 2 vols.); *Das Princip unserer Kirche*, Kiel, 1841; *Justification by Faith*, Kiel, 1857 (both the last tract on the formal and material principle of Protestantism are reprinted in Dorner's *Gesammelte Schriften*, Berlin, 1883, pp. 48-187); Schaff: *The Principle of Protestantism* (Ger. and Eng.), Chambersb., 1845; Schenkel: *Das Princip d. Protestantismus*, Schaffhausen, 1852, and *Die Reformatorin und die Reformation*, 1856; Karna : Über die Principien des Protestantismus, Leip., 1865, and *Inout only subordinatet it to, and measures its value by, the Bible, and believes in a progressive interpretation of the Bible through the expanding and deepening consciousness of Christendom. Hence, besides having its own symbols or standards of public doctrine, it retained all the articles of the ancient Catholic creeds and a large amount of disciplinary and ritual tradition, and rejected only those doctrines and ceremonies for which it found no clear warrant in the Bible, and which it thought contradicted its letter or spirit. The Calvinistic and the Lutheran branches of Protestantism went farther in their antagonism to the received traditions than the Lutheran and the Anglican Reformation; but all united in rejecting the authority of the Pope (Melanchthon for a while was willing to concede this, but only *jure humano*, as a limited disciplinary superintendency of the church), the meritoriousness of good works, the indulgences, the worship of the Holy Virgin, of saints and relics, the seven sacraments (with the exception of baptism and the Eucharist), the dogma of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory and prayers for the dead, auricular confession, celibacy of the clergy, the monastic system, and the use of the Latin tongue in public worship, for which the vernacular languages were substituted.
HUNDERSHEIM, SCHNECKENBURGER, SCHWEIZER, JULIUS MÜLLER, etc., quoted in SCHAFF'S CREEDS OF CHURCHES, vol. iv., N.Y., 1883.

III. THE REFORMATION IN THE DIFFERENT COUNTRIES. — We confine ourselves here to brief sketches, and refer for details to the respective articles, and omit those countries (Italy, Spain) where the Reformation was totally suppressed by the Inquisition and the counter-reformation of Jesuits. For the general history of the Reformation in all countries, we refer to SCHÖCKLICH: CHRISTL. KIRCHENGESCH. SEIT DER REFORMATION, LEIP., 1804-12, 10 vols.; GIESELER: CHURCH HISTORY, AMERICAN ED., VOL. IV., N.Y., 1862 (very important for the literature, and extracts from the sources); HAGENBACH: HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION (translated by Miss E. Moore), EDIN., 1878, 2 vols.; MERLE D'AUBIGNE: HISTOIRE DE LA REFORMATION AU XVI' SIECLE, PARIS, 1835-53, 5 vols., and HISTOIRE DE LA REFORMATION AU TEMPS DE CALVIN, 1892-75, 5 vols. (Eng. trans. repeatedly published in Lond. and N.Y.); COMPLETE EDITION BY CARTER, N.Y., 1879, the first work in 8 vols., the second in 8 vols., 1879); L. HAUSER: GESCH. DES ZEITALTERS DER REFORMATION, BERLIN, 1868 (ENG. TRANS., N.Y., 1874); GEORGE P. FISHER: HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION, N.Y., 1873 (an excellent work, with a valuable appendix on the literature of the Reformation, pp. 555-591, which see); SEEBOHM: THE ERA OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION, LOND. AND N.Y., 1874; T. M. LINDSAY: THE REFORMATION, EDIN., 1882; CHARLES BEARD: THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY IN ITS RELATION TO MODERN THOUGHT AND KNOWLEDGE (THE HIBBERT LECTURES FOR 1888, PUBLISHED IN LOND. AND N.Y.).

The most learned work against the Reformation is by DR. DÜLLINGER: DIE REFORMATION, IHRER INNERE ENTWICKLUNG UND IHRE WIRKUNGEN, REGENSB., 1846-48, 3 VOLS. BUT THE DISTINGUISHED AUTHOR AFTERWARDS PROTESTED HIMSELF AGAINST THE POPE AND THE VATICAN COUNCIL, AND WAS EXCOMMUNICATED IN 1871.

(1) THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY. — The movement in Germany was directed by the genius and energy of Luther, and the learning and moderation of Melanchthon, assisted by the electors of Saxony and other princes, and sustained by the majority of the people, in spite of the opposition of the bishops and the imperial government. It commenced in the University of Wittenberg with a protest against the traffic in indulgences, Oct. 31, 1517 (ever since celebrated in protestant Germany as the festival of the Reformation), and soon spread all over Germany, which was in various ways prepared for a breach with the Pope. At first it kept within the bosom of the Roman Church. Luther shrunk in holy horror from the idea of a separation from the traditions of the past, and retained a profound reverence for certain Catholic dogmas and institutions. He only attacked a few abuses, taking it for granted that the Pope himself would and must reform them if properly informed. But the irresistible logic of events carried him far beyond his original intentions, and brought him into irreconcilable conflict with the central authority of the church. Pope Leo X., in June, 1520, pronounced the sentence of excommunication against Luther, and made his memorable defence, added to the excommunication of the Pope the ban of the emperor. The bold stand of the poor monk, in the face of the combined civil and ecclesiastical powers of the age, is one of the sublimest scenes in history, and marks an epoch in the progress of freedom. The dissatisfaction with the various abuses of Rome, and the desire for the free preaching of the gospel, were so extensive, that the Reformation, both in its negative and positive features, spread, in spite of the Pope's bull and the emperor's ban, and gained a foothold before 1530 in the greater part of Northern Germany, especially in Saxony, Brandenburg, Hesse, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Lüneburg, Friesland, and in nearly all the free cities, as Hamburg, Lübeck, Bremen, Magdeburg, Frankfort, and Nürnberg; while in Austria, Bavaria, and along the Rhine, it was persecuted and suppressed. Among the principal causes of this rapid progress were the writings of the Reformers, Luther's German version of the Scriptures (his greatest and most useful work, begun 1521, completed 1534), and the evangelical hymns, which introduced the new ideas into public worship and the hearts of the people. That extraordinary man, as a sort of inspired apostle and prophet of Germany, gave to his people the Bible, the Catechism, and the Hymn-Book, in the purest and strongest idiomatic German; and well may Germany, and all the Protestant churches in Europe and America, celebrate the fourth centennial of his birth on the 10th of November of this year (1885). The Diet of Spire, in 1529, left each state to its own discretion concerning the question of reform, until a general council should settle it for all, and thus sanctioned the principle of territorial independence in matters of religion which prevails in Germany to this day; each sovereignty having its own separate ecclesiastical establishment in close union with the state. But the next Diet of Spire (in 1529) prohibited the further progress of the Reformation. Against this decree of the Roman-Catholic majority, the evangelical princes entered, on the ground of the Word of God, the inalienable rights of conscience, and the decree of the previous Diet of Spire, the celebrated protest, dated April 19, 1529, which gave rise to the name of "Protestants."

* The Diet of Augsburg, in 1530, where the Lutherans offered their principal confession of faith, drawn up by Melanchthon, and named after that city, threatened the Protestants with violent measures if they did not return shortly to the old church. Here closes the first, the heroic, and most eventful, period of the German Reformation.

The second period embraces the formation of the Protestant League of Smalcald for the armed defence of Lutheranism, the various theological conferences of the two parties for an adjustment of the controversy, and the imperial " Interims " or compromises (the Ratisbon, Augsburg, and Leipzig " Interims "), and the Smalcaldian war, and ends with the success of the Protestant army, under Maurice of Saxony, and the peace of Augsburg in 1555, which secured, in turn, liberty of worship, the free exercise of their religion, but with a restriction on its farther progress.

The third period, from 1555 to 1580, is re-
markable for the violent internal controversies within the Lutheran Church,— the Osianidian controversy, concerning justification and sanctification; the Anabaptist, arising originally from the fruitless compromises with Romanists (called "Interims"); the synergistic, concerning faith and good works; and the crypto-Calvinistic, or sacramentarian controversy, about the real presence in the Eucharist. These theological disputes led to the full development and completion of the doctrinal system of Lutheranism as laid down in the Book of Concord (first published in 1580), which embraces all the symbolical books of that church: namely, the three confessional creeds; the Augsburg Confession and its "Apology," both by Melanchthon; the two Catechisms of Luther, and the Smalcald Articles drawn up by him in 1537; and the "Formula of Concord," composed by six Lutheran divines in 1577. But, on the other hand, the fanatical intolerance of the strict Lutheran party against the Calvinists and the moderate Lutherans (called, after their leader, Melancthonians or Philippists) drove a large number of the latter over to the Reformed (Calvinistic) Church, especially in the Palatinate (1560), in Bremen (1561), Nassau (1582), Anhalt (1590), Hesse-Cassel (1605), and Brandenburg (1614).

The German Reformed communion adopted the Heidelberg Catechism — drawn up by two moderate Calvinistic divines, Zacharias Ursinus and Kaspar Olevianus, in 1543, by order of the elector Frederick III., or the Pious — as their confession of faith.

The sixteenth century closes the theological history of the German Reformation; but its political history was not brought to a final termination until after the terrible Thirty Years' War, by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, which secured to the Lutherans and the German Reformed churches (but to no others) equal rights with the Roman Catholics within the limits of the German Empire. Those two denominations, either in their separate existence, or united in one organization under the name of the Evangelical Church (as in Prussia, Baden, Wurttemberg, and other states, since 1817), are to this day almost the only forms of the Reformed communion as distinct from the Lutheran. In all the essential principles and doctrines, except that on the mode of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, the Helvetian Reformation agreed with the German; but it departed farther from the received traditions in matters of government, discipline, and worship, and aimed at a more radical moral and practical reformation of the people. It naturally divides itself into three periods, — the Zwinglian, from 1516 to 1531; the Calvinistic, to the death of Calvin in 1564; and the period of Bullinger and Beza, to the close of the sixteenth century. The first belongs mainly to the German cantons; the second, to the French; the third, to both jointly. Zwingli began his reformatory preaching against various abuses, at Einsiedeln, in 1515, and then, with more energy and effect, at Zürich, in 1519. His object was to preach Christ from the fountain, and to "insert the pure Christ into the heart." At first he had the consent of the Bishop of Constance, who assisted him in putting down the sale of indulgences in Switzerland; and he stood even in high credit with the papal nuncio. But a rupture occurred in 1522, when Zwingli attacked the abbot of St. Gall, and many of his hearers ceased to observe him. The magistrate of Zürich arranged a public dis-
The Swiss diet took a hostile attitude to the Reformed movement, similar to that of the German diet, with a respectable minority in its favor. To settle the controversy for the republic, a general theological conference was arranged, and held at Baden, in the Canton Aargau, in May, 1526, with Dr. Eck, the famous antagonist of Luther, as the champion of the Roman, and Ecolampadius of the Reformed cause. Its result was in form adverse, but in fact favorable, to the cause of the Reformation. It was now introduced in the majority of the cantons, at the wish of the magistrates and the people, by Ecolampadius in Basel, and by Haller in Bern, also, in part, in St. Gall, Schaffhausen, Glarus, Appenzell, Thurgau, and the Grisons; while in the French portions of Switzerland William Farel and Viret prepared the way for Calvin. But the small cantons around the Lake of Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Lucerne, and Zug, steadfastly opposed every innovation. It was now introduced in the majority of the cantons, at the wish of the magistrates and the people, by Ecolampadius in Basel, and by Haller in Bern, also, in part, in St. Gall, Schaffhausen, Glarus, Appenzell, Thurgau, and the Grisons; while in the French portions of Switzerland William Farel and Viret prepared the way for Calvin. But the small cantons around the Lake of Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Lucerne, and Zug, steadfastly opposed every innovation. At last it came to an open war between the Reformed and Catholic cantons. Zwingli's policy was overruled by the apparently more humane, but in fact more cruel and disastrous, policy of Bern, to force the poor mountaineers into measures by starvation. The Catholics, resolved to maintain their rights, attacked and routed the little army of Zurchers in the battle of Cappel, October, 1531. Zwingli, who had accompanied his flock as chaplain and patriot, met a heroic death on the field of battle; and Ecolampadius of Basel died a few weeks after. Thus the progress of the Reformation was suddenly arrested in the German portions of Switzerland, and one-third of it remains Roman Catholic to this day.

But it took a new start in the western or French portion of the country, where Theodore Beza eloquently but vainly pleaded the cause of the Protestants before the court, the hierarchy, and the popular sentiment, and had to work its way through severe trial and persecution. The tradition in that country was favorable to a change, as France had always maintained a certain degree of independence of Rome; and the university of Paris, once the centre of European intelligence and culture, had strongly urged a thorough reformation in capitale et membria on the crown and the Roman ecclesiastics, and especially Calvin (see those arts.); Bul-linger (d. 1576): Reformationgesch. (to 1532), published 1838-40; A. L. Herminjard: Correspondance des Reformateurs dans les pays de langue française, Genève et Paris, 1866-83, 5 vols.; Füsslin: Beiträge, etc., Zürich, 1741-53; Simler: Sammlung alter u. neuer Urkunden, etc., 1767; Ruchat: Histoire de la réformation de la Suisse, Geneva, 1727 sqq., 8 vols.; Hottinger: Gesch. d. Schweiz. Kirchentrennung, Zurich, 1825-27, 2 vols.; Merle d'Aubigné: History of the Reformation in the times of Calvin, N.Y., ed. 1863-79, 8 vols.; Archiv für die schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte, ed. by Scherrer-Boccard and others, Freiburg-im-Br., 1869-75, 3 vols.; T. Strickler: Actensammlung zur Schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte in den Jahren 1521-32, im Anschluss an die gleichzeitigen eidgenössischen Abhandl., Zürich, 1878-85, 5 vols.; Emil Egli: Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation in den Jahren 1519-33, Zurich, 1879.

(3) The Reformation in France. - While the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland carried with it the majority of the population, it met in France with the united opposition of the court, the hierarchy, and the popular sentiment, and had to work its way through severe trial and persecution. The tradition in that country was favorable to a change, as France had always maintained a certain degree of independence of Rome; and the university of Paris, once the centre of European intelligence and culture, had strongly urged a thorough reformation in capitale et membria on the crown and the Roman ecclesiastics, and especially Calvin (see those arts.); Bul-linger (d. 1576): Reformationgesch. (to 1532), published 1838-40; A. L. Herminjard: Correspondance des Reformateurs dans les pays de langue française, Genève et Paris, 1866-83, 5 vols.; Füsslin: Beiträge, etc., Zürich, 1741-53; Simler: Sammlung alter u. neuer Urkunden, etc., 1767; Ruchat: Histoire de la réformation de la Suisse, Geneva, 1727 sqq., 8 vols.; Hottinger: Gesch. d. Schweiz. Kirchentrennung, Zurich, 1825-27, 2 vols.; Merle d'Aubigné: History of the Reformation in the times of Calvin, N.Y., ed. 1863-79, 8 vols.; Archiv für die schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte, ed. by Scherrer-Boccard and others, Freiburg-im-Br., 1869-75, 3 vols.; T. Strickler: Actensammlung zur Schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte in den Jahren 1521-32, im Anschluss an die gleichzeitigen eidgenössischen Abhandl., Zürich, 1878-85, 5 vols.; Emil Egli: Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation in den Jahren 1519-33, Zurich, 1879.

John Calvin, a Frenchman by birth and education, but exiled from his native land for his faith, found providentially a new home, in 1536, in the little republic of Geneva, where Farel had prepared the way. Here he developed his extraordinary genius and energy as the greatest divine and energy as the greatest discipline, and left in Theodore Beza (d. 1605) an able and worthy successor, who, partly with Bullinger, the faithful successor of Zwingli in Zurich, and author of the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), labored to the close of the sixteenth century for the consolidation of the Swiss Reformation, and the spread of its principles in France, Holland, Germany, England, and Scotland.

movement here unavoidably assumed a political character, and led to a series of civil wars, which distracted France till the close of the sixteenth century. The Roman-Catholic party, backed by the majority of the population, was headed by the Dukes of Guise, who derived their descent from Charlemagne, and looked to the throne, then in the hands of Henry III., as the legitimate representative of the sovereignty of France. The Protestant (or Huguenot) party, numerically weaker, but containing some of the noblest blood and best talent of France, was headed by the Princes of Navarre, the next heirs to the throne, and descendants of Hugh Capet. The queen-regent, Catherine, during the minority of her sons (Francis II. and Charles IX.), although decidedly Roman Catholic in sentiment, tried to keep the rival parties in check, in order to rule over both But the champions of Rome took possession of Paris, while the Prince of Condé occupied Orleans. Three civil wars followed in rapid succession, when the court and the Duke of Guise rested the cry of treason, and concerted a wholesale slaughter of the Huguenots (Aug. 24, 1572), the leaders of the party having been expressly invited to Paris to attend the marriage of Prince Henry of Navarre with a sister of Charles IX. as a general peace. But the party was only diminished in number, by no means annihilated. Other civil wars followed, with varying fortune, and terminated at last in the victory of Prince Henry of Navarre, who after the assassination of Henry III. in 1589, by a Dominican monk, became king of France as Henry IV. This period of the French Reformation. But the Reformed party, still more numerous and powerful, and supported by Spain and the Pope, elected a rival head, and threatened to plunge the country into new bloodshed. Then Henry, from political and patriotic motives, abjured the Protestant faith, in which he had been brought up, and professed the Roman-Catholic religion (1593), saying that "Paris is worth a mass." At the same time, however, he secured the Edict of Nantes, in 1598, which closed the stormy period of the French Reformation. But the Reformed Church in France, after flourishing for a time, was overwhelmed with new disasters under the despotism of Richelieu, and finally the re-establishment of religious and civil liberty. The Duke of Alva surpassed the persecuting heathen emperors of Rome in cruelty, and, according to Groton, destroyed the lives of a hundred thousand Dutch Protestants and the six years of his regency (1567-73). Finally the seven northern provinces formed a federal republic,—first under the leadership of William of Orange, and, after his assassination (1584), under his son Maurice, and after a long and heroic struggle accomplished their separation from the Church of Rome and the Spanish crown. The southern provinces remained Roman Catholic, and subject to Spain. The first Dutch-Reformed synod was held at Dort in 1574, and in the next year the university of Leyden was founded. The Reformed Church of Holland adopted as its doctrinal and disciplinary standards the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563, the Belgic Confession of 1561, and the canons of the synod of Dort, but continued as a tolerated sect, and exerted, through the writings of their distinguished scholars and divines,—Arminius, Hugo Grotonius, Episcopius, Limps (Clericus),—considerable influence upon Protestant theology in England, France, and Germany during the eighteenth century. The Methodists under the leadership of Wesley adopted the Arminian views. The orthodox church of Holland has been represented in the United States, since 1826, by the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church (now the "Reformed Church in America"), the oldest, save one, of the denominations in the United States.


(5) The Reformation in Bohemia was thoroughly prepared by John Hus, a native of Prague, who were burned at the stake as heretics by order of the Council of Constance (the one July 6, 1415, the other May 30, 1416), but left a large number of followers, especially in the Czech or Slavic portion of the population. The wars which followed would have resulted in the triumph of the Hussites, if they had not been broken up by internal dissensions between the Calixtines, the Utraquists, and the Bohemian Brethren. From their remnants arose the "Unitas Fratrum," or the "Bohemian Brethren." They endeavor to reproduce the simplicity and purity of the apostolic church, and were in fraternal alliance with the Waldenses. Notwithstanding their violent persecution, they perpetuated themselves in Bohemia and Moravia. When the Reformation broke out, they sent several deputations to Luther; and persecution, they perpetuated themselves in Bohemian and Moravian the Waldenses. Notwithstanding their violent persecution, they perpetuated themselves in Bohemia and Moravia. When the Reformation broke out, they sent several deputations to Luther; and many of them embraced the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, but the majority passed to the Reformed or Calvinistic communion. During the reign of Maximilian II., there was a fair prospect of the conversion of the whole Bohemian nation; but the bloody Thirty-Years' War (which began in Prague, 1618), and the counter-Reformation of the Jesuits, crushed Protestantism, and turned Bohemia into a wilderness. A Jesuit named Anton Koniasch (1637) boasted that he had burned over sixty thousand Bohemian books, mostly Bibles. The Bohemian Brethren who had fled to Moravia became, under Count Zinzendorf, the nucleus of the Moravian Church (1722), which continues to this day one of the smallest but most active, devoted, and useful among evangelical denominations. But even in Bohemia Protestantism could not be utterly annihilated, and began to raise its feeble head when the emperor, Joseph II., issued the famous Edict of Toleration, Oct. 29, 1781. The recent revival of Czech patriotism and literature came to its aid. The fifth century of Hus was celebrated in Prague, 1889, and his works and letters were published. In 1880 there were about fifty Reformed congregations in Bohemia, and thirty in Moravia, holding to the Second Helvetic Confession and the Augsburg Confession. The synod of Oerebro, in 1529, and the general synod of Sendomir (Consensus Sendomiriensis), in 1570; but subsequently internal dissensions, the increase of Socinianism, and the efforts of the Jesuits, greatly interfered with the prosperity of Protestantism in that country. The German provinces now belonging to Russia — Courland, Livonia, and Esthonia — opened likewise the door to the Reformation, and adopted the Augsburg Confession.


(8) The Reformation in Scandinavia. — The Reformers of Sweden were two brothers, Olav and Laurentius Petri (Petersen), disciples of Luther, who after 1510 preached against the existing state of the church. In 1516, the Reformed Church, aided by Lorenz Anderson of Strängnäs. Gustavus Vasa delivered the country from the Danes, and became king in 1523, favored Protestantism from political and mercenary motives: the whole country, including the bishops, followed without much difficulty. He appropriated a large portion of the wealth of the church to meet the burdens of his war and administration. The synod of Oerebro, in 1529,
sanctioned the reform; and the synod of Upsal, in 1563, after a fruitless attempt to reconcile the country to Rome, confirmed and completed it. Sweden adopted the Lutheran creed, to the exclusion of every other, and retained the episcopal form of government in the closest union with the State. It did great service to the cause of Protestants. At the Thirty-Years' War; and recently the intolerant laws against dissenters have been almost completely abolished. Denmark became likewise an exclusively Lutheran country, with an episcopal form of State-church government, under Christian III. But the episcopal succession was interrupted; the new bishops received presbyteral ordination, and are therefore merely superintendents, as the bishops in the Evangelical Church of Prussia. A diet at Copenhagen in 1536 destroyed the political power of the Roman clergy, and divided two-thirds of the church's property between the crown and the nobility. The remaining third was devoted to the new ecclesiastical organization. Bugenhagen of Wittenberg was then called to complete the reform (1537). From Denmark, the Reformation passed over to Norway, in 1536. The Archbishop of Utrecht fled with the treasures of the church to Holland; another bishop resigned; a third was imprisoned; and the lower clergy were left the custody. The remaining third was devoted to the new ecclesiastical organization. Bugenhagen of Wittenberg was then called to complete the reform (1537). From Denmark, the Reformation passed over to Norway, in 1536. The Archbishop of Utrecht fled with the treasures of the church to Holland; another bishop resigned; a third was imprisoned; and the lower clergy were left the choice between exile, and submission to the new order of things, which most of them preferred. Iceland, then subject to Danish rule, likewise submitted to the Danish reform.

Lit. — SCHINEMEYER: Biographies of the Three Swedish Reformers, Andersen, O. and L. Petersen (German), Lübeck, 1788; THYSKEL: CH. Hist. under Gustav I. (Swedish), Stockholm, 1841-45, 2 vols.; FRYXELL: Life of Gustav Wasa (Swedish and German), 1831; GEIER: History of Sweden, (German), 1834, Eng. trans. by Turner, 1845; C. M. BUTLER: The Reformation in Sweden, N.Y., 1880. — MÜNTER: Church History of Denmark and Norway (Danish and German), 1823-38, 3 vols.; HELVIG: Church History of Denmark (Danish), Copenhagen, 1851, 3rd ed., 1857. Comp., also, Genealogical History of Denmark, by DAIHMANN, BADEN, and DUNHAM.

(9) The Reformation in England. — The struggle between the old and the new religion lasted longer in England and Scotland than on the Continent, and continued in successive shocks even down to the end of the seventeenth century; but it left in the end a very strong impression upon the character of the nation, and affected deeply its political and social institutions. In theology, English Protestantism was dependent upon the Reformation, especially the ideas and principles of Calvin; but it displayed greater political energy than any other form of the Reformation. The first period of the Reformation in England, characterized by the energy and power of organization. It was from the start a political as well as a religious movement, and hence it afforded a wider scope to the corrupting influence of selfish ambition and violent passion than the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland; but it passed, also, through severer trials and persecutions. In the English Reformation we distinguish five periods. The first, from 1527 to 1547, witnessed the abolition of the authority of the Roman Papacy under Henry VIII. This was merely a negative and destructive process, which removed the outward obstruction, and prepared the way for the Reform. Henry VIII, king, Gustavus Adolphus, in the Thirty-Years' War; and the so-called "bloody articles" — which enjoined under the severest penalties the dogma of transubstantiation, auricular confession, private masses, and the celibacy of the priesthood — were yet in full force. The only point of radical difference was the royal supremacy. He simply substituted a domestic for the foreign, and a political for an ecclesiastical Papacy, and punished with equal severity Protestant as well as Roman-Catholic dissenters who dared to doubt his supreme headship of the Church of England. But, while he thus destroyed the power of the Pope and of monasticism in England, a far deeper and more important movement went on among the people, under the influence of the revived traditions of Wiclif and the Lollards, the writings of the Continental Reformers, and chiefly of the English version of the Scriptures, commenced by Tyndale (1525), carried on by Coverdale (1535), Matthew alias John Rogers (1587), Taverner (1538), Cranmer (1540), the Generan exiles (1560), the Elizabethan Bishops (1568 and 1572), and completed in the Authorized Version of King James (1611). The second period embraces the reign of Edward VI., from 1547 to 1553, and contains the positive introduction of the Reformation by the co-operation mainly of the Duke of Somerset, protector and regent during the king's minority, and Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, who by his pliable conduct, and subserviency to the will of Henry, had preserved the idea and hope of a reformation through that reign of terror. Cranmer was assisted in the work by Ridley and Latimer, and by several Reformed divines from the Continent, whom he called to England, especially Martin Bucer of Strassburg, now elected professor at Cambridge, and Peter Martyr of Zürich (originally from Italy), for some time professor at Oxford. The most important works of this period, and in fact of the whole English Reformation, next to the English version of the Bible, are the Forty-two Articles of Religion (subsequently reduced to thirty-nine), or a new directory of worship in the vernacular tongue, on the basis of the old Latin service, but with essential changes. The third period is the reign of Queen Mary, from 1553 to 1558, and presents to us the attempt of that queen and her friend Cardinal Pole (now made archbishop of Canterbury, after the deposition of Cranmer) to undo the Reformation, and restore the Roman-Catholic religion and the authority of the Pope. This papal interin
did more to consolidate the Reformation in England than Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth. Hundreds were martyred in this short reign, among them the three British Reformers, Ridley, Latimer, and Cranmer, who were publicly burned at Oxford in 1555 and 1556. Many others fled to the Continent, especially to Geneva, Zurich, Basel, and Frankfort, where they were hospitably received and brought into close contact with the Reformed churches of Switzerland and Germany. The fourth period is the restoration and permanent establishment of the Anglican Reformation during the long reign of Elizabeth, 1558 to 1603. The Roman-Catholic hierarchy was replaced by a Protestant; and the Articles of Religion, and the Common Prayer-Book of the reign of Edward, were introduced again, after revision. The ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown was likewise renewed, but under a modified form; the Queen refusing the title "supreme head" of the Church of England, and choosing, in its place, the less objectionable title "supreme governor." The Convocation and Parliament readily sanctioned all these changes. But the Anglican Church, as established by Elizabeth, was semi-Catholic in its form of prelatical government and liturgical worship, a sort of via media between Rome and the Puritan party was almost annihilated in England, the Puritanic minority. Elizabeth's reign saw the Reformed Church of England, and the growing conflict between the Episcopalian majority and the Puritanic minority. Elizabeth's reign was as intolerant against Puritan as against Papal dissenters, and passed the severest penal laws against both. But, while the Roman-Catholic party was almost annihilated in England, the Puritan party grew more powerful under the successors of Elizabeth, and overthrew the dynasty of the Stuarts, and even the Episcopalian establishment. But the latter revived from the shock, and was restored, with the restoration of the Stuart dynasty, in 1662; while a limited liberty of public worship was given to the dissenting denomination after the accession of the Stuarts, by the Act of Toleration, in the reign of William and Mary (1688). These troubles and agitations constitute the fifth period in the history of English Protestantism, which in some respects is the most important and interesting, but lies beyond the age of the Reformation proper.

LIT. — Works of the English Reformers, published by the Parker Society (1841–54), 54 vols.; State Calendars, Wilkins: Concilia; Cardwell: Documentary Annals; Strype: Memorials of the Church of England; Burnet: History of the Reformation of the Church of England; Collier, Thomas Fuller, Neal, Herodotus Smer, Waddington, Blunt, Perry, Geikie, and others on the Church History of England and the English Reformation. See also arts. on Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Henry VIII., Articles of Religion (Thirty-nine), Puritanism, etc.


APPEND. — A few words must be added on the Luther Celebrations of the present year (1888) and their historic significance. The first impulse to the Reformation in Scotland proceeded from Germany and Switzerland. Copies of the writings of the Continental Reformers and of Tyndale's English Testament found their way to the Far North. The first preacher and martyr of Protestantism in that country was Patrick Hamilton, a youth of royal blood, and for some time a student at Wittenberg and Marburg, who was condemned to death by Archbishop Beaton, and burned at the stake. The movement gradually increased, in spite of persecution, especially after the rupture of England with the Pope, and was carried to a successful outcome under the guidance of John Knox, the Luther of Scotland. He was a disciple and admirer of John Calvin, with whom he spent several years. He returned, after the accession of Elizabeth, to his native country, resolved to reform the Scotch Church after the model of the Church of Geneva, which he esteemed as "the best school of Christ since the days of the apostles." After a short civil war the Parliament of 1560 introduced the Reformation, and adopted a Calvinistic confession of faith, drawn up by Knox, Spottiswoode, Row, and three others (superseded afterward by the Westminster standards), and prohibited, under severe penalties, the exercise of the Roman-Catholic worship. In 1561 the first Book of Discipline was issued, and gave the new church a complete Presbyterian organization, culminating in a General Assembly of ministers and elders. The mode of worship was reduced to the greatest simplicity, with a decided predominance of the didactic element. When the unfortunate Mary Stuart,—of French education, tastes, and manners, and in no sympathy with the public opinion of Scotland,—began her reign, in August, 1561, she made an attempt to restore the Roman-Catholic religion, to which she was sincerely attached. But her own imprudences, and the determined resistance of the nation, frustrated her plans; and, after her flight to England (1568), Protestantism was again declared the only religion of Scotland, and received formal legal sanction under the regency of Murray.

misrepresentations of ignorance, prejudice, and malice. They were held not only in Eisleben, Eisenach, Erfurt, Wittenberg, and Wornas, made memorable by Luther, but in every large city of Europe and North America, even in Rome. In the commemoration at Berlin the emperor and crown-prince of Germany, and eighty thousand children, took part. In London the event was celebrated in three hundred churches at once; and throughout Great Britain and Ireland to the same theme resounded from pulpit and platform. In New York every Protestant minister preached on the blessings of the Reformation; and three public mass-meetings were held beside, in Steinway Hall and the Academy of Music, on the 10th, 11th, and 13th of November which will long be remembered (especially the last) for their interest and enthusiasm. Similar celebrations took place in Philadelphia, Boston, Hartford, Princeton, Baltimore, Washington, and the great cities of the West, under the auspices of prominent citizens of all classes and denominations. Many thousands of addresses and sermons on the Reformation were preached in humble villages in Germany and throughout the world. Many Luther statues were unveiled. All the characteristic merits of the great Reformer were set before the people as never before: he lived his life over again as a man, as a German, as a husband and father, as a Christian, as a theologian, as a Bible translator, as a catechist, as a hymnist, as a preacher, as the founder of the Lutheran Church, as the champion of the sacred rights of conscience, and especially as the originator of a movement for religious and civil liberty which spread over Europe and across the ocean to the new world. His victorious battle-hymn, "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott," resounded throughout Christendom as never before. Truly the genius of the Reformation is still living and marching on in languages unknown to Luther, in countries not discovered, and nations not born, at the time of his birth.

The Luther bibliography of the year 1883 would fill several columns. See the Bibliographie der Luther-Literatur des Jahres 1883, published at Frankfurt; the Reading Notes on Luther, by John Edmunds, Philadelphia, Oct. 1, 1883; Die deutsche Rundschau for November, 1883; W. E. Foster (of Providence, R.I.): Monthly Reference-Lists, published by Leyoldt, New York, November, 1883. For illustrations, see the Luther-Nummer of the Illustrirte Zeitung of Leipzig, for October, 1883. Among American publications we mention two English translations of Küstlin's popular Life of Luther (New York and Philadelphia), and several biographies by Rein (translated by Behringer), by Wackernagel, Schaeffer, etc.; a beautiful edition of The Hymns of Martin Luther (German and English), with his original tunes, edited by J. O. Allen (Gosport, New York); the Luther Document (No. xvii.) of the American Evangelical Alliance, containing the stirring addresses of Drs. Taylor and Phillips Brooks, in the Academy of Music, New York, Nov. 13, 1883; the Symposia on Luther, consisting of the addresses of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, held Nov. 19, 1883, on the various aspects of Luther's character and labors, edited by Dr. Hitchcock.

The secular and religious newspapers during the weeks preceding and following the 10th of November are filled with reports on Luther and the Reformation. PHILIP SCHAFF.
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affairs of each congregation are managed by a consistory, A., consisting of elders and deacons chosen for two years, but in such a way that only one-half go out of office at once. The elders, with the pastor, receive and dismiss members, and exercise discipline: the deacons have charge of the aims. Both together are ex officio trustees of the church, hold its property, and call its ministers. A congregation, therefore, consists of ministers and four elders from each classis in a certain district, and one elder from each congregation in a certain district constitutes a classis, which supervises spiritual concerns in that district. Four ministers and four elders from each classis in a larger district make a Particular Synod, with similar powers. And representatives, clerical and lay, from each classis constitute a General Synod, proportioned in numbers to the size of the classis, which has supervision of the whole, and is a court of the last resort in judicial cases.

3. Doctrine. — The church is eminently confessional, having no less than five creeds,—the Apostles', the Nicene, the Quicunque Vult,1 the Belgic Confession (1561), and the Canons of Dordrecht (1618-19). It requires the Heidelberg Catechism (1563) to be taught in families and schools, and also to be regularly explained from the pulpit on the Lord's Day, so that the whole congregation, the censure morum; that is, to inquire if any communicant has become unsound in faith, or disorderly in life, and to take action accordingly. This action is subject to an appeal to each higher court in turn, even to the last. Careful provision is made for the trial of conscience. Reasoning of guides and deacons chosen and life, at every spring session of a classis each minister and elder is asked if the doctrines of the gospel are faithfully preached in their congregation, the Catechism explained from the pulpit, and taught in the schools, the censure morum observed, etc.; and the answers are entered in detail on the minutes, for the information of the higher judicatories. The church inherited from Holland a tolerably full Liturgy (parts from the psus of Calvin, Bucer, and John a Lasco), which has recently been enlarged, and has appended to it the Psalter, arranged for responsive reading. The use of the greater part of the Liturgy is optional; but the offices for the sacraments, for ordination, and for church discipline, are of imperative obligation. No psalmody is allowed to be used unless it has been approved by the General Synod. The old custom of reading the Ten Commandments during the morning service on the Lord's Day, and of reciting the Apostles' Creed during the second service, has been revived, and is rapidly becoming general.

5. Institutions. — Rutgers College, founded under the name of Queen's College at New Brunswick, N.J., in 1770, is and ever has been controlled by members of this church. It has a hundred and twenty-nine students, who are taught by fifteen professors, and is growing in means, character, and usefulness. Hope College, in Holland, founded in 1865, is doing a good work for the people among whom it is placed. The Theological Seminary at New Brunswick is the oldest on the continent, having been established in 1784. It has four professors (soon to be increased to five), forty-five students, commodious buildings, and a well-selected library of nearly 40,000 volumes. Foreign missions were begun through the A. B. C. F. M. in 1832, but independently in 1857, and now include stations in Japan, in Amoy, China, and in the Madura district, India. There are eighteen missionaries, thirty-seven churches, 2,843 communicants, and the annual outlay is from $70,000 to $80,000. A Woman's Auxiliary Board has been in operation for several years, and is very flourishing. The Board of Domestic Missions celebrated its jubilee in 1882. It aids in sustaining nearly a hundred churches, and expends about $40,000. A Board of Education aids between eighty and ninety students in the various stages of preparation for the ministry, and expends about $18,000, the larger portion of which comes from the wise endowments made by the benevolent during this century. The Board of Publication has a capital of $30,000, and issues a valuable monthly paper called The Soirer. The Christian Intelligencer, a weekly journal of high character, represents the church, but without official sanction. There is a widows' fund, amounting to over $58,000, and also a disabled ministers' fund of $53,000, the income of which, together with the voluntary offerings of the churches for the latter and similar offerings (aided by the annual payments of subscribers) for the former, is distributed twice a year by the treasurer.

6. Statistics. — At the present time (1883) the body numbers 516 churches, 509 ministers, and more than 80,000 communicants, who are organized into thirty-four Classes, four Particular Synods, and one General Synod. Its chief strength lies in the East; but four classes have been formed among the eighty thousand Hollanders who have settled within a generation in Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa.

1 The Dutch is the only Protestant ('Lutheran') church in America which formally receives the Athanasian Creed.
congregational purposes, over 88,700,000. Contributions of the whole body for the last year were, for benevolent purposes, $224,000, and for congregational purposes, over $87,000,000.

III. Educational and Benevolent Institutions. — The first organization of a theological seminary was effected at Carlisle, Penn., in 1825, afterwards removed to Mercersburg (1836), and then to Lancaster, Penn.; and the first college was established at Mercersburg in 1836. The church has now under its care and control Franklin and Marshall College and Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Penn., the oldest and most liberally endowed; Heidelberg College and Theological Seminary at Tiffin, O.; Ursinus College and Theological Seminary at Collegeville, Penn.; Catawba College at Newton, N.C.; a collegiate department in connection with a theological seminary at Howard Grove, Wis.; Calvin Institute at Cleveland, O.; Palatinate College at Meyerstown, Penn.; Mercersburg College at Mercersburg, O.; and a number of select classical schools and female seminaries. The church has fifteen English periodicals and six German. It carries forward two
orphan's homes, — one at Womelsdorf, Berks County, Penn., and one at Butler, Butler County, Penn.; the former having sixty-eight, and the latter forty orphans under their care.

The Reformed Church maintains a board of foreign missions, which has a mission under its care in Japan; and missionary work is carried on also in India, and among the North-American Indians. It has home missionary boards, which have at present about a hundred missionaries under their care. An important part of the home mission work refers to the wants of the large immigration from Germany to our shores, a considerable portion of which comes properly under the care of the German Reformed Church.

IV. ITS DOCTRINAL POSITION AND CULTUS. —

The Reformed Church in the United States belongs to the large family of Reformed churches in the world which constitutes the greater portion of Evangelical Protestantism. The name "Reformed" came to be applied to all those Reformation churches that were distinguished from the Lutheran Church. They belong to different nations, — England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Switzerland, Holland, Germany, etc.; and they have a number of confessions; but these are all moulded by one general type, with a recognized consensus of doctrine. But, while the Reformed Church in the United States belongs to this general family, it has its distinguishing type of doctrine, cultus, and life.

It differs from the Lutheran Church, in common with all the Reformed churches, in its doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and holds the Calvinistic doctrine of the spiritual real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy Eucharist, for believers only. It differs from the Church of England in holding to the parity of the ministry, and the presbyterial form of government, and in its more simple ritual in conducting public worship. It differs, on the other hand, from the strictly Calvinistic Reformed churches, in allowing freedom for more moderate views on the doctrine of predestination. The Heidelberg Catechism teaches substantially the old Augustinian doctrine of natural depravity, and salvation by free grace alone; but it does not teach a double decree, — a decree of reprobation as well as salvation, and it regards the children of the natural family, as standing in the covenant; and this view governs the faith and practice of the church on the subject of educational religion. It is required of her ministers that they shall faithfully instruct the young in the teachings of the Catechism, as the best means of preparing them for confirmation, and for their admission to the Lord's Supper, and full membership in the church. While it makes due account of experimental religion, it regards faithful instruction in the truths of God's word as the best means to be used to lead to this end.

On the subject of liturgical worship, the Reformed Church seeks to combine simplicity with decorum. It provides liturgical forms of service; but it has always allowed a certain degree of freedom in regard to their use, neither imposing such forms upon its congregations, nor forbidding their use if the church deems it expedient. On the subject of liturgical worship, as well as in regard to certain doctrinal views, the church passed through considerable agitation and controversy for a number of years, especially during the rise and progress of the "Mercersburg Theology," which for a time threatened its unity and peace; but the different tendencies at length came to an amicable settlement, by the unanimous adoption of the measure submitted by the Peace Commission, at the general synod held at Tiffin, O., in the year 1881. (See Mercersburg Theology.)

The statistics of the church, as summarized for the year 1883, include under the General Synod six distinct synods, — four of which are English, and two German, — fifty classes (presbyteries), 817 ministers, 1,428 congregations, and 163,669 communicant members.


REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. — See Presbyterian Churches, pp. 1911 sqq.

Regalia (jus regalia, or jus regale). — According to the oldest ecclesiastical legislation, any savings made by a bishop or other member of the clergy were to be spent for the interest of the church; and during vacancies the revenues of an episcopal see or other benefice were to be collected by the clergy, and during the vacancy the revenues. The custom was general in France and England even earlier. But while the king tried to extend his right of regalia to all ecclesiastical property, regardless of its historical origin, the Pope labored to abolish the right of regalia altogether; and sharp conflicts arose, as, for instance, between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair. By the aid of his Parlement, Philip was able to vindicate his right; and it was formally recognized by Clement V. and Gregory XI. (see Petr. de Marca, De concordia sacerdotii et imperii, viii. 17. During the middle ages, however, the church received fiefs from the State; and such ecclesiastical fiefs were subject to exactly the same rules as the secular fiefs: during a vacancy the State took the revenues. The custom was general in France from the middle of the twelfth century, and in England even earlier. But while the king tried to extend his right of regalia to all ecclesiastical property, regardless of its historical origin, the Pope labored to abolish the right of regalia altogether; and sharp conflicts arose, as, for instance, between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair. By the aid of his Parlement, Philip was able to vindicate his right; and it was formally recognized by Clement V. and Gregory XI. (see Petr. de Marca, c. 24). There were, however, in France several episcopal sees, — in the province of Bordeaux, in Provence and Dauphiné, — which were exempted from the royal claims; and when Louis XIV. simply in order to carry out consistently his
idea of royal sovereignty, extended his right of regalia also to those seas, it came to a violent embroilment between him and Innocent XI. The general assembly of the French clergy sided with the king in a declaration of Feb. 9, 1682, which was confirmed by a royal ordinance on March 26, 1682; and, though Innocent XI. condemned the declaration as null and void, he had no means of enforcing his verdict directly. He chose an indirect way: he refused to confirm the bishops appointed by the king; and, as his successors followed the same policy, the affairs of the French Church soon fell into utter confusion, until a compromise was brought about under Innocent XII. See Gaspard Andouil: De l'origine de la régale, Paris, 1708; Phillips: Das Regalienrecht in Frankreich, 1873.

REGENERATION. The idea of redemption leads directly to that of regeneration. For Christ's sake, sin is forgiven: the faithful is redeemed from the curse of his guilt. He is justified; that is, the fundamental condition for a communion between him and God is present. That communion, however, cannot be realized, unless man — whose natural tendency previously was towards sin, and against God — is internally transformed, and made another with respect to the very centre of his personal life. Nor does God forgive, or justify, or restore to favor, without communication of his own spirit: so that man, from the moment his sins are forgiven him, and his guilt is blotted out, feels within himself the germ of a new life, and the power to rise above his former misery; for the inner transformation is a real regeneration. A new man is born. It is not a simple restoration which takes place, a restoration by which man returns to the state of innocence and righteousness and grace before the fall, but a new creation by the quickening spirit of the lost Adam (1 Cor. xv. 45).

The testimony of Scripture concerning regeneration gradually develops under the old dispensation, and in the New Testament it stands forth in full definiteness. The Mosaic law, placing the divine will over against the human will, as the norm and rule of the latter, steadily inculcates the necessity of a moral conversion. Very characteristic in this respect are the passages in Deut. x. 10 and xxx. 6: the demand of the circumcision of the heart, the promise that God will circumcise the heart of his people, and the purpose of that demand and that promise, which is the love of God. But a total transformation of the inner man is not expressed by that simile. Still more characteristic is, for instance, Ps. li., referring in definite and very impressive terms to the gifts from above which the sinful needs in order to begin a new moral life; not simply the forgiveness of sin, but the restoration of a clean heart, and the renewal of a right spirit. But even here a regeneration in the full sense of the word is only hinted at in a vague way. Quite otherwise in the New Testament. Jesus, too, insists upon conversion as the first act of all blessedness in the kingdom of heaven; but the moral character to be accomplished is "perfection," and the religious character to be realized is "sonship" (Matt. v. 9). The agency is the Word, which falls like a seed into the soul (Mark iv. 26); and the process is that of being born anew, born of God (John iii. 8). In the apostolic writings, and more especially in the Epistles of Paul, the occult depths of this act of new birth, its various stages, and its internal relations, are set forth with matchless lucidity and impressiveness.

Not so in the after-apostolical age. Regeneration as a divine act became gradually connected with baptism in such a way that the whole ethical process, with the subjective appropriation of the divine grace, was swallowed up by a magical conception of the divine activity. When grown-up persons were baptized, the demand of faith, penitence, etc., was, of course, not abandoned; but faith itself was considered a kind of offering from man to God, rather than the organ through which divine grace was to be received, and moral conversion to be effected; and as infant baptism became more and more general in the church, the magical view of regeneration also spread. What little the scholastic theology of the middle ages had to say of regeneration, it presented under the head of gratia infusio, the first stage of justification. (See Thomas Aquinas: Summa, Pt. 2, 1, quest. 110.) And the Council of Trent, when fixing and systematizing the doctrine of justification in the Roman-Catholic Church, had nothing to add to the meagre definitions of the schoolmen. It was, indeed, the German mystics, who, during the middle ages, kept alive the idea of regeneration. (See Böhinger: Die deutschen Mystiker, 1855.) In the soul, Tauler says, which has become pregnant with the eternal Word, God bears his Son; and the man in whose soul that takes place is thereby born himself anew, a son of God. However deeply the mystics penetrated into the mysteries of this process, and however sedulously they investigated its ethical development, they always represented the state of man before regeneration, not as a positive degradation and guilt, but simply as a natural deficiency common to all creation.

At this point the Reformation effected a radical modification. Luther placed the idea of regeneration in the closest connection with those of forgiveness of sin, reconciliation with God, and justification; and the only essential difference between this point between him and Calvin was the emphasis he laid on the contrito, the pangs of conscience, as a preparation for regeneration, while Calvin referred the act more directly to the reconciliation with God through Christ. Too soon, however, the orthodox party, jealous of keeping the doctrine of justification pure, began to neglect the serious practical labor in behalf of the true internal transformation; but the corrective was rapidly and energetically given by Arndt and Spener. Spener wished to remain true to the orthodox doctrine of the Church, but he could not help reproaching the preachers of his time because they spoke too little of the power of faith as a heavenly light destined to bear the soul anew. The controversy between the Pietists and the orthodox was, however, on this point confined to the question whether the intellectual light was necessary to the act of regeneration, or was not conditionally efficacious in producing an inward reception of the gospel. By the rationalists not only that question, but the whole subject, was set aside; and with the exception of some remarkable allusions in the Kantian philosophy, and some singular insinuations in the Hegelian, it was abandoned to neglect, until revived by Schleiermacher, who
give it a solution as deep as ingenious, and strictly evangelical in its whole bearing. "In popular religious books, "regeneration" are often used as synonymous terms. But they are properly to be distinguished, as in the Bible, where regeneration (σωτήριος) is the act of God, and conversion (μετανοεσθαι) is the act of man, who is exhortd to repent, and turn to God. — J. KÖSTLIN.

REGENSBURG. See Ratisbon.

REGINO, b. at Altrip on the Rhine, near Spire; d. at Treves, in 815; was monk in the monastery of Prüm, and was elected abbott there in 822, but was expelled in 829, and was by Archbishop Ratbod of Treves placed at the head of the monastery of St. Martin. His Chronicon is the first world's history written in Germany. The first book goes from the birth of Christ to the death of Charles Martel; and the second, from that point to 906. From 814 the narrative is based upon personal observation or oral tradition, but it is not so very reliable. The best edition of the work is that in Mon. Germ. i. 536-612. His Libri duo de synodal. causis, etc., edited by Wasserschleben, Leipzig, 1840, is a collection of ecclesiastical laws for judicial use on diocesan inspections. A little treatise on church music, De harmonica institutione, is printed in Coursermaker: Scriptores ecclesiasticus de musica, Paris, 1897, i. 1-73.

REGIONARIUS is the title of different classes of ecclesiastical officers in Rome who are assigned to certain "regions" or districts of the city. Thus there are regional deacons, subdeacons, notaries, etc.

RECIUS, Urbanus. See Rhegius.

REGLA FIDEI (rule of faith). This term was used by the Fathers of the second half of the second century and of the third century to designate the sum of Christian doctrine as based upon the formula of baptism, and accepted by the orthodox church. Tertullian, Tertullian, and Origine have preserved the earliest form. Ireneus (Her., i. 10) says, "The church, although it is scattered to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples the faith in one God, the Almighty Father, Maker of heaven, etc." Tertullian dwells upon the rule of faith in his De praes. Haaret., and in his De veland. virg., says, "The rule of faith is everywhere the same, alone unchangeable and immovable." Origine's statement (υπερ αυτων) is very important, when he says, "Because many of those who profess to believe in Christ differ not only in the smallest things, but also in the greatest, therefore it seems necessary to lay down beforehand a fixed line and clear rule (certam lineam manifestamque regulam ponere) about single matters."

These are the oldest utterances about the rule of faith. What conclusion are we to draw from the earliest and the modernized rules of conversion in the trinitate seu regula fidei connected with Novatian's name, the so-called "Catholic teaching" of the Apostolic Constitutions (vi. 14), etc.? The substance of them all is essentially the same, and indicates an incontestable connection with the ancient Roman formula of baptism. This rule of faith was not identical with the Apostles' Creed, which was the accredited formula of baptism for the church. Called now lex fidei, fides legitima, regula veritatis, linea, mensura, canon, tradition, etc., it was simply a statement of the subjects of Christ's faith both in the New Testament and oral tradition. It is probable that the first attempts to formulate such a statement date back to the apostolic age, although the earliest account we have is that of Irenaeus. At first it was probably a simple statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, which Tertullian calls "the substance of the New Testament (c. Praxeum, 31). Subsequently polemical affirmations were added in defence against the heresies. Thus formulated, it no doubt formed an important part of the instruction of the catechumens. Irenaeus (i. 8, 4) says the believer has in himself "the norm of the truth (την κανονιζοντας γιατριαν) having received it in baptism."

In the Occident, the rule of faith was developed out of the formula of baptism. In the Orient, on the contrary, it seems to have influenced the formula of baptism; or, in other words, the formula of baptism adapted itself from time to time to the anti-heretical doctrinal statements of distinguished ecclesiastical leaders. The formula which the prebishops in Smyrna in 230 opposed to Noetus is quite similar to the old Roman formula of baptism, and the Apostles' Creed in Latin seems to have been a translation from the Greek (Caspari, iii. 254-268). The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (see art.) of 381 is nothing else than the first ocumenical formula of baptism enlarged. This creed is still used as the formula of baptism in the Eastern Church.

In the Protestant churches the numerous, and, for the most part, bulky confessions are substituted for the rule of faith. The Roman Catholic theologians now pretty generally understand by the expression the utterances of the infallible Church and Pope. See CASPARI: Quellen zur Gesch. d. Taufsymbola u. d. Glaubensregel, 1866-75; 3 vols.; ZEISCHWITZ: System d. Katechetik (ii. 2), 2d ed., 1875; [SCHAF: The Creeds of the Church, etc., Cambridge, 1878; SCHAFF: Creeds of Christendom, N.Y., 1880, vol. i. 14 sqq., vol. ii. 11-40; and the bts. Apostles' Creed, Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed].

REGULARS are those who have made their vows in some religious house, such as monks. A regular priest is in some order, while a secular priest lives in the world. Regular benefits were only conferred on regular priests. Regular places are those within the boundary of a convent, as the cloister, dormitory, chapter, and refectory.

REHOBOAM (enlarger of the people), son of Solomon by the Ammonite princess Naamah (1 Kings xiv. 21), and his successor in his forty-first year. He reigned seventeen years, and was himself succeeded by his son Abijah (Abijam), the child of his favorite wife, Maachah (Michaiah), the granddaughter of Absalom (1 Kings xv. 2). To the new king, who assembled Israel and brought their grievances, and prayed their amelioration. But he answered harshly, foolishly following the counsel of the contemporary advisers; and his Israel revolted, and under Jeroboam set up a rival kingdom. Only Judah and a part of Benjamin remained loyal to Rehoboam. Between the two kingdoms there was naturally constant friction, giving rise at times to bloodshed (1 Kings xiv. 30); but the prophet Shemaiah repressed Re-
Thomas Reid was a student in Marischal College, Aberdeen, there being two colleges in the Granite City of the North. Afterwards he was appointed librarian to the college, which office he held till he was twenty-six years of age. A year later he was ordained minister of New Machar, Aberdeen, to which he was presented by King's College, Aberdeen; the duties of the chair, however, requiring the teaching of physical as well as mental philosophy. Twelve years later (1764) he published his Inquiry into Human Mind; and in the same year he was elected professor of moral philosophy in the university of Glasgow, as immediate successor to Adam Smith, afterwards author of The Wealth of Nations, who had succeeded Hutcheson in the chair. The Inquiry was an investigation into the conditions of knowledge, and produced a deep impression as a bold and resolute defence of the certainty of human knowledge against the scepticism which Hume had developed out of the theory of ideas then current. Its title was, An Inquiry into the Human Mind, on the Principles of Common Sense. This formal introduction of the phrase "common sense" by and by afforded the descriptive appellation of the Scotch philosophy, "the philosophy of common sense." The phrase had aptness for the end contemplated, and yet awkwardness, on account of its popular use as an equivalent for "good sense," or sagacity. Its consequent ambiguity led to mistaken applications and misshapen criticism. What Reid meant by the phrase was that any adequate inquiry into the human mind must disclose certain principles or axiomatic truths common to all intelligence, as essential to a sound philosophy as to a healthy intellect. As in the philosophy of Locke, all knowledge had been traced to sensation and reflection, Reid took "sense" in the wide meaning of knowledge; and "common sense" was a knowledge common to all the race. In effect, Reid's title meant "an inquiry into the human mind, on the principles common to rational beings;" and his motto was a quotation from the Book of Job, "The inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." Thus he suggested the form of his theory,—the creation of intelligence implies communication of the first principles of knowledge. All language suggesting that some men are highly endowed with a faculty of common sense, and perceive by special insight what others fail to recognize, is language wide of Reid's formula of common sense, and quite alien to his theory. See Hamilton's Note A, in Reid's Works, 742.

When he had prepared his reply to Hume, he submitted the manuscript in part to the author of a Treatise of Human Nature, and received from Hume a friendly reply, reserving full judgment until the book appeared. Hume acknowledged having read it "with great pleasure and attention," adding, "It is certainly very rare that a piece so deeply philosophical is wrote with so much spirit, and affords so much entertainment to the reader." In reply to this, Reid said to Hume, "I have learned more from your writings in this kind than from all other put together." (Stewart's Life of Reid; Stewart's Works, x. 306, Reid's Works by Hamilton, p. 891; Bennett's Life of Hume, ii. 158-159.) Of Reid, Hill Burton says, "His was the greatest mind which itself set in opposition to Hume's system in British literature; and he was great because he examined the works of the sceptical philosopher, not in the temper of a wrangler or partisan, but in the honest spirit of a philosopher, not bound either to believe in the arguments he is examining, or to set against them a system which
will satisfy his own mind and the minds of other honest thinkers" (Life of Hume, ii. 151). Reid did set himself to develop a system, which he offered to the acceptance of honest thinkers as a refutation of the scepticism of Hume, by refuting the theory of ideas previously in favor among philosophers. But in doing this he acknowledged, as Kant afterwards did in a very similar manner, that he was indebted to Hume for rousing him to the task of criticizing the popular philosophy, and endeavoring to replace it by another which could endure the test of sceptical argumentation.

Reid's Inquiry into the Human Mind is an investigation into the relations of mind to the special senses, dealing in succession with smelling, tasting, hearing, touch, seeing. The work shows that Reid had given considerable attention to the physiology of the senses; though it cannot meet the requirements of present knowledge as to the structure of the terminal organs of the special senses, and their relation to the brain. Considering the period of its publication, it sufficiently refutes the allegation that mental philosophers have shown themselves ignorant and indifferent as to the relations of mental phenomena to physiological facts. His main purpose is to show the ample warrant we have for trusting the information gathered by the senses, and constructing a theory of things by the application of rational principles. In point of form, his method is to confront scepticism with the bulwarks of common sense. Unhappily his favorite phrase, "common sense," is at times used vaguely, and does not always meet the requirements of philosophic procedure. At one time it seems as if "common sense" were opposed to philosophy; at another, as if it were essential to it: but commonly his reasoning is clear and forcible, and ambiguities are easily brought into harmony with the general drift of the argument. Thus, when he says, somewhat angrily, somewhat boldly, and rather unwise in both respects, "If thou hast not power to dispel those clouds and phantoms which thou hast discovered or created... I despise philosophy, and renounce its guidance,—let my soul drift in the argument. Thus, when he says, some-

...

of thought which could be neither demonstrated, nor disputed, nor dispensed with. His next position was reached in laying open to view certain first principles in reasoning which are essential to intelligence. "The judgment follows the apprehension of them necessarily; and both are equally the work of nature and the result of our original powers" (Intellectual Powers, essay vi. chap. iv.). These are axioms, first principles, principles of common sense, common notions, self-evident truths. His third position was reached when he entered the domain of morals, and maintained, in reference to our knowledge of moral truths, that there "must be in morals, as in other sciences, first principles which do not derive the-evidence from any antecedent principles, but may be said to be intuitively discerned" (Intellectual Powers, essay vii. chap. ii.). Such is Reid's theory, often involved in considerable obscurity of statement, at times adopting forms of expression which favor the view that there is a measure of intellectual constraint holding man in subjection; but in the main a clear and strong vindication of the adequacy of intelligence as a guide to certainty. He had not Kant's distinction between reasoning and reason; he did not grasp Kant's problem, How is a knowledge a priori possible to mind? (see art. KANT): but, when concerning the ruling power in mind, he clearly distinguished those two functions,—to reason, and to recognize first principles apart from reasoning. "We ascribe to reason two offices or two degrees. The first is to judge of things self-evident: the second is to draw conclusions from those that are. The first of these is the province, and the sole province, of common sense; and therefore it coincides with reason in its whole extent" (Intellectual Powers, essay vi. chap. ii.). Even though it be granted that there is in Reid's
works a want of philosophic exactness and metaphysical range, there is a sagacity, a breadth of reflection, and a massiveness of thought, fully accounting for the power of his philosophy in Britain, France, and America.

**REIHING, Jakob.** b. at Augsburg, 1579; d. at Tübingen, May 5, 1628. He entered the Jesuit order; taught theology and philosophy in their seminaries at Ingolstadt and Dillingen; and was in 1613 appointed court-preacher to the apostate count-palatine, Wolfgang William. He took a very active part in the Romanization of the Palatinate, but the careful study of the Bible which he found necessary in order to dispute with the Protestants had its influence. In the beginning of 1621 he suddenly fled to Stuttgart, and towards the close of the same year he formally embraced Protestantism. In 1622 he was made professor of theology at Tübingen. His writings are mostly polemical, first against the Protestants, afterwards against the Jesuits: they are described in his life by Oehler, in MARIOTT'S Wohre Protestantien, iii. 1854.

**REINARDO.** Hermann Samuel, the author of the famous Wolfenbüttel Fragments; b. at Hamburg, Dec. 22, 1694; d. there March 1, 1768. He studied philology at Jena and Wittenberg; travelled in Holland and England; and was appointed rector of the gymnasium in Weimar, 1723, and in Hamburg, 1739. He was a pupil of Wolff, and one of the most radical among German rationalists. He published Diss. de assessoribus Synedrii, Hamburg, 1751, and De vornehmsten Warheiten der natürlichen Religion, Hamburg, 1754. His life was written in Latin by Büsch. See also sketch in Eng. trans. of the Fragments (Lond., vol. i., 1789), and art. Wolfenbüttel Fragments.

**REINHARD, Franz Volkmar.** b. at Vohenstrauß in the Upper Palatinate, March 12, 1758; d. in Dresden, Sept. 6, 1812. He studied theology at Wittenberg, and was appointed professor there in 1790, and court-preacher in Dresden in 1792. He was a rational supranaturalist, that is, one of those rationalists who still retained the principal tenets of supranaturalism, the divinity of Christ, and the absolute authority of the Bible. His System der christlichen Moral, Sulzbach, 1788–1815, 5 vols., was several times reprinted; but he exercised the greatest influence as a preacher. His collected sermons comprise thirty-five volumes. See his Geständnisse, Sulzbach, 1810, and TESCHNER'S Briefe, Leipzig, 1811, thereby occasioned. His life was written by Böttger, Dresden, 1813, and Politz, 1801–04, 4 vols. Cf. PALMER'S art. in Herzog.

**RELAND, Hadrian.** b. at Ryp, near Alkmaar, July 17, 1678; d. at Utrecht, Feb. 5, 1718. He studied Oriental languages and ecclesiastical antiquities in Amsterdam, and was in 1690 appointed professor at Utrecht. His principal theological works are, Analecta rabbinica, Utrecht, 1702; De religione Mohammedica, 1705 (in which he tried to give a more accurate and impartial representalion of the religion of Mohammed); Antiquitates sacrae veterum Hebræorum, 1708 (best edition by Vogel, Halle, 1769); Palestina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata, 1714 (his chief work, often reprinted, in which he displays such comprehensive learning and so much penetration and power of analysis, that it still remains the foundation of all study of ancient Palestine); De sopitis templi Hierosolymitani in arcu Tituino, 1716 (new edition by Schulze, Utrecht, 1775).

**RELEICHS.** The Latin word relicia meant "re- mains," and was in that sense adopted by the Church, where, however, while on the one side its application was confined to the remains of saints and martyrs, it was on the other extended to every thing which had been in bodily contact with the deceased. Thus the church of Jerusalem boasted of the possession of the episcopal chair of James as a precious relic (EUSEBIUS: Hist. Eccle., VII. 19). The worship of relics developed with the worship of martyrs. The possession of the corpus of a martyr was held to guarantee the continuous communication between the deceased and the congregation: hence the custom of gathering around the tomb of the martyr for the celebration of the Eucharist. Though the worship of relics originally had to overcome a certain aversion founded on the views of the Old Testament concerning the uncleanness of a corpse, it easily succeeded, as may be seen from the Apostolical Constitutions, I. 14, 3. At the time of Constantine it was in full bloom; and the Greek Fathers of that and the next periods are unanimous in their recommendations (EUSEBIUS: Praeparatio evang., 13, 11; GREGORY NAZIANZEN: Ora£. in Cyp., 17; GREGORY NYSSA: Oratio in Theod., 740; BASIL: Epitola II., 197; CHRYSOSTOM: Laud. Dros., p. 688; THEODORIT: In Psalm., 67, 11). In the West it also found zealous defenders (Jerome and Paulinus of Nola). From the latter, as well as from Gregory of Tours, it appears that people in general considered relics to be the bearers of some hidden miraculous power; and it became necessary to protect by laws the corpses of martyrs from being cut into pieces (Cod. Theod., ix. 17, 7). But so great was the credulity and superstition of the people, that the laws proved in vain. The church authorized this superstition to a certain extent by decreeing that relics should be deposited in every altar. Ambrose refused to consecrate a church when it had no relics (Ep. 22 ad Marcell.); and though the synod of Agde (506) simply demanded the anointing and benediction of altars, the seventh ecumenical synod of Nicaea (787) forbade the bishops, under penalty of excommunication, to consecrate a church without relics; and the synod of Mayence (888) presumes that even the portable altars contain relics. In the Roman-Catholic Church the medieval superstition is still maintained; while the whole Protestant world had adopted the views of Luther, set forth in his Larger Catechism: "Tis but a dead thing which sanctifies nobody." (HAUCK.

**RELIEF SYNOD.** See art. Presbyterian Churches, p. 1894.

**RELIGION and REVELATION are correlative terms; that is, the relation in which man places himself to God in religion presupposes the relation in which God has represented himself to man in revelation. Without revelation there can be no religion; and it is a fact which should not be overlooked, that even those, who, on account of their idea of God, absolutely reject the idea of a direct divine revelation, recognizing nothing but Nature in her material existence and mechanical working, cannot help applying to Nature expres-
RELIGION.

sions and conceptions which tend to raise her above the dumb necessity, and constitute her a higher being, capable of moral relations; nor can they from a longer period escape a feeling of thirst after revelations of the secret depths of that being which they then strive to attain by ways more or less mystical and magical.

1. Religion — either from relegeare, "to read over," i.e., to reflect upon what has been written (Chrysostom); — means the conscious relation between man and God, and the expression of that relation in human conduct. It has thus, though it presupposes certain objective conditions both for its origin and for its farther development, a purely subjective character, forming the innermost centre of the human personality, and the only true basis of spiritual growth.

But, in spite of its decidedly subjective character, religion is as much a social as an individual affair. Not to speak of the specifically Christian ideal of the kingdom of heaven to be established here on earth by the Christian congregations, in all spheres of human consciousness, — in the religious no less than in the moral, and in the moral no less than in the intellectual, — reciprocal contact between individual and individual is the general condition of development. Thus originate common forms of the religious consciousness and common forms of its expression in actual life; and thus the word "religion" assumed a new sense, an objective sense, — so objective, indeed, that not only there spring up many different religions, but it becomes possible for an individual to have religion without being religious, to stand in an external relation of recognition and obedience to a certain form of religion, without standing in any living relation to God himself.

It is the business of Christian science by a searching analysis to find those elements which constitute religion, and which must be present in all religious life, even on its lowest and most primitive stage, and to represent the psychological process by which the actual formation of a religion takes place. The New Testament gives a few but very important notices on the subject, which fully sustain the above propositions concerning the relation between religion and revelation (Rom. xiv. 17, xvi. 27; John i. 19).

From a comparison of the various Pagan religions it is apparent, that originally all religious life started from an impression of an overwhelming power; which impression could not fail to engender fear, as it was accompanied by a complete ignorance of the true nature and character of the power observed. But fear naturally leads to attempts at reconciling that which is feared; and as the understanding develops, and one light is lighted after the other, the attempts at reconciliation will result in a partial willingness to submit. Finally, when the will hold good the power dawns upon the consciousness, the willingness to submit will grow into a desire to obey; and religious life has thus reached the highest stage of development which it can attain within the bounds of Paganism. The old dispensation may be referred to the country in which God made with Abram: "And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and multiply thee exceedingly" (Gen. xvii. 1, 2).

Here, too, the emphasis is laid upon the omnipotence of God, before whom it behooves man to walk in fear. But a new element, which in Paganism never reached beyond the dim dream, is here added in the form of direct promise, — the love of God to Abram: "And I will multiply thee exceedingly." The law is laid upon the omnipotence of God, before whom it behooves man to walk in fear. But a new element, which in Paganism never reached beyond the dim dream, is here added in the form of direct promise, — the love of God to Abram: "And I will multiply thee exceedingly. The law with the promis,

of the understanding the will of God, that true human wisdom; which element, however, was never severed from its moral complement; for "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom: a good understanding have all they that do his commandments" (Ps. cxli. 10). Under the new dispensation, love, God's love to man, appears as the true centre of religious life, instead of fear, man's fear of God. Man has become chiefly receiving. The words of life, forgiveness of sin, the sonship of God, eternal life, etc., is offered him, and he has only to take it. But how? By faith. Faith, however, though a sacrifice of one's own, a submission of one's own righteousness to the righteousness of God (Rom. x. 3), and consequently a moral act which cannot be accomplished without the aid of God (1 Cor. ii. 5), has a much more strongly pronounced intellectual character than the wisdom of the old dispensation, because that which shall be accepted, that to which man shall surrender himself, is the truth. Christ calls himself the truth (John xiv. 6), and even the possession of eternal life is referred back to the knowledge of the truth (John xvii. 3). Thus the elements of religion, though always the same, change as religion grows from its first germ in Paganism to its full maturity in Christianity.

A scientific treatment, however, of the subject was not attempted until quite recent times. The Reformation made a beginning with its comprehensive and penetrating analysis of faith as the informing centre of all religious life. In the Confessio Augustana and the Apology, faith, as the confidence that in Christ the grace of God has been offered to us, is represented as an act of the will; and this moral act is again represented as the necessary condition of any true knowledge of God. But the old Protestant, more especially the Lutheran, theologians, very soon left that track. Calvius, Quenstedt, Buddeus, J. Gerhard — they all represent the moral act in faith as preceded by a theoretical acceptance of the divinely revealed truth, thus making the basis of faith purely intellectual; and in this they were followed both by the rationalists and the supranaturalists. And this dualism has received a much more powerful impulse from the development of German philosophy; though at times it looked as if philosophy were about to dissolve, and finally supersede religion. Kant excluded the idea of God from the competency of practical reason: the existence of God is necessary for the realization of the highest good. But thus religion was defined as a mere recognition
of our duties as divine commandments; that is, it was made a mere appendix to morals, and its innermost kernel, the direct relation between man and God, was set aside as something irrelevant. The opposite extreme was developed by Hegel. He considered all existence an illusion of the spirit. But the true character of spirit is thought; and the thinking of man, of the human spirit, of the subject, is the medium in which God, the divine spirit, the absolute, becomes conscious of itself.

This process in its lowest form,—in the form of feeling, to be distinguished from the form of imagination (art) and the form of pure thought (philosophy),—Hegel called religion; that is, while Kant had made religion a simple, practical matter, Hegel made it a merely theoretical interest. A reaction against those extremes was started by Jacobi and Schleiermacher. Both agreed in deriving religion from feeling, in making feeling the proper sphere of religion, the place in which it has its roots. But there was, nevertheless, a considerable difference between them. "Faith in God is an instinct in man," said Jacobi: "when spoken to, it will answer." But the religious relationship to God, and that specially the Christian religion is not more radically injured by the new theory than it ever could be by rationalism, was pointed out as the true source of religion; that is, the feeling, and not the intellect, was the adequate sphere of religion, the absolute, becomes conscious of itself.

As representing the stand-point of Kant may be mentioned Wegscheider; Hegel is represented by Daub and Marheinecke; Schleiermacher by Nitzsch, Twisten, and Dorner. An attempt to go beyond Schleiermacher may be observed in Lipsius, Biermann, and Pfeiderer, members of the so-called critical school.

2. Christian faith and Christian theology recognize, and have always recognized, both that religion in general would be impossible without a direct activity for the purpose from the side of God, and that specially the Christian religion is the result of such an activity. In details, and more especially with reference to the different religions, the views of the character and nature of that activity may vary considerably; but there is general agreement with respect to its principal features,—that it must be a direct communication between the divine will and the human consciousness, that is, have the character of a revelation; and that this must present, for acceptance by man, truths which give a new form to religious life, and tend to gather communities or congregations which strive to express this new form. But the question then arises, whether that activity is identical with the origin of every religion,—like human nature, like the laws of spiritual development,—or whether the biblical revelation on which the Christian religion rests is the result of a special activity of a peculiar kind, which, in contradistinction from the general activity, may be designated as extraordinary and supernatural. Cf. AUBERLEN: Die göttliche Offenbarung, Basel, 1891; ROTH: Zur Dogmatik, Gotha, 1862; A. E. KRAUSS: Die Lehre von der Offenbarung, Gotha, 1868.

The New Testament (for the Old Testament see F. E. KÖNIG: Der Offenbarungsbegriff des A. T. 1862, 2 vols.) speaks of a revealing activity of God, under the influence of which religious life has developed; but directly it makes no distinction between a general and a special revelation. The two terms it uses to express its ideas, ἥνεκα καὶ ἀπόκαλεται, it applies promiscuously, both to the general manifestation of God in his creation and to the specific Christian revelation. Indirectly, however, the distinction is present. The revelations reported in Scripture—the signs, miracles, prophecies, and other manifestations to the ear and the eye, culminating in the incarnation—form a continuous series, a logically connected totality, discovering the divine scheme of salvation. And to this revelation in the objective world corresponds a revelation in the subjective world. The final reason why so large a portion of the human race remained outside of the communion with God established by the old dispensation was, according to Paul (Rom. i.), the lack of power to comprehend the plans of God, the loss of the very organ for the divine truth; it being impossible to appropriate this special revelation without an internal resuscitation and revival. In the theology of the Reformers, this distinction between a general revelation, which can only prevent man from being overwhelmed in his own sin, and a special revelation, which alone can carry him safely to salvation, is set forth with great sharpness. The old orthodox theologians even made a distinction, with respect to the special revelation, between a revelatio immediata, made to the prophets and apostles, and a revelatio mediate, made to us through them. Nevertheless, the distinction was soon threatened with complete dissolution, and the attack came from two different points. On the one side, the general depravity of the race, which made a special revelation (objective as well as subjective) necessary, was denied; and, on the other side, the human intellect was supposed to be able to reach by itself the very truths of revelation, which made revelation itself superfluous. See the arts. on SOCINIANISM and RATIONALISM.

A strong reaction against rationalism, and its conception of religion as a merely intellectual recognition of the higher truths, naturally sprang up in the very moment, when, with Jacobi and Schleiermacher, the feeling, and not the intellect, was pointed out as the true source of religion; and a necessary result of that reaction was a complete remodelling of the relation between religion and revelation. A complete reversion of the relation established by rationalism. The idea of revelation, almost extinguished by rationalism, now came to great honor. Yet it is a question, whether the distinction between the general and a special revelation, which Christian apologetics absolutely must insist upon, is not more radically hurt by the new theory than it ever could be by any of the propositions of rationalism. According to Jacobi, every strong religious emotion is a revelation, and outside of this inner enthusiasm there is no revelation; for God is felt only in secret, and the Word, which by itself reveals nothing, is set only to prove and corroborate the
revelations of the inspiration. More especially the
term "revelation" is applied to such productions of
the religious spirit as exercised a decisive influ-
ence in wide circles and for long periods. But
what differs essentially from such production
the inspiration in the sphere of faith, in religion,
and genius and originality in the sphere of imagi-
nation, in art? Schleiermacher put the so-called
natural religion out of the world as a mere ab-
straction, and defined revelation as the product of
a direct, divine activity. But, unable to give
his definition the necessary preciseness, he was
compelled to recognize every idea which rose in
the soul, and could not be explained from ex-
ternal influences, as a revelation. Hence his
exertions to stretch the supernatural and supra-
reasonable in Christianity, until it will connect
with nature and reason, or, rather, his exertions
to raise nature and reason until they can reach the
supernatural and supra-reasonable. Among the
theologians after Schleiermacher, some— Rich-
ard Rothe, Isaac August Dorner, etc.— vindicate
with great emphasis the claims of Christianity
upon an extraordinary, supernatural origin; while
others, the critical school— Lippsius, Biedermann,
etc.,— hold that all religions rest in the same
manner upon revelations.

RELIGION, The Philosophy of, comprises two
elements,— one historical, and one metaphysical,—
which must be present, equally developed, and
organically combined. On the one side, religion
is a fact whose origin and manifold relations
must be explained: on the other, that fact claims
to contain the final truth, and the claim must be
investigated. But a perfect fusion of these two
elements is difficult, and the difficulty explains
the late development of this branch of philos-
ophy.

Researches concerning the final cause of exist-
ence and the true nature of consciousness are as
old as philosophy itself; and during the middle
ages a relation actually sprang up between meta-
physics and religion as far as the first part of the
representation of the theological system generally
occupied itself with the question, whether man
is able to demonstrate the existence of God, and
form a just idea of his nature, without the aid of
a direct revelation. But the relation remained
barren. Philosophy and religion were more and
more sharply separated from each other, the
former being confined to that which is mathe-

matically demonstrable, the latter to that which
is directly revealed; and an application of the
results of metaphysical researches to the various
forms of religion was impossible, simply because
the history of religion was not yet written. Ju-
dalism and Christianity were the only religions
known: even concerning Mohammedanism igno-
rance prevailed. In the latter part of the seven-
teenth century, however, the study of religion
began. The first work of the kind was A. Ross:
A View of all the Religions of the World, 1682;
which, however, was written not as a theological
work, but from the standpoints of both French and
German. Then followed Hoffmann: Umbra in luce
sive consensus et dissensus religionum
profanorum, Jena, 1680; JUTHE: Histoire cri-
tique des dogmes et des cultes, Amsterdam, 1704;
Krocher: Abriss aller bekannten Religionen, Jena,
1753; Kocher: Abriss oilerbekannten Religionen,
Jena, 1753; Kipping: Philosophie der natiunal.
Gottesgelehrsamkeit, Brunswick, 1761; Ouvrier:
Geschichte d. Religionen, Leipzig, 1751; Meiners:
Geschichte aller Religionen, Lengo, 1783; Rein-
hard: Geschichte der religiösen Ideen, Jena, 1794;
Dupuis: Origine de tous les Cultes, Paris, 1796.

As soon as the natural religions were col-
lected, the philosophical treatment began, with
Lessing: Erziehung des Menschengeschichte, 1780
(according to which all religion depends upon a
revealing activity of God, whose purpose is the
education of the race); and Herder: Ideen zur
Philosophie der Geschichte, 1784. Before Kant
published his Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen
der reinen Vernunft, 1793, two other works ap-
peared,— Tiefrunk: Entwurf einer Kritik der
Religion, 1789; and J. G. Fichte: Versuch einer
Kritik aller Offenbarung, 1792, which, on the basis
of the Kantian philosophy, subjected religion to
a severe criticism, reducing religious faith, the
ideas of God, of the freedom of the will, and
the immortality of the soul, to mere postulates
of practical reason. Leaning against Jacobi,
and constructing religion on the basis, not of reason,
but of feeling, F. Köppen published his Philoso-
phie des Christenthums in 1813; and to the same
sphere of influence (Kant-Jacob) belongs Fries:
Handbuch der Religionsphilosophie, though it was
not published until 1832. Meanwhile the appear-
ance of Schelling and Hegel gave a new and
powerful impulse to the movement. To Schelling
—who defined God as the absolute, and the abso-
late as full identity of the subjective and the
objective, the ideal and the real, the finite and
the infinite— absolute knowledge, or, as he called
it, intellectual intuition, was the only medium
through which man could become fully conscious
of God. Religion he was consequently compelled
to reject as a mistaken conception: see his Phi-
losophie und Religion, 1804. He was vehemently
attacked by Fries, Jacobi, and Herbart, but in
vain. Hegel, whose Religionsphilosophie was not
published until after his death (1832), also defined
God as the absolute. But with him every thing
was process and evolution. The absolute was
not a dead identity, always at rest, but the result
of a never-ending process by which the opposites
reached identity through contest and reconcilia-
tion. He was consequently able to give religion
a legitimate place in his system, though only as a
lower and temporary form of the consciousness
of God.

Against Schelling's and Hegel's ideas of the
absolute, though in many respects influenced by
their methods, wrote Eschenmeyer (Religions-
philosophie, 1818—24, 3 vols.), Franz von Baader
(Fermenta cognitionis, 1822—25, Vorlesungen iiber
religiose Philosophie, 1827, and Vorlesungen über
speculative Dagnatik, 1829), and Heinrich Steff-
fens (Religionsphilosophie, 1839, 2 vols.). All these
writers have a more or less pronounced mysti-
cal character. The most interesting of them is
Baader. He was a strict Romanist, but held that
nature and Scripture reciprocally interpret each
other, that a transmuted philosophy of nature.
Christian theology must lead to the same results.
Of still more importance among the adversaries
of the pantheism of Schelling and Hegel are
J. H. Fichte (Speculative Theologie, 1846), and
Ch. G. Weisse (Philosophische Dagnatik, 1850).

Very characteristic is the proposition with which
RELI GIOUS DRAMAS.


RELI GIOUS DRAMAS IN THE MIDDLE AGES. Between the ancient and modern theatre there is an absolute void of several centuries. Only a few dramas were produced during that period. — the *Krois Niko* of Gregory Nazianzen, some cloister-plays from the Carolingian age, the six comedies of Roswitha, — and they were all simple imitations of the ancient models, and without any literary influence. When at last the modern drama began to germinate, it was prompted by no reminiscence of the ancient. Its origin was entirely religious: it grew up in the midst of the divine service of the Christian Church.

Even in its earlier form there were in the Christian service numerous dramatic elements which needed only a little development in order to become real dramas, such as the antiphonies and responsories of the mass, the change of persons and costumes in various parts of the Liturgy, the processions inside and outside the church, the washing of feet on Maundy-Thursday, the imitation of the manger at Christmas and the tomb of Christ at Easter, the recitation of the gospel report on Easter morning, etc. These recitations of the biblical narratives were soon recast in the form of rhymed dialogues interspersed with choral hymns. Costumes were added, to represent the angels, the women carrying incense, the soldiers keeping watch, etc.; and in the eleventh century the Christmas and the Easter plays were read, though the period of their full bloom falls in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In France they were called *misteres* (formerly derived from *mysterium*, now generally from ministerium); in England, *miracles*; in Spain, *autos*; in Germany, *lustspieler*. They were presented in the palace of the marquis, and became the special privilege of the Bischöfe, the guild of lawyers and advocates; while at the same time (1402) the *Confrérie de la Passion* erected the first stationary scene in Paris for the representation of *mysteries*. In England *moralities* also found much favor; and many plays of the kind were produced and became popular. In Germany, on the contrary, they hardly occur.

The *moralities*, as well as the *mysteries*, were strictly orthodox; not so with the *sottises*, or *entremets* in France, the *English interludes*, the German *fastnachtspiel*. They were from their very origin, while yet mere episodes of the larger plays, humorous and satirical; and, when the Reformation began to put men's ideas and passions in com motion, their satire was immediately directed against the Roman-Catholic Church and clergy. Already, in the first half of the sixteenth century, Anselm Faidit of Avignon wrote for Boniface of Montferrat a comedy, *Heresy dels Fegyes* ("The Heresy of the Fathers"), which was represented in the palace of the marquis, and which depicted all the adversaries of the Albigenses as heretics. In the beginning of the fourteenth century Luca de Grimoald is said to have written a bitter satirical comedy against Boniface VIII., which, however, he was compelled by force to burn; and in the sixteenth century the satirical drama became a most effective weapon in the hands of the Reformers. In a *sottise* by the French poet Pierre Gringoire (1511), the Mother of all Fools enters the stage with the pontifical mantle on her shoulders, and the tiara on her head. In an *auto da fe*, by the Portuguese poet Gil Vincenzo
RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

(1508), the church is represented as an inn-keeper. Thomas Heywood, the inventor of the English *interludes*, launched boldly out in the religious controversies of his time; and Edward VI. is said to have written a drama against the Roman-Catholic Church under the title, *The Whore of Babylon*. The most celebrated specimens, however, of this kind of dramas, are the *fastnachts-spiele* of Pamphilus Gegenbach in Basel, Nikolaus Manuel Deutsch in Bern, and Hans Sachs in Nuremberg.

In England the religious drama of the middle ages connects directly with Shakespeare; in Spain, with Lope de Vega and Calderon de la Barca; in France, with Corneille. Its most direct artistic offspring, however, is the Protestant oratorio. In Catholic Germany the representation of mysteries has continued down to the present time. [See OBER-AMMERG.][1]

**GRÜNEISEN.**


RELIGIOUS LIBERTY. See Liberty.


Note.—The value of this table is not in the accuracy and freshness of its figures (for manifestly in the case of the United States a former census has been used, and it is probably so in other cases), but in its presentation of the comparative strength of the various religions. The first column expresses the number of millions and fractions of millions there are in the respective countries: thus in the German Empire there are 43 and 72 hundred millions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>To Every Thousand Inhabitants there are</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R frees. Caliph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[41] Alp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Orthodox.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>18.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>36.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>22.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>15.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Empire</td>
<td>43.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>33.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>71.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>50.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden and Norway</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>309.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>239 468 228 17 21 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>18.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyssinia</td>
<td>23.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabian States</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Asia</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Caucasus</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 5 9 22 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>America</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru, Bolivia, Chili,</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia, Ecuador,</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela, Peru,</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentine Republic,</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay, Uruguay</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayl, Spanish and</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French West Indies</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch, Danish, and</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish West Indies</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British North America</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of N.</td>
<td>38.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British West Indies</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patagonia and Terra del Fuego</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>199.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 12 27 3 423 5 523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>14533.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RELLY, James, b. at Jefferson, North Wales, 1720; d. in London about 1780. He may be regarded as the founder of the Universalist denomination from his association with John Murray. Both Relly and Murray were, in the early part of their career, disciples and correspondents of Whitefield. Very few particulars in the life of
Renny have been preserved. Even Mr. Murray, his ardent admirer and convert, tells us nothing which would afford an insight into his personality. He became a Universalist about 1750, and organized a society a year or two later. His society, after his death, until its dissolution in 1830, was ministered to by laymen. He is best known through his writings, which are somewhat voluminous. Mr. Renny's style of writing is remarkably good, indicating more than ordinary culture. His principal works are as follows: The Tryal of Spirits, or a Treatise upon the Nature, Offices, and Operations of the Spirit of Truth, London, 1756, 2d ed., 1762; Union, or a Treatise of the Consanguinity and Affinity between Christ and His Church, 1758, Reprinted, Philadelphia, 1843; Antichrist Resisted, 1761; The Life of Christ, 1762; The Sadducee Refuted and Rejected, 1764; Christian Liberty, 1775; Epistles, or the Great Salvation Contemplated, 1776; Salvation Completed ("a discourse on that subject by J. R., wrote in the year 1733"), 1779; The Salt of the Sacrifice, or the True Christian Baptism Delineated, According to Reason and Spirit [n. d., 1779?]; The Chiefof His Works—That in Which His Doctrine Is Most Clearly Expressed, 1780. His Writings show him to be a man of intellectual vigor, versed in theology, a careful student of the Scriptures, a keen logician, and a good controversialist. He must have been a powerful preacher, inasmuch as Mr. Murray, who abhorred Universalism, and who had been specially appointed to refute the Union, was converted by the first sermon which he heard him preach.

**REMMIGIUS, St.,** b. probably in 487; d. Jan. 15, 538. He was made bishop of Rheims in 489, and was an intimate friend of Clovis, whom he converted to Christianity. Twice he was made the subject of a fraudulent fiction invented for political purposes by Hincmar of Rheims; first as having anointed Clovis with oil from the sacred ampulla, and next as having received a letter from Pope Hormidas recognizing him as primas of France. He has left four letters. The Commentary on the Pauline Epistles, ed. by J. B. Villalpandus (1699), and also found in Bib. Max. (Lyons, 1677), is not by him, but by Remigius of Auxerre. [See A. Aubert: Hist. de saint Remi, Paris, 1849; Dessailly: Authenticité du grand testament de saint Remi, Paris, 1878.]

**REM’PHAN** (more correctly Raiphan), a god, so called in Acts vii. 43. It occurs in a quotation from the Septuagint of Amos v. 26, where the Hebrew has Chiaun. The god is generally identified with Saturn.

**RENAISSANCE,** The, is the term now commonly used to designate the general movement of the human mind against the system of government in Church and State which prevailed in Europe during the middle age. That system was founded upon the principle of absolute authority in both spheres, in accordance with the supposed divine order for the government of the world. The Church maintained this principle in its control of the consciences, opinions, and acts of men in their relations to subjects within its special jurisdiction; while the civil power, claiming the same divine origin, ruled with the same authority over the citizen in his more immediate relations to the State. The theory was, that there could be no lawful resistance to the duly constituted authority either in Church or State, and no conceivable opposition between them, because the divine will was represented by its lawful exercise in either sphere. Against this theory, upon which the medieval system was based, a revolt began in the twelfth century, which, in one form or another, continued to assert itself with aggressive force throughout Western Europe for nearly four hundred years; and that revolt is known by the general name of the "Renaissance." This movement was most active during the transition period between the middle age proper and our modern era (1100-1500), and its influence is clearly seen in some of the most characteristic features of existing civilization. It may be described in general terms as a struggle of individualism to control the forces of European civilization; and that control was exercised by the Church and State as organized in the middle age.

The movement, as a general one throughout the countries of Western Europe, is said to have begun with the teachings of Abelard (1079-1142); and its special work was not completed, at least in France, until the close of the sixteenth century. Two eras are to be distinguished in its history: first, that in which the assertion of this claim to
individualism — which is, after all, only another name for the right of private judgment — was boldly avowed, and persistently maintained, by scholars and philosophers, as a distinct general principle, and the result of the growth of these opinions, and the changes which they produced in the condition of European society, became conspicuous. The first was seed-time, the other the fruit-season; and between the two lay the dark night of nearly a century, in which the "new birth," the Renaissance, seemed to have reached an untimely end.

The following is an outline, in their historical order, of some of the principal events in which this spirit of individualism — afterwards known, from the marvelous changes it produced in European life, as the Renaissance, or "new birth" — exhibited itself.

1. Abelard (1079-1142) was the first great scholar in the middle age who openly maintained the principle of individualism in a definite form against that of the authority of the church as recognized and settled in his time. He did not claim, as later scholars did, that the church itself had actually reached wrong conclusions in any given case, but that her fundamental theory, that her own declaration of her own infallibility in all cases should be binding upon Christians, was a false one. Anselm had formulated the church's position by asserting that we must believe in order that we may be able to understand; Abelard, on the contrary, insisted that we must first understand before we can believe. Abelard, although condemned by the church for this and other errors, had many disciples, who, adopting his theory, did not hesitate to discuss and condemn many things which were done under the claim of church authority. Indeed, so widespread and potent was the influence of Abelard's example, that, according to Hallam, the greater part of the literature of the middle age from the twelfth century may be considered as artillery levelled against the dogma.

2. Arnold of Brescia, who lived in the first half of the twelfth century, was a pupil of Abelard, and applied the principle of free inquiry, as defended by his master, to an examination of the claim of popes and bishops to the exercise of authority as secular princes. His influence was so great, that he practically dethroned, for a time, one pope, and became himself the ruler of Rome. He was soon deposed, condemned, and burned; but his career lasted long enough to show that in Italy in the twelfth century there was an opinion strong enough to make itself felt effectually, questioning the authority of the church, not merely to make itself the interpreter of its own jurisdiction over civil as well as over ecclesiastical affairs, but revolting also against the system of government it had established. The same principle we see applied, about the same time, in a different sphere, in the insurrection of the Italian cities, under the name of the "Lombard League," against the authority of their German master, the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire,—an authority which had theoretically, in the middle age, the same divine origin and sanction, and the same claim to unquestioning universal obedience, as that of the church. But the church of Lombardy did not hesitate to disown the imperial authority; and they acquired, by successful resistance to it, a certain qualified independence of the emperor, thus maintaining, as Sismondi says, the first and noblest struggle ever waged by the nations of modern Europe against that of the authority of their German master, the emperor, whose restraintshad become distasteful to them; and naturally they found justification for their course in opinions regarded as heretical. The example of the nobles was followed by the peasants, who, known in history as the Albigenses, had long been ready to revolt against the church for another and opposite reason; viz., that its doctrines, as well as its authority, did not seem to them to be in accord with the principles and examples revealed in the New Testament. As is well known, this revolt against the authority of the church was cruelly crushed in the thirteenth century: still, it must be regarded as one of the most important movements of the earlier Renaissance against that authority which had been recognized as paramount, not merely in settling the belief, but in regulating the lives and actions, of men. While the Provençal poetry was the outgrowth of an age and race thus characterized by disbelief and gross materialism, according to the church standard, the Norman ballads and the lays of the minnesingers in Germany, although the same, seem to have been consistent with devotion to the authority of the church, and with the encouragement of the robust virtues of chivalry.

3. Another step in the process of change from the old to the new, the revolt of individualism against the theory of passive obedience to authority as maintained by the church, is seen in the condition of the south of France in the thirteenth century. This movement presents itself under a double aspect. We see a defiance of the church's authority by all classes of the population. The higher nobility and the peasants of that region were both arrayed at the same time against it, but from different motives. The nobility of Provence, affected, no doubt, a good deal by the example of their Saracen neighbors, not only led lives in this era characterized by a worldliness, luxury, and love of display, up to that time wholly unknown in Western Europe among Christians; but many of their opinions were regarded as loose and heretical, and they had become restless under the restraints of church discipline. They professed to be orthodox Catholics; but their practice of an extraordinary exaltation of the passion of sexual love, their pretentious gallantry to women of their own rank, the courts which they established for the formal regulation of the relations between the sexes, their strange notions of the nature and extent of the marriage obligation, the encouragement of the troubadours, whose love-songs are the expression of an important phase in the life of the time,—all this was a genuine revolt, as much directed against the church's ideal conception of Christian virtue based upon poverty and self-denial, as it was against the recognition of the authority which enforced its discipline. The nobles denied the power of the church, whose restraints had become distasteful to them; and naturally they found justification for their course in opinions regarded as heretical. The example of the nobles was followed by the peasants, who, known in history as the Albigenses, had long been ready to revolt against the church for another and opposite reason; viz., that its doctrines, as well as its authority, did not seem to them to be in accord with the principles and examples revealed in the New Testament. As is well known, this revolt against the authority of the church was cruelly crushed in the thirteenth century: still, it must be regarded as one of the most important movements of the earlier Renaissance against that authority which had been recognized as paramount, not merely in settling the belief, but in regulating the lives and actions, of men. While the Provençal poetry was the outgrowth of an age and race thus characterized by disbelief and gross materialism, according to the church standard, the Norman ballads and the lays of the minnesingers in Germany, although the same, seem to have been consistent with devotion to the authority of the church, and with the encouragement of the robust virtues of chivalry.

4. From Provence the spirit of opposition to the church's theory of the universality of its jurisdiction, and to the nature of the ideal of life which it set forth, spread into Italy. Dante (1310), Petrarch (1348), and Boo-
caccio are called the earliest humanists; that is, they are the earliest and most eminent of the writers who regarded human life as something more than a state of preparation for the life to come, and by believing that human life did not necessarily include all virtue. Dante, with his mind filled with a knowledge of medie-
val history, and with medieval conceptions of life, still does not hesitate, in La Divina Comme-
dia, to try every human action by the standard of right and justice implanted in every con-
escience, and never makes mere obedience to the order of the church the test of rightfulness of conduct. He strikes at the very foundation of the secular power of the Pope, as understood in his age, by portraying vividly, in a celebrated passage, the evil results of the supposed gift by the Emperor Constantine, of the Roman territory, and with it the temporal authority, to the Bishop of Rome. While Dante thus made, in opposition to the spirit of the age, the conscience the final judge, Petrarch and Boccaccio strove to conceive of human life as a state less gloomy and ascetic, more human and natural, more joyous, in short, as it was supposed to have been in antiquity, than it was under the practice and the discipline of the church. Petrarch sang at the same time the praises of love and of the free spirit of antiquity, exalting human dignity and pride, and claiming that there were objects worth living for in this life outside of those included in the church's ideal. Boccaccio was even more worldly, attracting attention to human interests, and por-
traying man's passions, joys, and sorrows, the good and the evil so strangely mingled in life, concentrating interest upon man as he actually is, and not upon the ideal man, whom the church by its all-controlling power and discipline sought to make him.

The first or early Renaissance, then, was char-
acterized by a general restlessness in European society; a strong desire making itself manifest through philosophers and poets, and by habits of self-indulgence, to free life from those restraints in opinions and acts which the Church and the State, by means of their universal authority, recognized for ages, had imposed upon it.

There was a long eclipse of the light shed by the earlier Renaissance, but at somewhat different epochs in the different countries of Europe. In Italy it occurred during the long struggle which resulted in the downfall of the city republics; in France and England, during the hundred-years war between those countries; and in Germany, during that reign of force and terror which accompanied the decline of the imperial power. During this eclipse the pretensions of the popes to absolutism became more pronounced than ever.

The new orders of the Dominicans and Francis-
cans were their most active agents in repressing heresy; and, the practical control of the universi-
ties being in their hands, the most slavish theories of proper duties as head of the church, or in maintaining its traditional authority. No one in Italy at that time, save a few unheeded enthusiastic,
such as Savonarola, drew attention to the utter incompatibility between the Christian philosophy and that of the Greeks. Hence there was no open defiance of church authority, and outward conformity was maintained, being all that was required or expected from the learned. This love of antiquity included many things besides an enthusiasm for the Greek philosophy. The discovery of certain remains of Greek sculpture changed the whole ideal of art in the fourteenth century, or, rather, as to taste in painting and architectural authority were taught there. But nothing could restrain the bursting-forth in due time of the new and greater Renaissance, the force of which, unlike that of the earlier one, has gone on increasing ever since.

This revival was mainly stimulated by the enthusiasm awakened among scholars by the study of the works of the great writers of antiquity, and especially of Greek authors, whose writings were first brought to the knowledge of scholars in Western Europe during the fifteenth century, and by the discovery of Greek art. There had been many learned Greeks, and many manuscripts of Greek authors, in Italy before the taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453; but that event drove the Greek scholars into exile, and gave those in Italy who were students of the ancient classics invaluable aid in their interpretation. It was soon found that the ancient authors, Greek and Latin, offered to Italy a literature inspired by nature and reality, guided by reason alone, not subject to any authority, or shrouded by any mysticism. To cultivate and imitate this literature, and to seek for the ideal of life as set forth by the ancient philosophers and scholars, was to break the last bond imposed by the middle age. Italy soon became invaded by a species of fanaticism for the learning of antiquity. Search was made everywhere for the treasures of Greek and Roman art; and the dis-
covery of a valuable manuscript, by a celebrated author was regarded as a prize almost equivalent to the conquest of a kingdom. All classes, even the rough soldiers who had become sovereign princes in Italy, became enthusiasts in the study of Greek literature. Academies were founded in the principal cities for the study of the Greek philosophy; and very soon the ancient Greek ideal of life, which was that formed by the exaltation of human pride, and dignity, and force,—in other words, individualism,—was substituted, even among orthodox churchmen of the highest rank, for the Christian ideal, which was that of poverty, humility, and obedience. Some of the popes even became the unconscious instruments of sapping the foundations of their own authority. Nicolas V. (1455), for instance, who urged the Greek exiles to accept his hospitality, and to teach Greek literature under his protection, seemed to have no higher ambition in life than the patron-
age of Greek scholars, even those whose opinions were thoroughly Pagan, and the formation of a library made up of the manuscripts of the works of ancient authors. So Leo X. was, to say the least, as enthusiastic in the cultivation of the Platonic philosophy as in the performance of his proper duties as head of the church, or in maintaining its traditional authority. No one in Italy at that time, save a few unheeded enthusiastic, such as Savonarola, drew attention to the utter incompatibility between the Christian philosophy and that of the Greeks. Hence there was no open defiance of church authority, and outward conformity was maintained, being all that was required or expected from the learned. This love of antiquity included many things besides an enthusiasm for the Greek philosophy. The discovery of certain remains of Greek sculpture changed the whole ideal of art in the fourteenth century, or, rather, as to taste in painting and architectural authority were taught there. But nothing could restrain the bursting-forth in due time of the new and greater Renaissance, the force of which, unlike that of the earlier one, has gone on increasing ever since.

This revival was mainly stimulated by the enthusiasm awakened among scholars by
painters as Raphael and Michael Angelo, of such architects as Bramante and Brunelleschi, and of such a wonderful genius as Leonardo da Vinci, have given them fame unrivalled in the history of art. All this went hand in hand with this peculiarity of the time, as distinguishing them from artists of the middle age: (1) They are utterly free from any conventional type, but are pre-eminently the expression of individual and original genius; and (2) Their ideal of form and beauty, even in the portrayal of Christian subjects, is the natural or Greek type, wholly unlike that consecrated by the piety and usage of the church in the middle age.

It was the passionate love of the literature and art of antiquity, and especially of Greece, which made Christian Italy during the Renaissance essentially Pagan in opinion and in life. The study of Greek in Germany and in England produced the same effect in disintegrating and crumbling the Catholic faith and authority in those countries, but in a different way. In Italy the tendency was to make life practicably Pagan; north of the Alps, to which region the study of Greek soon spread, it became the seed of Protestantism. In the hands of such scholars as Erasmus, Melanchthon, and Reuchlin in Germany, and as Colet and Sir Thomas More in England, a knowledge of Greek became a key to the interpretation of the original tongue in which the New Testament was written. It was thus the most powerful instrument of biblical study, and became a formidable instrument in assailing the doctrines, practices, and traditions of the Roman Church, and necessarily the authority of that church upon which so much that was distinctive in its system was based. The recent invention of printing, spreading the result of these investigations far and wide, made Christian Italy during the Renaissance essentially Pagan in opinion and in life. The study of Greek became a key to the interpretation of the Bible into Italian, and she made her court a place of refuge for French and Italian Protestants. In 1556 Calvin came to Ferrara, and in 1541 began that correspondence which ceased only with his death (1564). But, when the religious re-action of 1542 set in, her position became difficult. The Inquisition was established at Ferrara in 1550, and in 1554 the duke complained to the king of France of the obstinacy of his wife. The inquisitor Oris came to Ferrara; and Sept. 7, 1554, Renata was imprisoned as a heretic in the old castle of Este. She was released on Sept. 28, but she was forced to recant. After her husband's death, in 1559, she returned to France, and openly embraced the Reformation. She lived at first in Paris; but, as she could not celebrate Protestant services there, she retired to Montargis in 1563. She was in Paris during the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, and succeeded in saving Merlin and the daughter of L'Hôpital. See E. MASI: I Burlamacchi e di alcuni documenti intorno a Renata d'Este, Bologna, 1876; [and SOPHIA W. WEITZEL: Renée of France, Duchess of Ferrara, N.Y., 1883].

RENAUDOT, Eusèbe, b. in Paris, July 20, 1646; d. there Sept. 1, 1720. He was educated by the Jesuits; entered the Congregation of the Oratory; visited Rome in 1700, and published a number of works referring to the history of the East and the agreement between the Eastern and Western churches with respect to the doctrine of the Eucharist: Défense de la perpetuité de la foi catholique, Paris, 1708, with two continuations, against Ayvon's Monuments authentiques; Gennadii homiliae de Buccharistica, Paris, 1709, against Leo Allatius; Historia patriarcharum Alexandrienorum; Paris, 1718; Collectio literarum humaniorum, Paris, 1718. This last work is that which has most interest to our time.

REPENTANCE (the rendering, in the New Testament, of the Greek metanoia) signifies a change of mind and disposition. This idea can never be wanting where there is genuine and earnest consciousness of the divine commands and human.
sin. The obligation to repent will only be acted upon when pardon and atonement have been offered to allay the guilt, condemnation, and pain of conscience. In the Old Testament the need of pardon is insisted upon; and pardon is offered for all sins committed hasten, provided it is sought by the offering of a sacrifice to the God of mercy. In the Psalms and prophets a broken and contrite heart is substituted for sacrifices (Ps. li.; Joel ii. 13). The motives for the cultivation of such a state of heart are human guilt and the divine willingness to forgive sin (Isa. xli. 22). God himself creates the new heart (Ps. ii.; Ezek. xxxvi. 25 sqq.), converts (Jer. xxxi. 18), and promises a dispensation in which he will write his law upon the heart (Jer. xxxi. 31 sqq.).

The Mediator of the new covenant, and his forerunner, John the Baptist, began their public labors with the call to repentance (Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17; Mark i. 15). Citizenship in the kingdom of heaven depends upon this change of disposition. Jesus enunciated the code of the repentant sinner in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v.-vii.), and gave a picture of such a one in the parable of the prodigal son (Luke xv.), who, "coming to himself," returned in humility, and with the confession of his sins, to his father. The thief was saved on the cross (Luke xxiil. 40 sqq.) when he besought the mercy of the crucified Saviour. The apostles called upon the people to repent, and urged, as the strongest reason for it, the elevation of Christ, the Saviour of the world, to the right hand of God (Acts v. 31, xi. 18). They used the term επετρέψαντο as synonymous with μετανοεῖν (Acts iii. 18, ix. 35). The most emphatic statement of the thoroughness of this moral change is made by Paul when he speaks of it as a burial with Christ, which is followed by a change of life (Rom. vi. 2 sqq.; Col. ii. 12 sqq.), and in the Gospel of John, when it is spoken of as a new birth from above (John i. 12 sqq., iii. 3). This brings us to the connection between genuine repentance and that which goes before it, and which is called regeneration. From the standpoint of regeneration, the change of heart is an act of God; from the standpoint of repentance, an act of the human will.

In the Roman-Catholic Church, baptism is regarded as simultaneous with regeneration and the washing-away of sins. It imposes, however, certain exercises, obligations, and burdens upon its members, which are subsumed under the head of penance (see art.). The Reformers went back to the original idea of repentance as "a transmutation of the mind and affections" (transmutatio mentis et affectiones—Luther); and Luther, in his ninety-five theses, asserted that the entire life should be a penance, penitential act. The decisive element in repentance, or metanoia, is faith. Repentance, therefore, consists of contrition for sin, and faith in Jesus Christ; or, as the Augsburg Confession puts it, of "contrition, or the tears of a startled conscience for sin, and faith, which conscience is conceived by the gospel, or pardon, and believes its sins to be forgiven for Christ's sake." Good works are the necessary fruits of true repentance. Calvin did not differ from Luther, although he failed to emphasize the pangs for sin committed as much as he.

The Pietists in Germany, and the Methodists in England, laid great stress upon the necessity of a thorough repentance, or change of heart (metanoia). This led to the exaggeration that true repentance necessitates a prolonged and agonizing spiritual struggle. Spener, who is often named as the founder of this idea, except to say, that whereas many passed into the joys of adoption without experiencing the terrors of the law, others might reach them only after prolonged spiritual gloom and sorrows, or after passing, as it were, through hell itself. Zinzendorf, however, under the influence of the former theory, lingered for a protracted period in a state of spiritual gloom and doubt before reaching conviction.

The subject was warmly discussed by the Pietists on the one hand, and Luther on the other. (See Joch: De desperatione salutari, Wittenberg, 1780; Ehrenfert: D. Geheimniss d. Bekehrungs, 1780; Burgmann: De luctu penitentem, 1736, etc.) The Methodists insisted on a hearty contrition for sin; and under the preaching of Wesley, Whitefield, and their contemporaries, there were manifestations of violent bodily agony. The Rationalists insisted with all earnestness upon a change of the will, but failed to understand the basis of faith. Among the modern presentations of this subject which go back to the view of repentance which prevailed among the Reformers is that of Chr. F. Schmid, in his Christl. Stütenth. (See the theologies of Hodge (iii. pp. 3 sqq.) and Van Oosterzee; Shedid: Sermons for the Natural Man, New York, 1871, etc.)

REPHE'DIM. See Wilderness of the Wandering.

REPROBATION. See Predestination.

REQUIEM, a mass for the dead, thus called from the opening words of the text, — Requiem aeternam dona eis domine ("Give them, O Lord, eternal rest"). On account of its peculiar character, the Dies irae, dies illa, is used instead of Gloria in excelsis, the Offertorium instead of the Credo, etc. The most excellent compositions of the kind are those of Mozart and Cherubini.

REVEROS (from the French l'arriva des) is the division wall or screen at the back of an altar, rood-loft, etc., in old churches.

RESERVATION, Mental, is a trick by which, according to the moral school of the Jesuits, it is possible for a man to tell a lie, or even commit perjury, without doing any thing wrong; namely, by adding mentally some qualification to the words actually spoken. Thus a man who is the only witness of a crime may, when asked by the court, answer, "I know nothing of it," when he mentally adds, "as a public fact." This infamous doctrine was first set forth by the Jesuit Sanchez (d. 1610), and then developed by Paulus, Castro Palao, Escobar, and Jo. Caromuel, in his Haplotes de restrictionibus mentalibus disputans, Leyden, 1672. Outside of the order of the Jesuits, the doctrine found a zealous defender in Antoninus Diana (d. 1663): see his Resolutiones morales. ZOELKER.

RESERVATION, Papal. The term which which the popes confer upon the appointment to vacant benefices by the issue of precios and mandata de providendo (comp. the art. MENSES PAPALES) gave the Roman curia occasion for further exertions in that direction. From the end of the twelfth century, instances occur, in which, when a foreign ecclesiastic died in Rome,
the Pope himself undertook to fill his place, because it had become vacant apud sedem apostolicam; and in 1265 Clement IV. formally established the rule concerning the Reservatio ex capite vacationis apud sedem apostolicam. Honorius IV. extended the rule, in 1268, also to cases in which the incumbent resigned his benefice into the hands of the Pope; and Boniface VIII. defined, in 1294, the apud sedem apostolicam as a circuit two days' journey distant from Rome. New kinds of reservations were trumped up; and in 1316 John XXII. decreed that all benefices which became vacant apud sedem apostolicam— not only by death, but also by deposition, cancelling of election, promotion, transference, etc.— were reserved for the Pope. The annoyances and scandalous transactions which were caused by this practice gave rise to much complaining, and the Council of Trent also effected some reforms; but it was the concordats which the popes were compelled to make. The concordats states which finally brought order and justice out of confusion.

H. F. JACOBSON.

RESIDENCE (that is, the personal presence at the place of one's office) seems to be a duty more evident in the case of an ecclesiastic than in that of any other official. Nevertheless, at a very early time it was found necessary to forbid absence. See Concil. Nican. (325), can. 15, 16; Antiocch. (341), can. 3; Can. Apost., 15, 16. Similar rules were established also in the Frankish Empire by Boniface. The accumulation of benefices, however, and other still more frivolous reasons, made absence one of the most glaring and widespread misuses of the church in the time of the Reformation. But the Council of Trent succeeded only in introducing partial reforms in the Roman-Catholic Church; while in the Protestant churches the abuse speedily disappeared, and made all legislation superfluous.

H. F. JACOBSON.

RESTORATION. See Apokatastasis.

RESIGNATION, the submission of the soul to the will of God, is a Christian grace distinguishing Christian from heathen ethics. Although the will of God is irresistible, Christian resignation is a voluntary act of the soul, with the assurance that all things must work together for good to them that love God (Rom. viii. 28). The love of God for man, as revealed in the New Testament, awakens a sense of imperturbable trust in his care, the very hairs of our head being all numbered (Matt. x. 30). Resignation is therefore a mixture of voluntary obedience, humility, and trust. Christ is the fulfilment of this grace, and exhibited its highest manifestation in Gethsemane. Christian resignation is distinguished from Stoic submission and Mohammedan fatalism by being voluntary, and based upon the confidence that God will do all things to will all good for the good of those that love him. CARL BECK.

RESCURRECTION OF THE DEAD. 1. Definition and Biblical Notices. — The term resurrection is a figurative one, taken from the conception of the deposit of the dead body under the ground. It is used of the body lying or resting in the grave. The essential reference of the term, however, is to the revivification of the dead, and the resumption of bodily and spiritual existence by them after a period of interruption. The firm belief in the resurrection and the eternal life is one of the products of Christianity, and rests upon the resurrection of Christ. Outside of Christian circles, death is and always has been the king of terrors. In the Old Testament the hope of the resurrection becomes clearer and clearer as revelation progresses. The prophets declare that the righteous shall participate in the consummation of the face VIII. defined, the resurrection of the dead. This act will be consummated at the end of the world, or the second coming of Christ. According to 1 Thess. iv. 16 sqq., and 1 Cor. xv. 28 sqq., the righteous will be raised first, and take part in the judgment with Christ; then will follow the resurrection of the rest. In reference to the relation rests upon the promise of the present body, we may say in general that it will be subject to all the laws of the eternal life. We shall participate in the glory of God, and be like Christ. There will be a spiritual body (1 Cor. xv. 44 sqq.). Augustine (Serm. 99) defined it by the attributes, impassibility, lucidity, alertness, etc. The main point is its freedom from the service of sin and all mere sensualism. We can form to ourselves some conception of it from the transfiguration of Christ (Matt. xvii. 1 sqq.) and by the words used by Paul, "We shall be changed!" (1 Cor. xv. 51). The difference of the sexes will come to an end; they shall be no prolongation of the sexual passion. We shall be like the angels (Luke xx. 36). The identity of the resurrection body with the earthly body cannot be denied. Origen and others hold to the survival of the eternal form and appearance (τὸ ἀπόθετον) of the individuality, the essential nature which forms the body; others hold that already here on earth there is an organism or body of the soul, the ethereal body, which exists between the physical body and the soul. The consummation of this ethereal or
spiritual body occurs at the resurrection, and its present relation to its future condition is represented by the relation of the seed to the ripe fruit. But why should not the soul be its own ethereal body? The soul itself, as J. H. Fichte says, forms the body; and the body of the resurrection will correspond to the individuality of the soul. He presented the soul so far as it is characteristic of the individual.


Robert Kübel.

Retberg, Friedrich Wilhelm, b. at Celle, Aug. 21, 1805; d. at Marburg, April 7, 1849. He was appointed professor of theology at Göttingen in 1834, and at Marburg in 1838. Most of his writings belong to the department of church history, and comprise, besides a number of minor essays and monographs, Cyprians Leben u. Werken (Göttingen, 1831) and Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands (Göttingen, 1845-48, 2 vols.), reaching to the death of Charlemagne, and a work of immense industry, excellent method, and great critical talent.

Wagenmann.

Rettiq, Heinrich Christian Michael, b. at Giessen, July 30, 1795; d. at Zürich, March 24, 1836. He studied theology in his native city, and was appointed professor at Zürich in 1833. His Die freie protestantische Kirche, oder die kirchliche Verfassungsgrundzüge des Evangeliums (Giessen, 1832) made a great sensation, on account of its modern and original ideas on church organization. He also edited the Gospel Codex Sangallensis, Zürich, 1836.

Reubner. See Tribes.

Reuchlin, Johann, b. at Pforzheim, Feb. 22, 1455; d. at Stuttgart, June 30, 1523; one of the most prominent among the humanist predecessors of the Reformation. He entered the university of Freiburg in 1470; was appointed court-singer to the margrave of Baden-Durlach in 1473; accompanied one of the sons of the margrave as tutor to the university of Paris, where he learned Greek from Andronicos Contoblacos, and settled, after his return, at Basle (where he published a Latin dictionary which ran through twenty-three editions), and began to lecture on Latin and Greek. But the theologians of Basle found that “lectures on Greek” were an impious thing, which might draw away the flocks from the Roman fold; and Reuchlin left the city. He went first to Paris, where he resided about two years, and then studied under Hermogenys of Sparta, and thence to Orleans, where in 1478 he began to study law. After his return, in 1481, he entered the service of the Duke of Wurttemberg, was made his counsellor, and accompanied him in that capacity to Rome. In Rome he conversed much with Hermolaus Barbarus (who translated his name into the Greek, Capnio), and in Florence with Marcellus Ficinus, Picus de Mirandola, Politian, and others, who inspired him with enthusiasm for the mysticism of Plato and the Cabala. The first Hebrew he learned from Jacob Jehiel Lom fiery who learned Jew who was court-physician to Friedrich III. Reuchlin was sent to the emperor in 1492, on some diplomatical mission; was very well received, ennobled, etc.; but the Hebrew knowledge he brought back with him he valued higher than any thing else; and in 1494 appeared his De verbo mirifico, the first-fruit of his cabalistic studies. Afterwards, during a whole year’s stay in Rome, in 1497, on business of the elector-palatine, he continued his Hebrew studies under another learned Jew; and in 1506 appeared his Hebrew grammar, from which dates the scientific study of Hebrew (Contarinus). Meanwhile he had published a text-book in universal history, another in civil law, Prognymasmatia scenica (a kind of school-comedies for exercise in Latin, which ran through twenty-nine editions), De arte coabacchistica, 1516, etc.; and how great a fame and confidence he enjoyed is shown by the circumstance, that in 1502 the Susian Union chose him for their judge.

In 1509 he first made the acquaintance of Pfefferkorn, a converted Jew holding some office in the asylum of St. Ursula at Cologne; but from that moment his life was filled with anxiety and misery. Pfefferkorn had obtained a decree from the emperor, Maximilian I., ordering all Jews living in the empire to give up their books to Pfefferkorn for examination, and permitting Pfefferkorn to confiscate and burn such books as contained polemical utterances against Christianity. Pfefferkorn wished to have Reuchlin for his partner in this enterprise, but Reuchlin excused himself. He was, nevertheless, dragged into it. Through the elector of Mayence he received an imperial order to present a memoir and to set forth the absurdity of such a measure, was shown to Pfefferkorn; and he printed it in his Handspiegel, 1510, with the most venomous commentaries. Reuchlin answered with his Augenspiegel, 1511; but the theological faculty of Cologne then charged a committee with examining the orthodoxy of the Augenspiegel, and the Dominican inquisitor, Hoogstraaten, took openly the side of Pfefferkorn. The committee found forty-three condemnable propositions in the Augenspiegel; Hoogstraaten stepped forward as formal accuser, 1513; and Reuchlin always felt the danger of the stake hovering about him. The court of Spires fully acquitted him, March 29, 1514, and sentenced Hoogstraaten to pay a fine of a hundred and eleven gulden. But Hoogstraaten appealed to the Pope; and Leo X. formed a court, under the presidency of Benignus de Salvati, and with the Pope in person, to pass judgment. On August 2, 1516, the court gave its verdict, which was an unqualified acquittal of Reuchlin; but the Pope dared not confirm the decision in the face of the powerful party of the Dominicans, who actually...
threatened him with rebellion. The final solution was accepted by Franz von Sickingen, who politely advised the Dominicans of Cologne to stop all further proceedings, and pay the fine, or to be prepared for a visit from himself and his friends. The Dominicans chose to pay and be silent.  

The sensation caused by the trial of Reuchlin was enormous. All the humanists sided with him; and a party with very outspoken extraordinary tendencies, and something of an organization, was formed under the name of Reuchlinists. It must not be understood, however, that Reuchlin himself stood at the head of that party. On the contrary, during the whole course of his trial he did his utmost not to fall out with the church. There was in his nature and character not the least trace of a talent for martyrdom. The last years of his life were much disturbed by war-incidents; and the brilliant engagement he accepted in 1521, as professor in Greek at Tubingen, he was by death prevented from fulfilling. After the appearance of Luther he also became estranged from his grand-nephew, Melanchthon, who had previously been his pride. See his biography by Mai, Durlach, 1587 (Latin); Mayerhoff, Berlin, 1830; Lamey, Pforzheim, 1855; Ludwig Geiger, Leipzig, 1871. KLÜPEL.

REUTERDAHL, Henrik, b. at Malmö, Sweden, Sept. 10, 1793; d. at Upsala, June 28, 1870. He studied theology at Lund, and was appointed adjunct to the theological faculty in 1824, professor ordinarius in 1844, minister of worship and public education in 1852, bishop of Lund in 1855, and archbishop of Upsala in 1856. His principal work is Svenska kyrkans historia (History of the Swedish Church), 1838-63, 5 vols., reaching to the Reformation, — a work based on original and exhaustive researches, but often admitting too much space to secular history. A. MICHELSK.

REVELATION, Book of, called, also, by adoption, instead of translation of the Greek title, The Apocalypse, a term, which, according to its original sense, would denote the future glorious revelation of Christ, and only by a later idiom, the prophecy of it, and which is now commonly used to designate that specific kind of prophecy, of which the book is an example, which expresses itself in symbolical visions rather than in simple predictive words. According to the usual arrangement, it stands at the end of the New Testament, a position appropriate to its contents, and probably, also, to its date. It is the only prophetic book of the New Testament canon, and, with the partial exception of Daniel, the only prophetic book of either Testament which is planned and written in the form of a carefully ordered and closely concatenated whole. The boldness of its symbolism makes it the most difficult book of the Bible: it has always been the most effectively understood by, and most accurately interpreted, the most exquisitely tortured. Any question of its genuineness, authenticity, or canonicity, may be considered excluded by the strength of the external evidence. The book asserts itself to be by John in terms which forbid our doubting this, and (at one) of the John of all other New-Testament books (l. 1, 4, 9, xxii. 8). "An unknown John, whose name has disappeared from history, leaving hardly a trace behind it, can scarcely have given commands in the name of Christ and the Spirit to the seven churches;" and it is indubitable that "all this is a merely understood in the first two centuries of the apostle John" (Hilgenfeld). Traces of the use of the book are found as early as Barnabas, Ignatius, and the Test. xii. Patt.; John's pupil, Papias, witnessed to its credibility; Justin (147) declares it an inspired prophecy of the apostle John. No claque writer ever supposed the Book of Revelation to be anything more than a mixture of confused historical allusions, and a fanciful account of the judgments against the Jews by the Roman empire. Grotius, Vogel, Schleiermacher, Völter, and (at one) of the John of all other New-Testament books and almost alone in doubting them. To-day "the assumption of the unity of the Apocalypse forms the uniform basis of all works upon it" (Völter). Its text, because of the comparatively few manu-
The term "the Lord’s Day," for Sunday, is unique in the New Testament; the office of "pastor," found elsewhere clearly marked in the New Testament only in the case of James, is here assumed as universal in Asia Minor, and well settled; the public reading (i. 3) of the Christian writings in the churches is spoken of as a usage of long standing, and a matter of course. On the other hand, it has of late become the ruling opinion among critics, that the book comes from a time previous to the destruction of Jerusalem. The chief arguments which are urged in its support are: (1) The whole tradition of the Domitianic origin of the Apocalypse hangs on Ireneus; and it is quite conceivable that Ireneus has fallen into an error, either as to time alone (e.g., Stuart), or as to matter as well,—the banishment, and hence the time of it, and hence the date of the Apocalypse, all depending on a misunderstanding of Rev. i. 9 (e.g., Düsterdieck).

But Rev. i. 9 seems most naturally to imply a banishment. Ireneus does not depend on any inference from the book, but mentions excellent independent sources of information in the matter. (2) The time of writing is exactly that of the apostles, etc. (3) The internal condition of these seven churches suggests such a catastrophe the less probable, and a matter of course. (4) Jerusalemmis spoken of as a usage of long standing, and a matter of course.

But these, or any such degree as to make the book to the apostle, yet assigned it to this time. Not the slightest trace (except, perhaps, an obscure one in Origen) of another opinion is found until the late fourth century (the Muratorian canon has been misunderstood), when the name of Neron is connected with the writing; but this self-contradiction, places the banishment and prophecy of John under Claudius (41-54). Some few writers adopt interpretations of special passages which might appear to imply their writing before the destruction of Jerusalem, but this inference is sometimes clearly excluded. No early writer assigns John's banishment, or the composition of the Apocalypse, to the times of Nero or his immediate successors. The earliest direct statement to this effect is found in the Syriac Apocalypse of the sixth century, which declares that John was banished to Patmos by Nero Caesar. Is this due to a clerical error for Nerva? This is thought to be supported, (1) by Theophylact (eleventh century), who places the writing of John's Gospel at Patmos thirty-two years after the ascension, and at the same time assigns John's condemnation to Trajan, and (2) by a false reading (Domitianus [understood of Nero] for Domitianus) in one passage of Hippolytus Thebanus (tenth or eleventh century), which is corrected in another. Certainly, if historical testimony is ever decisive, it assigns the Apocalypse to the closing years of the first century. Nor are supporting internal considerations wanting. (1) The natural implication of i. 9 is, that John was banished to Patmos; and this is in accordance with Domitian's, and not with Nero's, known practice. (2) The churches are addressed after a fashion which suggests intimate, perhaps long-standing, personal acquaintance between them and the author; yet it is certain, that, up to A.D. 85, John was not their spiritual head, and was probably unknown to them. Neither in Second Timothy nor in Second Peter (both sent to this region) is there the remotest hint of the relation between John and these churches, which seems to have been of long standing with the church. (3) The internal condition of the seven churches appears to be different from that pictured in Ephesians, Colossians, First and Second Timothy, First and Second Peter; and the difference is such as seems to require not only time, but a period of time, and a persecution, for its development. (4) The ecclesiastical usages of the churches seem to have made an advance.
REVELATION.

Jerusalem as an impending fact, John received the visions of Neronian persecution fresh in mind, with the horrors of the Jewish war then going on, and in view of the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem (vi. 1 sq.), in language which implies that the nature and object of the Revelation are best suited by the lapse of time. The Apocalypse betrays no lack of knowledge of, or command over, Greek syntax or vocabulary: the difference lies, rather, in the manner in which a language well in hand is used, in style, properly so called; and the solution of it requires not chronological, but psychological and divergent mental condition of the writer. The evangelist, dealing freely with his material, takes pains to write better Greek than was customary with him; the seer is overwhelmed with the visions crowding upon him, and finds no other speech fit for their expression than that of the old prophets, and that type is rightly yielded to a prophetic, antique, Ezekiel-like, Hebraizing form of speech (Ebrard).

The plan and structure of the book, the whole of which seems to have been seen by John in one day (1. 10), are exceedingly artistic, and are based on progressive repetitions of sevenfold visions. It thus advertises to us at once itscopious use of numerical symbolism, and the principle underlying its structure. Ewald, Volkmar, Rinck, Weiss, Farrar, have further correctly seen that the whole consists of seven sections, and thus constitutes a sevenfold series of sevens, and symbolizes the perfection and finality of its revelation. Five of these sections are clearly marked: it is more difficult to trace the other two. But, if we follow the indications of the natural division of the matter, we shall find the separating line between them at xix. 11 (so De Wette, Weiss, Godet, Hilgenfeld). The plan of the book, which at once determined the choice and treatment of the matter which gives it a universal and eternal application and usefulness, forbids us to expect in it, what we might otherwise have looked for, a continuous or detailed account of the events of future ages. All expositions are wrong which read it as a history framed with chronological purpose and detailed minuteness, and seek to apply its main portions to events of local or temporal interest, or to recognize the vast outlines of the future as drawn in it in the minute and recondite details of past or contemporary crises. We might as well see in Michael Angelo’s Last Judgment a country assize. This was to make John a pedant, puzzling his readers with his superior knowledge of petty details, instead of a comforter, consoling and strengthening their hearts by revelation of the true relations and final outcome of things. He is dealing with the great conflict of heaven and earth, and hell, not with such facts as the exact time when Roman emperors began to wear diadems, or that Turcomans used horse-tail standards, or that the arms of old France were three frogs. (2) Like the other biblical books, the Apocalypse was intended to be, for the purpose it was meant to subserve, a plain book to be read and understood when Roman emperors began to wear diadems, or that Turcomans used horse-tail standards, or that the arms of old France were three frogs.
but must labor to avoid the two opposite errors, of considering the book an elaborate puzzle, refusing to find any mystery in it at all. It would be difficult to determine which notion is the more hopelessly wrong,—that which supposes that the original reader readily understood its whole meaning in every particular, and which thus refuses to allow here the brooding shadow which the prophetic picture casts all over, especially if only broadly outlined; or that which supposes, that, in delineating each prophetic picture, the seer chose emblems appropriate, not to his own age or all ages, but specifically to that in which this special prophecy was to be fulfilled, and which thus condemns him to write in enigmas unintelligible to all ages alike,—a concourse of meaningless symbols enclosing one single spot of lucidity for each era. Both the analogy of other Scripture and the experience of all time have disproved both fancies. Notwithstanding the naturalists, no one has ever understood all the details of Deuteronomy, and, indeed, perfection; notwithstanding the pedants, the unlettered child of God has found them always open to his spiritual sight, and fitted to his spiritual need. (3) The Apocalypse is written in a language of its own, having its own laws, in accordance with which it must be interpreted. There is such a thing as a grammar of apocalyptic symbolism; and what is meant by the various images is no more a matter for the imagination to settle than are points of Greek syntax. This is not the same as calling the book obscure, in any other sense than a writing in a foreign language is obscure to those ignorant of it. "As all language abounds in metaphor and other materials of imagery, imagery itself may form the ground of a descriptive language. The forms of it may become intelligible terms, and the combination of them may be equivalent to a narrative of description" (Davison). The sources and explanation of this symbolism are found in the prophets of the Old Testament (especially Daniel, Ezekiel, and Zechariah) and our Lord's eschatological discourses, which, moreover, furnish the model on the lines of which the Apocalypse is composed. The study of apocryphal apocalypses has grown in its importance, and is also drawn from the canonical prophets; but it is best to draw water direct from the fountain. (4) The question of the fulfilment of the prophecy is totally distinct from and secondary to that of the sense of the prophecy. Nowhere is it more necessary to carry out the processes of exegesis free from subjective preconceptions, and nowhere is it more difficult. There seems no way, except to jealously keep the exegesis of the prophecy and the inquiry after its fulfilment sharply and thoroughly separated. It is only after we know fully what the book says, that we can with any propriety, considering the breadth of its meaning, decide whether the various emblems have been fulfilled. (5) As the very structure of the book advises us, and numerous details in it make certain, it is exegetically untenable to regard it as one continuously progressive vision: it is rather a series of seven visions, each reaching to the end, not in mere repetition of each other, but in ever-increasing clearness of development.

Doubtless it is because of failure to note and apply these and like simple principles, that the actual exegesis of the book has proceeded after such diverse fashions, and reached such entirely contradictory results. No book of the Bible has been so much commented on: the exegesis of no book is in a more unsatisfactory state. It is impossible here to enter upon the history of its interpretation: the works of Lücke and Elliott, mentioned below, treat the subject in detail. In general, the schemes of interpretation that have been adopted fall into three roughly drawn classes. (1) The Preterist, which holds that all, or nearly all, the prophecies of the book were fulfilled in the early Christian ages, either in the history of the Jewish race up to A.D. 70, or in that of pagan Rome up to the fourth or fifth century. With Henstenberg and Salmonon as forerunners, the Jesuit Alcasar (1614) was the father of this school. To it belong Grotius, Bossuet, Hammond, LeClere, Wetstein, Eichhorn, Herder, Hartwig, Koppe, Hug, Heinrichs, Ewald, De Wette, Bleek, Reuss, Réville, Renan, Desprez, S. Davidson, Stuart, Lücke, Disterdieck, Münster, Ferrar, etc. (2) The Futurist, which holds that the whole book, or most of it, refers to events yet in the future, to precede, accompany, or follow the second advent. The Jesuit Ribera (1808) was the father of this school. To it belong Lacunza, Tyso, S. R. and C. Maitland, De Burgh, Todd, Kelly, I. Williams, etc. (3) The Historical, which holds that the book contains a prophetic view of the great conflict between Christ and the Enemy from the first to the second advents. It is as old as the twelfth century, when Berengaud, followed by Anselm and the Abbé Joachim, expounded it. It has received in one form or another, often differing extremely among themselves, the suffrages of most students of the book. It is the system of DeLire, Wiclif, the Reformers generally, Fox, Brightman, Pareus, Mede, Vitringa, Sir I. Newton, Fleming, Daubuz, Whiston, Bengel, Gausen, Elliott, Faber, Woodhouse, Wordsworth, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, Von Hofmann, Auberlen, Alford, W. Lee, etc. The last six of these writers will be found nearest the truth.

LIT.—(1) Introduction. The various introductions to the New Testament, e.g., CREDDNER'S, GUERRICKER'S, BLEEK'S; the arts. in the encyclopedias, e.g., KITTO'S (by Davidson), MCCLINTOCK and STRONG'S, SMITH'S, HERZOG'S, LICHENBERGER'S (by A. Sabatier), and EREICH and GRUBER'S (by Reuss); the prolegomena to the commentaries, e.g., DÜSTERDIECK'S, STUART'S, ALFORD'S, LEE'S (in the Bible Commentary), and EBRARD'S; and the sections in the church histories, e.g., NEANDER'S Planting and Training, and SCHAFF'S History of the Apostolic Church (1853, pp. 418-430 and 603-607) and History of the Christian Church (vol. i., 1852, pp. 825-853); also GODET: Studies on the New Testament, 1850; and, above all, LÜCKE'S great work, Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitug d. Ap. (Hornbach, 1862; Ewald: Die Johann.
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REVIVALS OF RELIGION. This phrase is ordinarily applied to the spiritual condition of a Christian community, more or less limited in extent, in which a special interest is very generally felt in respect to religious concerns, accompanied by a marked manifestation of divine power and grace in the quickening of believers, the reclaiming of backsliders, and the awakening, conversion, and restoration of the unregenerate.

Theory of Revivals. — The progress of Christianity in the world has rarely, for any length of time, been uniform. Its growth in the individual and in the community is characterized by very obvious fluctuations. Like all things temporal, it is subject to constant change, exposed to influences the most varied and antagonistic. Now it makes rapid advances in its conflict with sinful propensities and developments; then it is subjected to obstructions and retardations that effectively check its onward course, and result in spiritual declensions.

The natural is ever at enmity with the spiritual. “The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary to one another.” Growth in grace is attainable only by ceaseless vigilance, untiring diligence, unremitting conflict, and a faithful improvement in the opportunities and means of spiritual advancement. Any relaxation in the strife with moral evil tends to spiritual retardation: the evil prevails, and gains the advantage over the good; the religious fervor abates; the soul becomes lukewarm, cold, dead.

As with the individual believer, so is it with the community. A church, a sisterhood of churches covering a large section of country, by reason of the predominate influence of some worldly interests,—the greed of gain in a season of great commercial prosperity, the strife of party during a highly excited political campaign, the prevalence of a martial spirit in a time of international or civil war, or the lust of pleasure in a time of general worldly gayety and festivity, or any absorbing passion for mere temporal good,—may be so diverted from the direct pursuit of holiness, and the prosecution of the work of advancing the kingdom of Christ, as to lose, to a considerable extent, the power, if not the life, of godliness. The spiritual and eternal become subordinate to the worldly and temporal. The blight of spiritual declension settles down upon them, and attaches itself to them with increasing persistency year by year. Such has been the history of Christian churches everywhere.

The ancient people of God were rebuked with great frequency by their priests and prophets for their proneness to spiritual declension. “My people are bent to backsliding from me.” “Why is this people of Jerusalem slidden back by a perpetual backsliding?” This proneness was continually growing to the surface, in the days of Moses and the judges, under the kings, and both before and after the exile. Judges and rulers, priests and prophets, Deborah and Barak, Samuel and David, Elijah and Elisha, Jonah and Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, were raised up to beat back the waves of corruption, to arrest the tide of degeneracy, and to heal the backslidings of the people. The fire was kept burning on the altar only by repeated divine interpositions, resulting successively in a revival of religion.

Similar tendencies have from the beginning been developed in the history of the Christian Church: Ephesus loses her first love, Laodicea becomes lukewarm, Sardis dries her garments, Philadelphia and Gideon yield to the blemishes of worldly pleasures. Worldliness and carnality, leanness and spiritual death, succeed, too often, a considerable extent, the power, if not the life, of godliness. The spiritual and eternal become subordinate to the worldly and temporal. The blight of spiritual declension settles down upon them, and attaches itself to them with increasing persistency year by year. Such has been the history of Christian churches everywhere.
ties bear painful testimony to this degenerating tendency.

Such being the testimony of universal experience to the proneness of human nature to declination from the spirit and power of godliness, how, if it is asked, is this tendency to be checked? Obviously the true and only effective and appropriate remedy for a season of spiritual declension is a season of spiritual revival. Such a season, by whatever agencies or instrumentalities brought about, by whatever adjuncts of questionable propriety it may be accompanied, and of greater or less extent, may properly be termed "a revival of religion."

These manifestations, moreover, are to be regarded as the result of a special and peculiar effusion of the Holy Spirit. All spiritual life, all progress in the divine life, whether in the individual or in the community, in the church or in the nation, is the Spirit of God. The whole period of grace, from the Day of Pentecost to the final judgment, is properly termed "the dispensation of the Holy Spirit." Every true convert is begotten of the Spirit, and so becomes a child of God. The Spirit is always in and with the church, carrying forward the work of redemption.

Revivals in Biblical Times.—Mention, moreover, is made in the Scriptures of special dispensations of the Holy Spirit, of copious effusions of the Spirit, of particularly times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord: "It shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." The fulfillment of this prediction of the prophet Joel began, as the apostle Peter testifies, on the Day of Pentecost next following the crucifixion of our Lord. So great and so efficacious was this outpouring of the Spirit, that about three thousand souls were that day made partakers of the divine nature by regeneration. And this was only the initial of a marvellous dispensation and display of divine grace in the renewal and sanctification of a great multitude of souls, extending through a continued series of years, whereby the Christian Church was planted, took root, and filled the land of Israel with its blessed fruits. It was a great and glorious revival of religion.

This was but the first great revival in the history of the Christian Church. Times without number, at particular periods, in peculiar circumstances, God has interposed for the redemption of the church and for the triumphant advancement of the gospel of Christ. After a season of spiritual declension, when iniquity had come in, and rolled over the whole land like a desolating flood, a wave of renewing and sanctifying grace has spread itself over a whole region of country, whereby the attention of the multitude has been aroused, great numbers of the careless and thoughtless have been brought under saving conviction, and converts by thousands have been brought into the church of such as should be saved. Marvellous changes have thus been wrought in the aspect of large communities, affecting most favorably the character and the results of the preaching of the Word, the devotions of the closet, the family, and the sanctuary, and the interest taken by the multitude in spiritual and eternal concerns, resulting in an extraordinary increase of the number of those "who turned away among the Gentiles," —at Samaria, at Caesarea, at the two Antiochs, at Lystra and Derbe, at Philippi and Thessalonica, at Athens and Corinth, at Ephesus and Rome,—such scenes were witnessed. So many and so mighty were those special manifestations of divine power and grace in the gospel, by reason of such effusions of the Holy Spirit, that Tertullian could say at the beginning of the third century, in his appeal to the civil authorities, "We have filled all places of your dominions,—cities, islands, corporations, councils, armies, tribes, the senate, the palace, the court of judicature." "So mightily grew the word of God, and prevailed."

The Great Protestant Revival.—Passing over the intervening centuries, it may well be asked, What was the Protestant Reformation, that beginning in the fourteenth century under Wiclif, and continued down to Huguenot, that great revival under Knox and his brethren. It was a special dispensation of the Spirit, whereby the minds of men everywhere in Christian lands were turned towards the utterances of the Divine Word, the errors of the Papacy were discovered and renounced, the truth as it is in Jesus apprehended and embraced and embraced and embraced and embraced and embraced and embraced, and the churches built up in the faith of the gospel. It was a great and general revival of religion, whereby converts in tens of thousands were born of the Spirit of God. So thorough and wide-spread were those conversions, that the fires of persecution were kindled in vain. In spite of princes and prelates, converts to the pure faith of the gospel were made all over Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland, and Great Britain, and not a few in Spain and Italy. It was the greatest revival of religion that the world had witnessed, and the church enjoyed, since the days of Constantine.

Revivals in Great Britain and Ireland.—From that day, all along the centuries, the annals of the church abound in testimonies to the reality and efficacy of these special effusions of the Spirit. The Church of Scotland was born anew in the great revival under Knox and his brethren.

"The whole nation," says Kirkton, "was converted by lump." Near the close of the sixteenth century, under the ministry of such divines as Wishart, Cooper, and Welsh, all Scotland was visited by an extraordinary effusion of the Holy Spirit. So mightily were men affected, that the whole General Assembly, four hundred ministers and elders, while renewing their solemn league and covenant, with signs and groans and tears, were swayed by the Spirit, as the leaves of the forest by the "rushing mighty wind" of the driving tempest.

Similar scenes were further witnessed in Scotland, beginning in 1625, at Stewarton, extending through the land, and into the north of Ireland, and eventuating in that remarkable display of divine grace in the Kirk of Scotland, where, in the month of June, 1638, under the preaching of Drusus and Livingston, "near five hundred" souls, in one day,
were brought under deep conviction of sin, and presently into the light and liberty of the gospel. So, too, in 1838, on the preparation of the covenant, the whole country was stirred as by the mighty hand of God. "I have seen," says Livingston, "more than a thousand persons, all at once, lifting up their hands, and the tears falling down their eyes," as with one heart they vowed, "unto the Lord." Wave after wave of divine grace extended to the British Colonies in America, where, under the preaching of Edwards, and Bellamy, and the Tennes, and others of kindred spirit, the churches everywhere, in and out of New England, were so graciously and powerfully revived, that the period has ever since been known as "The Great Awakening," so many were the revivals of religion among the Christian people of the Western World.

These visitations of the Spirit were followed by the French War and the war of the American Revolution, resulting in a great decay of piety, and a wide diffusion of scoffing infidelity and profanity. During this period, here and there a church or neighborhood was favored with a gracious outpouring of the Spirit; but, for the most part, the churches in America were brought into a most lamentable state of spiritual declension. At length, in 1792, "commenced," says Dr. Griffin, "that series of revivals in America which has never been interrupted. I could stand at my door in New Hartford, Litchfield County, Conn.," he adds, "and number fifty or sixty congregations in one field, of four wonders, and as many more in different parts of New England."

The Grand Era of Modern Revivals. — All over the new settlements in the Western and Southern States of America, particularly in Kentucky and Tennessee, a work of divine grace, resulting from a special outpouring of the Spirit, beginning in 1795, and continuing for a dozen years or more, completely remoulded the character of the people, and led large numbers to forsake their sins and unbelief, and to connect themselves with the church. Again :after the war with Great Britain (1812-15), many of the churches were favored with a great input of souls. Especially in the years 1827-32, when, under the preaching of Nettleton, Finney, and other evangelists, and by means of protracted meetings of four days' continuance, or longer, revivals were multiplied all over the land.

Very early, also, was the wave of spiritual grace, that, beginning in the city of New York early in 1858, shortly after a season of widespread bankruptcy, spread from city to city, and town to town, all over the United States, until, within a single year, nearly half a million of converts had been received into the churches. It was a work confined to no denomination of churches, and no one class in the communities where it prevailed. It was a great and wonderful revival.

During the year 1837 a work of peculiar power began at a mission-station at Ilolo, in Hawaii, under the preaching of Mr. Cosan, and continued for a period of the preparation in Scotland, and in England also, for the great reformation, that issued in the Common Wealth under Cromwell, and the prevalence of Puritanism in the Church of England.

The Great Awakening in the Eighteenth Century. — A period of great degeneracy, profanity, and corruption, succeeded the restoration of the monarchy, extending into the next century. At length, in 1730, an era of spiritual revival was ushered in, under the preaching of the Wesleys, Whitefield, and a host of like-minded men of God, during which the churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland were visited with a wonderful refreshing from the presence of the Lord. The wave of divine grace extended to the British Colonies in America, where, under the preaching of Edwards, and Bellamy, and the Tennes, and others of kindred spirit, the churches everywhere, in and out of New England, were so graciously and powerfully revived, that the period has ever since been known as "The Great Awakening," so many were the revivals of religion among the Christian people of the Western World.

These visitations of the Spirit were followed by the French War and the war of the American Revolution, resulting in a great decay of piety, and a wide diffusion of scoffing infidelity and profanity. During this period, here and there a church or neighborhood was favored with a gracious outpouring of the Spirit; but, for the most part, the churches in America were brought into a most lamentable state of spiritual declension. At length, in 1792, "commenced," says Dr. Griffin, "that series of revivals in America which has never been interrupted. I could stand at my door in New Hartford, Litchfield County, Conn.," he adds, "and number fifty or sixty congregations in one field, of four wonders, and as many more in different parts of New England."
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REVIEW.

REVOLUTION. The French. In Ecclesiastical
Respects.—The violent commotion, which, towards
the close of the eighteenth century, almost de-
stroyed the whole social and political organization
of the French people, was principally and prima-
tarily an attack upon the church; but the
connection between the feudal State and the Roman-Catholic Church, that an attack
on the former could not fail to affect also the
latter. Moreover, all the writers and teachers
who had engaged in undermining the founda-
tions of the social fabric were utterly hostile, not
only to the church and her officials, but to reli-
igion in general. A supercilious scepticism with
respect to the positive doctrines of the church,
and a fickle-hearted frivolity, which felt the moral
code of Christianity as a galling chain, stirred up
a suspicion that the clergy clung to their political
privileges, their social organization, their wealth,
not from any conviction of having a higher call-
ing, but from mere egotism and arrogance. The
idea of the church as an institution based on
divine authority was gone, and to employ her
wealth in aid of the bankrupt State seemed a
simple and natural expedient.

Before the outbreak of the Revolution, it was
generally believed in the higher circles of French
society, that the clergy, as a privileged class,
would make common cause with the nobility;
but this supposition was rudely shaken at the
very opening of the contest. While the nobility
insisted upon strict class-separation in the debate
and voting of the states-general, nearly one-half
of the delegates of clergy (a hundred and forty-
eight out of three hundred and eighty) joined the
third estate on June 22, 1789; and, two days
later, a hundred and fifty-one other ecclesiastical
delegates, led by Talleyrand, bishop of Autun,
followed the example. The clergy began to
become popular, the more so as they proved very
liberal under the discussion of the financial
emergency. The abolition of tithes, Aug. 7, with-
out any recompense, they submitted to almost
without resistance; and when, on Sept. 26, it was
proposed that all gold and silver service of the
church not absolutely necessary to a decent cele-
bration should be used for the alleviation of the
people, the Archbishop of Paris supported the move;
and on Sept. 29 the generous offer, esti-
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Testament and the councils of the fourth century. On July 12 the debate was ended, and the civil constitution of the clergy was ready: only the assent of the king was lacking.

The king had been most painfully touched by the attacks on the church, and he actually felt his conscience hurt in giving his assent to the civil constitution of the clergy. In this emergency he addressed a letter to the Pope, dated July 28, 1790; but the Pope’s answer of Aug. 17 was vague and evasive, and on Aug. 24 the king confirmed the decree. Meanwhile the bishops were busy with organizing a passive resistance. Boisgelin, archbishop of Aix, drew up a protest, Exposition des principes, representing the contradiction between the principles of the church and those of the civil constitution; and a hundred and ten bishops signed the instrument, which on Nov. 9 was sent to the Pope through Cardinal Bernis. The National Assembly answered by a law of Nov. 27, which demanded that all ecclesiastics should take an oath on the Constitution, and threatened those who refused with deposition, loss of civil rights, and punishment for disturbance of the public worship. The first to take the oath; Talleyrand and seventy-one other clergymen followed the next day; but the rest of the three hundred ecclesiastics who sat in the National Assembly refused; and out in the country refusal became, in many districts, the rule. In Southern France, traces of rebellion began to show themselves. By a letter of March 10, 1791, to the archbishop of Aix, and a formal brief of April 13, the Pope now defined the position he proposed to maintain with respect to the whole movement. He absolutely condemned the civil constitution of the clergy, declared all its precepts and arrangements null and void, demanded that the clergy who had taken the oath should retract within forty days, under penalty of deposition and excommunication, and exhorted the faithful among the people to keep their separation from any priest not recognized by the papal authorities. In Southern France, traces of rebellion began to show themselves. By a letter of March 10, 1791, to the archbishop of Aix, and a formal brief of April 13, the Pope now defined the position he proposed to maintain with respect to the whole movement. He absolutely condemned the civil constitution of the clergy, declared all its precepts and arrangements null and void, demanded that the clergy who had taken the oath should retract within forty days, under penalty of deposition and excommunication, and exhorted the faithful among the people to keep aloof from any priest not recognized by the papal church. The declaration made a deep impression.

On the one side, many priests retracted; Talleyrand resigned his bishopric, and returned to civil life; on the other, the mob of Paris burnt the Pope in effigie, and the National Assembly closed all the churches in which the priests did not conform to the civil constitution. But, on account of an earlier law establishing freedom of worship, it was not possible for the National Assembly to forbid the obstinate priests to celebrate service in private houses and chapels; and it now became a point of honor among all royalists to support and encourage those priests who had not taken the oath. By the king’s unsuccessful attempt at flight and the Pope’s too hasty letter of congratulations, — which latter fell into the hands of the revolutionists, and was published, — the tension of the situation was very much increased.

On Sept. 14 the National Assembly incorporated the papal dominion of the Mole on the frontier of France; and on Nov. 29 it issued a law that every priest who had not taken the oath should present himself within eight days, and take the oath, before the municipal authority, under penalty of losing his pension, and, according to circumstances, being punished with imprisonment. The king vetoed the law, but with no other result than a palpable increase of the hatred against him and the church; and when he also vetoed the law of May 27, 1792, which condemned all refractory priests to deportation in order to stop their re-actionary agitation, the National Assembly was, by the fury of the mob, forced to supersede the royal veto. Deportation to Guiana was impossible, as the government lacked the necessary means. But very severe measures were employed, and in a very short time the situation of the non-sworn clergy became terrible. A great number of priests were dragged to Paris, and imprisoned in the monastery of the Carmelites: eighteen of them were murdered in the streets by the mob, and sixty more in the courtyard. One Rossignol boasted that he had killed more than sixty-eight priests. Fortunate were those who escaped by flight. More than forty thousand French priests fled to England, Spain, the Papal States, etc. In England alone about eight thousand found refuge.

Nevertheless, the whirlwind was yet far from having reached the acme of its fury. A number of laws now appeared, purporting to dissolve the connection between Christianity and civil life. A law of Sept. 20, 1792, defined marriage as a merely civil contract, dissolvable by common consent, and transferred the registration of births, deaths, and marriages, from the ecclesiastical to the civil authorities. A law of Sept. 22 inaugurated the complete re-arrangement of the calendar,— the year should be reckoned from the establishment of the republic; the month should be divided into three decades, each of ten days, the first of which should be kept a holiday; the five surplus days of the new year should be fasting-days, in honor of Genius, Labor, etc.; the celebration of the Christian Sunday was positively prohibited. On the whole, the convention proved much more hostile to Christianity than any of its predecessors. Public avowals of atheism became quite common. On Aug. 25, 1793, a deputation of teachers and pupils presented itself before the convention; and the pupils begged that they should not any longer be trained to pray in the name of a so-called god," but be well instructed in the maxims of liberty and equality; and on Nov. 1 another deputation, from Nantes, openly demanded the abolition of the Roman-Catholic service. The granting of the demand was not far off. On Nov. 7 a letter from a priest was read aloud in the convention, beginning thus: "I am a priest; that is, I am a charlatan." Immediately, after the Archbishop of Paris, an old man, Gobel by name, entered the hall, laid down his staff and his ring on the president's table, renounced his office in the Roman-Catholic Church, and declared, amidst immense applause, that he recognized no other national worship than that of liberty and equality. On Nov. 10 the municipal council of Paris celebrated a grand festival in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, in honor of Reason. Mademoiselle Maillard of the Grand Opera, in white robe and blue cap, represented the goddess of Reason. On men's shoulders she was carried from the church to the convention. The president embraced her; and the whole convention accompanied her back to the church, and participated in the festival thus sanctioning the abolition of Christianity, and the introduction of the
worship of Reason. On Nov. 18 all magistrates were authorized to receive the resignations of the clergy, and all priests were admonished to renounce Christianity; and on Nov. 22 those bishops and priests who willingly abdicated were granted pensions. The church-buildings were used as barracks, as sheep-pens, etc.: not a few were destroyed.

It must not be understood, however, that all religion had died out in France: by no means. Everywhere the people, especially the women, continued to visit the churches; and even in the convention, voices were heard denouncing the rude, anti-religious demonstrations. Singularly enough, it was Robespierre who gave the first sign of a coming re-action. On Nov. 21 he hotly attacked Hebert in the club of the Jacobins. "There are people," he said, "who, under the pretence of destroying superstition, try to establish a religion but sincere. But atheism is the religion of the aristocrats; while the idea of a Supreme Being, who defends innocence, and punishes crime, is for the people." The speech was not without effect; and Robespierre neglected no opportunity to push his plans. Finally, on May 7, 1794, he persuaded the convention to declare that the French people acknowledges the existence of a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul, and that festivals ought to be introduced tending to re-awaken in men thoughts of the Divinity. The first festival was held on June 8. Robespierre, as president of the convention, appeared with a huge bouquet in his hand, and colored plumes in his hat, and made a politico-moral speech, interspersed with various kinds of childish mummeries. Of course the infidels laughed, and the faithful were scandalized: nevertheless, the festival denotes the turning-point of the movement. The constitution of Aug. 22, 1795, granted religious liberty. Christian worship was tolerated once more; and in many places the congregations received back their church-buildings on the simple condition that they should themselves defray the expenses to keep them in repair; also a great many emigrant priests returned to France. Many restrictions, however, still remained in force,—thus, it was not allowed to use bells; and the persecutions did not cease altogether. After the coup d'état of Aug. 24, 1797, it was demanded that all priests should take an oath on the new constitution, which bound them to hate royalty, and devote themselves wholly to the republic. About seventeen thousand clergymen are said to have taken the oath, but such as would not be treated with great severity. Three hundred and eighty were deported to Guiana, and as many died miserably at Oleron and Rhee.

The complete restoration of the Roman-Catholic Church proceeded, generally speaking, along with the growing influence of Napoleon. Immediately after his return from Egypt, the imprisoned clergymen were set free, Dec. 28, 1799; the civil authorities were instructed to let alone all religious affairs; the churches were allowed to be kept open on the first day of the decade, but on any day it pleased the congregation; the number of the revolutionary festivals was diminished to two; and the civil oath, binding them to hate royalty, was not demanded. In spite of the rapid spreading of infidelity during the last ten years, and though the people had, so to speak, been weaned from religious worship by the Revolution, about forty thousand congregations immediately returned to the Roman-Catholic Church; and on April 15, 1801, service was celebrated, on the order of Napoleon, in the most solemn manner, in the Cathedral of Notre Dame. He hoped thus to form a solid party in support of his own power, and he partly succeeded. A peculiar difficulty arose from the dissension which prevailed among the clergy. Those priests who had taken the oath on the Constitution considered themselves as the true bearers of the French Church, and prided themselves on having remained steadfast at their post in the days of danger; while the non-sworn priests—the emigrants, who now returned—looked down upon them as apostates and infidels, who had suffered themselves to be awayed by the circumstances like reeds by the winds. Napoleon first entered into negotiations with the former party, the constitutional priests; but, when he saw that not one of the non-sworn priests was present at the great National Council, opened by Bishop Grégoire on June 29, or took the least notice of its proceedings, he immediately changed policy, and opened direct negotiations with the Pope through the emigrant bishops,—negotiations which finally resulted in the Concordat. See Concordat, France, Huguenots, etc.


Reynolds, Edward, D.D., Church-of-England prelate; b. at Southampton, 1599; d. at Norwich, Jan. 16, 1676. He was educated at Merton College, Oxford; became probation-fellow in 1620, on account of "his uncommon skill in the Greek tongue"; was preacher at Lincoln's Inn, London, and rector of Braynton, Northamptonshire; was the "pride and glory of the Presbyterian party," a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, a very eloquent, learned, and popular preacher, though his voice was harsh, and a cautious man, though lacking in firmness. On the ejection, by the Long Parliament (1646), of obnoxious heads of colleges, he succeeded Dr. Fell as vice-chancellor of the university of Oxford, and dean of Christ Church. From 1651 to 1659 he was deprived of his deanship, because he refused, in common with the Presbyterians, to take the "Engagement," and therefore accepted the vicerietate of St. Laurence Jewry, London. In 1659 he was restored, conformed at the Restoration, and was in that year (1660) chaplain to the king, warden of Merton College, and made bishop of Norwich, without, however, surrendering his Presbyterian view, that a bishop was only a presbyter, and governed with the assistance of his co-presbyters. In the Assembly he was on the committee to draw up the Confession of Faith, and in 1661 he was a member of the Savoy Conference. In the latter capacity his weakness
showed itself. He carried, however, his Puritanic principles into practice even while a bishop, and lived simply for his diocese. His works were first collected and published in 1658; best edition, with critical apparatus, 1826, ed. by E. E. H. H. 

REYNOLDS (RAINOLDS), John, D.D., Puritan; b. at Pinho, Devonshire, 1549; d. at Oxford, May 21, 1607. He was a successful scholar, fellow, and president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. For a while he was dean of Lincoln (1599), but resigned when chosen president. He was one of the great Puritan leaders, and played a prominent part in the Hampton Court Conference, where he had the distinguished honor of suggesting to King James the desirability of a new translation of the Bible. (See English Bible Versions.) He was appointed one of the revisers, and assigned to the committee to translate the prophets, but he did not live to finish his part. He was endowed with a wonderful memory, and passed for a marvel of scholarship. See Neale: History of the Puritans, vol. i. 252; I. J. Mombert, Handbook of English Versions, pp. 388, 945. Reynolds, by Rhegius, with ten thousand inhabitants, in extreme south-west Italy, opposite Messina, Paul stopped there a day on his way to Rome (Acts xxviii. 13).

RHEGIUS (not REGIUS, for his family name was “Rieger,” and not, as his own son, and, after him, many others have it, “ König”), Urbanus, b. at Langemarien, on the Lake of Constance, in the latter part of May, 1489; d. at Celle, May 27, 1541. He studied jurisprudence at Freiburg under Zasius the humanist, among the jurists; but he seems to have been chiefly occupied with the study of classical languages and literatures under the celebrated humanists, Capito and Zenti-campanius; and such progress did he make in that field, that in 1517 he was crowned as imperial orator and poeta laureatus by the Emperor Maximilian. Theological influences, however, were not altogether lacking, even at that time. In Freiburg he became acquainted with Ecks, and in 1510 he followed him to Ingolstadt; and in 1518 he wrote his first theological work, De dignitate sacerdotum. In 1519 he was ordained a priest. He was at that time in perfect harmony with the Church of Rome, the shield-bearer of the papal bull, decided him. In Augsburg he openly preached the views of Luther; against the bull he wrote Anzygung dass die Romisch Bull, etc., he was mentioned as author of many of those satirical pamphlets which in that year were published at Augsburg against the Romanists; and the clergy of the city were glad, when, in 1521, an incident offered them an opportunity of having Ecks succeeded by a trustworthy Romanist, Dr. Krätz.

After a short stay at Hall in the valley of the Inn, Rhegius returned in 1524 to Augsburg, and was appointed preacher at the Church of St. Anna. The state of affairs in the city was very critical. All the most violent excesses of the time were seething within its walls, and Rhegius was not exactly a strong man. When the Peasants' War approached the city, he wrote Von Leibegenschaft oder Knechtschaft (1525) and Schlussrede von weltlicher Gesuelt, but he did not live to finish his part. The excitement was so great that the peasants, and the Romanists ascribed the calamity to him and his party. When the great controversy broke out between the Swiss and the German Reformers concerning the Lord's Supper, his Wider den neuen Irsal Dr. Karlstadt (1524) was found weak, and he was for some time strongly drawn towards the Zwinglian camp; first after 1527 he is again found firmly planted on Lutheran ground. Shortly before, the Anabaptists had entered the city, and formed a considerable party. Rhegius's Warnung wider den neuen Tastorden (1527) was not an unsuccessful move; but the disturbances were not quelled until the city council stepped forward, and decided to employ very severe measures, as, for instance, capital punishment. With the opening of the diet of 1530 Rhegius's activity in the city came to a sudden end. Immediately after his entrance, June 15, the emperor forbade the ministers to preach; and, shortly after, Rhegius entered the service of Duke Ernest of Lüneburg, and settled at Celle.

His labor in Northern Germany for the establishment of the Reformation in Lüneburg, Hanover, etc., was very successful; and to this last period of his life belong also some of his best works: Formulae caute loguendi, 1585, in Latin, and 1536 in German, often reprinted, and considered almost as a symbolical book; Dialogus von der trostreichen Predigt (1537), a devotional book very much read during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, etc. In the present century the character of the man has been unfortunately judged by Dollinger, Keim, Keller, and others; and their charges of vanity, lack of strength, etc., are by no means unfounded. He was a humanist, and he fancied himself a poet. Nevertheless, he was one of those humanists who did not shrink back from the Reformation when it became deadly earnestness. His works, nearly complete, were edited by his son, in twelve volumes folio, Nuremberg, 1561-77. (His Formulae was edited by H. Steinmetz, Celle, 1880.) See Uhlhorn: Urbanus Rhegius, Elberfeld, 1861. B. Uhlhorn.

RHETORIC: Sacred. See Homer.

RHODES, an island of the Mediterranean, ten miles off the coast of Asia Minor, with a capital of the same name, known as early known as a centre of commerce. The brazen statue at the entrance of the harbor, the so-called Colossus of Rhodes, was one of the seven wonders of the world. Paul visited the city on his return from his third missionary journey (Acts xxi. 1). The island vindicated its independence until the time of Vespasian, but under the Roman rule its prosperity gradually declined. The city, however, flourished much as a possession of the Knights of St. John, the last outpost of the Christians in the East (1309-1522); but, after its surrender to Soliman the Great, it fell rapidly into decay. See Ed. Bilotti et l'abbé Cottret: L'Île de Rhodes, Compiegne, 1882.

RICCI, Lorenzo, b. at Florence, Aug. 2, 1706; d. in Rome, Nov. 24, 1776. He entered the order of the Jesuits in 1718, and became its general in 2044.
RICCI, Scipione de', b. at Florence, Jan. 9, 1745; d. at the Villa Rignano, Jan. 27, 1910. Educated for the church, and ordained a priest in 1766, he was shortly after appointed auditor to the papal nuncio at Florence, in 1776 vicar-general to the Archbishop of Florence, and in 1780 prefect of the Castel of St. Angelo, and remained there for the rest of his life. His biography was written by Carraccioli in Italian, and by Sainte-Foi in French.

RICCI, Scipione de', b. at Florence, Jan. 9, 1745; d. at the Villa Rignano, Jan. 27, 1910. Educated for the church, and ordained a priest in 1766, he was shortly after appointed auditor to the papal nuncio at Florence, in 1776 vicar-general to the Archbishop of Florence, and in 1780 prefect of the Castel of St. Angelo, and remained there for the rest of his life. His biography was written by Carraccioli in Italian, and by Sainte-Foi in French.

RICHARD, Edmund. See Eadmund, St.

RICHARD, Fitzralph (Armachanus), Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland; d. at Avignon, France, December, 1350. He was fellow of Balliol College, Oxford; was by Edward III. promoted to be archdeacon of Lichfield; and in 1353 became chancellor of the university of Oxford. He was for some time engaged in the study of theology; was licensed in 1363; ordained and installed pastor at Cub Creek, Charlotte County, Va., in 1804. In May, 1812, he came to the first Presbyterian Church in Richmond, Va.; for up to that time the Presbyterians and Episcopalians had worshipped together. In 1818 he started The Christian Monitor, the first publication of the kind in Richmond, and in 1817, The Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine (discontinued in 1829). In 1819 he was moderator of the General Assembly at Philadelphia. In 1823 he was elected president of Princeton College, and professor of divinity; in 1827 he was installed pastor at Danville, Ky. Dr. Rice was a great debater and an able preacher. In New York he was listened to by crowds assembled. He was one of the leaders of his denomination. His publications, besides the debates already referred to, include God Sovereign, and Man Free, Philadelphia; Romanism not Christianity, New York, 1847; Baptism, St. Louis, 1856; Immortality, Philadelphia.

RICE, John Holt, D.D., Presbyterian; b. near New London, Bedford County, Va., Nov. 28, 1777; d. in Prince Edward County, Va., Sept. 3, 1831. He studied at Liberty-Hall Academy (later, Washington College); was tutor in Hampden-Sidney College, 1796-98 and 1800-04; in 1800 began the study of theology; was licensed in 1803; ordained and installed pastor at Cub Creek, Charlotte County, Va., in 1804. In May, 1812, he came to the first Presbyterian Church in Richmond, Va.; for up to that time the Presbyterians and Episcopalians had worshipped together. In 1818 he started The Christian Monitor, the first publication of the kind in Richmond, and in 1817, The Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine (discontinued in 1829). In 1819 he was moderator of the General Assembly at Philadelphia. In 1823 he was elected president of Princeton College, and professor of divinity; in 1827 he was installed pastor at Danville, Ky. Dr. Rice was a great debater and an able preacher. In New York he was listened to by crowds assembled. He was one of the leaders of his denomination. His publications, besides the debates already referred to, include God Sovereign, and Man Free, Philadelphia; Romanism not Christianity, New York, 1847; Baptism, St. Louis, 1856; Immortality, Philadelphia.

RICE, Nathan Lewis, D.D., Presbyterian; b. in Garrard County, Ky., Dec. 29, 1807; d. in Brecken County, Ky., June 11, 1877. He studied at Centre College, Danville, Ky., but did not graduate; was licensed; went to Princeton for further theological study; and finally was settled at Bardstown, Ky., 1838. Noticing the success of the Roman Catholics in alluring Protestant children to their schools at Bardstown, he established there an academy for each sex, and also a newspaper, the Western Protestant, afterwards merged into the Louisville Presbyterian Herald. From 1841 to 1844 he was stated supply at Paris, Ky. In 1843 he had the famous debate at Lexington, Ky., with Alexander Campbell, founder of the Disciples, on the subject of baptism. He ably held his own, and won great repute. From 1844 to 1858 he was pastor in Cincinnati. During this period he held three other public debates: (1) in 1845, with Rev. J. A. Blanchard, on slavery; (2) in 1845, with Rev. E. Pringree, on universal salvation; (3) in 1851, with Rev. J. B. Purcell (afterwards Roman-Catholic archbishop; see art.), on Romanism. These debates, except the last, were published, and widely circulated. From 1858 to 1858 he was pastor in St. Louis, Mo. While there, edited the St.-Louis Presbyterian. In 1855 he was elected moderator of the General Assembly (Old School) at Nashville, Tenn. From 1858 to 1861 he was pastor, and from 1858, also theological professor, at Chicago, Ill.; from 1861 to 1867, pastor in New York City; from 1868 to 1874, president of Westminster College, Mo.; and from 1874 till his death, professor of theology in the theological seminary at Danville, Ky. Dr. Rice was a great debater and an able preacher. In New York he was listened to by crowds assembled. He was one of the leaders of his denomination. His publications, besides the debates already referred to, include God Sovereign, and Man Free, Philadelphia; Romanism not Christianity, New York, 1847; Baptism, St. Louis, 1856; Immortality, Philadelphia.
in the council before Pope and cardinals, Nov. 8, 1357. But his bold move was unsuccessful. The story of his Bible translation into Irish is insufficiently supported. His works in print are, Defensio curatorum adversus Fratres mendicantes, Paris, 1496; Sermones quatuor ad Crucem, London, 1612. See also by Lechler : Lechler's translation, vol. i. pp. 75–88, pp. 117, 118.

**RICHARD OF ST. VICTOR, d. 1173.** Very little is known of his personal life. He was a native of Scotland, but became very early an inmate of the Augustine abbey of St. Victor, in Paris. He was chosen prior in 1162; and after a long contest he finally succeeded in driving away the abbot Erasias, who scandalized the brethren by his frivolous life. Of Richard's writings quite a number are still extant, — exegetical, moral, theological, and mystical. As his method was the mystical allegory, his exegetical works have now little interest. His moral works (De statu interioris hominis, De eruditione interioris hominis, etc.) are also strongly colored by mysticism. Of his theological works, the principal are, *De verbo incarnato,* in which he praises sin as the *felix culpa,* because, if there had been no sin, there would have been no incarnation; *De trinitate,* one of his most original productions; *De Emmanuelus,* against the Jews, etc. The most celebrated of his mystical works is his *De gratia contemplationis,* in which he gives the psychological theory of *contemplatio* as an intuition, an immediate vision of the divine, in contradistinction from *eruditione,* the pondering on a single, special subject. The first edition of his works is that of Paris, 1528; the best, that of Rouen, 1630. See J. G. V. Engelhardt: *Richard von St. Victor,* Erlangen, 1888; Lienuber: *Richardi doctrina,* Gottingen, 1857–59. C. Schmidt.

**RICHARD, Charles Louis, b. at Blainville-sur-Eau, Lorraine, 1711; executed at Mons, Aug. 16, 1794.** He entered the Dominican order in 1727; taught theology in Paris; and took active part in the polemics against the encyclopedists. At the outbreak of the Revolution he settled in Belgium, and was overtaken by the French army of occupation. Too old to flee, he was seized, and sentenced to be shot, on account of his *Parall'el des conciles* (1760, 5 vols.) and *Analyses des conciles* (1722–77, 5 vols.) are still of value. C. Schmidt.

**RICHARDS, James, D.D., Presbyterian; b. at Plainfield, Mass., Aug. 22, 1792; d. at Honolulu, Sandwich Islands, Dec. 7, 1847.** He was graduated from Williams College, 1819, and from Andover Seminary, 1822, and on Nov. 18, 1822, sailed for the Sandwich Islands, under commission of the American Board. He was stationed at Lahaina, on the Island of Maui, and was very successful. In 1837 he returned home; went out again the next year; and, being taken into the king's confidence, he was made his counselor, interpreter, and chaplain, while still continuing missionary labors. In 1842, on the independence of the islands being guaranteed by England, Belgium, France, and the United States of America, he was sent as ambassador to England and several other foreign courts. In 1845 he returned to Honolulu, and was appointed minister of public instruction, which made him a member of the king's privy council. See Sprague: *Annals,* ii. 988.

**RICHELIEU, Armand Jean Duplessis de, b. in Paris, Sept. 5, 1585; d. there Dec. 4, 1642.** He was educated for the military profession, but took holy orders, and was in 1607 consecrated bishop of Luçon, and in 1622 made a cardinal. His career as a statesman may be begun in 1614, when sent as a deputy of the clergy to the states-general; and from 1622 to his death he governed France as its prime-minister. The great aim of his foreign policy was the humiliation of the house of Austria, the baffling of its aspirations to a world's empire; that of his home policy was the annihilation of the independence of the feudal lords, the establishment of the absolute authority of the crown. He succeeded in both fields. Very characteristic are his relations with the Protestants. Making a sharp distinction between religion and politics, he allied himself with the Protestants in Germany against the emperor; while in France he completely destroyed the political influence of the Huguenots. By the edict of grace (*Nîmes, July 14, 1629*) the fortifications of the cities of the Huguenots were razed, and their synods were not allowed to meet unless by authority of the king, who thereby respects the freedom of worship, and the civil equality of Huguenots and Roman Catholics, were fully respected. See Robson: *Life of Cardinal Richelieu,* 1854; Schybergson: *Le due de Rohan et la chute du parti protestant en France,* Paris, 1880.

**RICHER, Edmund, b. under humble circumstances at Chource, a village of Champagne, Sept. 30, 1850; d. in Paris, Nov. 28, 1831.** He entered the service of the church; studied theology; was made a doctor in 1859, and director of the College of Cardinal Lemoine in 1854. In 1829 he published his *De ecclesiasticopoliticapotestate* (Collogne, 2 vols.), a learned and acute argument in favor of Gallicanism, defending the views of the Sorbonne, that the ecumenical council stands above the Pope, that in secular affairs the State is entirely independent of the Church, etc. He was tried by the Inquisition, there being published his *Lettres,* and, when pronounced guilty, he put a knife on his neck, compelled to recant. See his life by Baillet, Amst., 1715. C. Schmidt.

**RICHMOND, Legh, Church of England; b. at Liverpool, Jan. 28, 1772; d. at Turvey, Bedfordshire, May 6, 1827.** He was graduated at Trinity
College, Cambridge, 1794, and proceeded M.A., 1797. In the latter year he was ordained, and became a curate on the Isle of Wight. In 1805 he married Miss Dury. While a child, by leaping from a wall, he was lamed for life. He edited The Fathers of the English Church, or a Selection from the Writings of the Reformers and Early Protestant Divines of the Church of England, with Memorials of their Lives and Writings (London, 1800, 4 vols.), and wrote Domestic Portraiture, or the Successful Application of Religious Principle in the Education of a Family, exemplified in the Memoirs of the Three Deceased Children of the Rev. Legh Richmond (9th ed., 1861). But the work by which he is best known is The Annals of the Poor, 1814, 2 vols.; which contain those immortal tracts, The Dairyman's Daughter, The Negro Servant, and The Young Cottager, previously published separately. Of the first, four million copies, in nineteen languages, had been circulated before 1849. See his Memoirs by Rev. T. S. Grimshaw, London, 1828; 9th ed., 1829; edited by Bishop G. T. Bedell, Philadelphia, 1840.

Richter, Emil Ludwig, b. at Stolpen, near Dresden, Feb. 15, 1808; d. in Berlin, May 8, 1864. He studied jurisprudence, more especially ecclesiastical law, at the university of Leipzig, and was appointed professor there in 1835, at Marburg in 1838, and at Berlin in 1846. His works on ecclesiastical law—Lehrbuch des kathol. und evangel. Kirchenrechts, Leipzig, 1842 (7th ed. 1874); Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16ten Jahrhunderts, Weimar, 1846; Corpus Juris Canonici, 1833—39 (the best edition of that work); Canonen und Decreta Concilii Tridentini, Leipzig, 1853, etc.—have exercised a decisive influence on that branch of study.

Richter, Christian Friedrich Gottlieb, M.D., German hymnologist; b. at Sorau, Silesia, Oct. 5, 1776; d. at Halle, Oct. 5, 1811. After studying medicine and theology at Halle, he was appointed by Francke superintendent of the academy there, and, later, physician to the famous Halle Orphan House. He was a Pietist. He wrote thirty-three excellent hymns, of which several have been translated; e.g., "Jesus my king! thy mild and kind control," "O watchman! will the night of sin," "My soul before thee prostrate lies," "O God! whose attributes shine forth in turn," "Thou Lamb of God! thou Prince of peace!" "Tis not too hard, too high, an aim." He also wrote four remarkable treatises upon the bodily sufferings of Christ during his crucifixion, contained in vol. ii. of his Opuscula Medica, Leipzig, 1780—81, 3 vols. For a brief account of his views, see Lange, Matthew, p. 523, note. See Richter's Leben u. Wirken als Arzt, Theol. u. Dichter, Berlin, 1865; and Miller: Singers and Songs of the Church, pp. 141, 142.

Riddle, Joseph Esmond, Church of England; b. about 1594; d. at Cheltenham, Aug. 27, 1659. He was made rector of the parish of Scalby, Yorkshire, 1622, and settled at Leckhampton, near Cheltenham, 1840. In 1852 he was Bampton lecturer. He is best known for his Latin-English Dictionary, founded on Freund, London, 1849, and (with T. K. Arnold) English-Latin Lexicon, 1849; he has also edited the valuable Monasticon Anglicanum, London, 1839, 2d ed., 1843; Ecclesiastical Chronology, 1840; Natural History of Inf-
ings behind him. They are, A Treatise against Image-Worship: Declaration against Transubstantiation: A Piteous Lamentation of the Miserable Estate of the Church in England in the Time of the Late Recoll from the Gospel, etc. And there have been published by the Parker Society, London, Treatise and Letters of Dr. Nicholas Ridley; and by the Reformers, the work of their own time, and the statesmen who recommended and will. Eternal life was a superadded gift. The Reformers, with their deep sense of the sinfulness of sin, defined the original state of man as one in which righteousness and goodness were essential elements. Bellarmine developed the Roman-Catholic doctrine. As man came forth from the Creator's hands, he consisted of flesh and spirit, and stood related to the animals and the angels. By the latter he had intelligence and will; by the former, passions and appetite (sensus et affectus). A conflict arose, and from the conflict a terrible difficulty in doing well (ingens bene agendi difficulitas). This was the disease of nature (morbus nature) which inhereth in matter: hence God added the gift of original righteousness. It was this perfection of the divine image, and not the image itself, which man lost at the fall.

The question is, whether man began with a state of absolute moral perfection, as the older Protestant theologians, especially the Lutheran theologians, asserted. Against this view, Julius Müller properly brings the objection that it excludes the possibility of the fall. But man's original condition was not one without a positive inclination to goodness. His will had this disposition; but, while it was in harmony with God's will, it might sin, and in the possibility of its sinning consisted its freedom. It was man's duty to preserve his rectitude by his own voluntary choice, thus confirming God's work. The doctrine of man's original righteousness is not necessarily found in Eph. iv. 24, but in Gen. i., ii., Eccl. vii. 29, and especially in the scriptural definitions of sin,— as a defiance of the divine will, and the cause of human corruption, and the analogy presented by the righteousness of faith. See CHEMMITZ: De imag. Dei in hom., Wittenb., 1750; COTTA: De rectitud. hom. primae, Tübingen, 1753; WERNSDORF: De reliq. imag. div., Wittenb., 1720; [A. RITSCHL: Die christl. Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung dargestellt, Bonn, 1870-74, 3 vols., 2d ed., 1882-83; Eng. trans. of vol. i., A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, Edinb., 1872; and the Theologies of Hodge, Van Oosterzee, and Dorner; and the works on Symbolics sub "Primitive State").

RIMMON (יוֹם, pomegranate), the name of an Aramaic divinity mentioned by Naaman (2 Kings v. 18). It occurs as the name of three places (Josh. xv. 92; 1 Chron. vi. 77; Judges xx. 45), and also as a proper name (2 Sam. iv. 2); but it is uncertain whether, in these cases, the name comes from the god, or the pomegranate. The LXX. makes a distinction between them, calling the god Ρημών, and the pomegranate Ρημών. The case he shoule not believe in God, or to be influenced concerning God, except the prevenient grace of the divine mercy act upon him." The scholastic theologians went farther. They dated the discord between flesh and spirit after the fall. The divine grace subjected the former to the latter in the case of Adam: therefore man's original righteousness was a superadded gift (donum superadditum). The proof was found in the alleged difference between likeness and image (similitudo imago, Gen. i. 20). The essential elements of the divine image were reason and will. Eternal life was a superadded gift.

The Reformers, with their deep sense of the sinfulness of sin, defined the original state of man as one in which righteousness and goodness were essential elements. Bellarmine developed the Roman-Catholic doctrine. As man came forth from the Creator's hands, he consisted of flesh and spirit, and stood related to the animals and the angels. By the latter he had intelligence and will; by the former, passions and appetite (sensus et affectus). A conflict arose, and from the conflict a terrible difficulty in doing well (ingens bene agendi difficulitas). This was the disease of na-
man, Zeus Kasios). Astarte planted the pomegranate upon Cyprus; hence the close connection between the name "pomegranate" and the god. See Baudissin: Studien; P. Scholtz: Gétzendiät.

WOLF BAUDISSIN.

Rög, Melchior, was schoolmaster at Hersfeld, when in 1524 he became acquainted with Thomas Münzer, and soon, also, one of his most ardent disciples. In the same year he went to Sweden as leader of an Anabaptist movement in Stockholm, but returned shortly after to take part in the Peasants' War. After a visit to Switzerland, he began to preach in the vicinity of Hersfeld, attacking the Lutherans with great violence; but in 1531 he was imprisoned by the landgrave of Hesse, and probably never released. His writings have perished.

RINGS were used as ornaments for the nose, the ears, the arms, and the legs, and more especially for the fingers, as far back in the history of the human race as historical researches reach. The Babylonians, Hebrews, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, and the barbaric peoples of Tengonic origin which invaded Europe, or, rather, the Roman Empire, at the beginning of our era, wore them. In course of time, however, the ornament received a special signification, and the finger-ring became a token of authority, or a sign of a pledge. A token of authority was that ring which Pharaoh gave to Joseph (Gen. xli.42), or Ahasuerus to Haman (Estb. iii.10), or Antiochus to Philip (1Mace. vi.15); and so was the ring which every member of the equestrian order in the Roman Commonwealth wore. After the battle of Cannæ, Hannibal sent a bushel of such rings to Carthage. A sign of a pledge was the ring, which, among the Hebrews and the Romans, the bridegroom gave to the bride on the occasion of their espousal to the church and of the power of his servitude, and sometimes annulus palatii. At a charge in London; was b. at Tiverton, Devon, April 29, 1751; and d. in London, Dec. 17, 1836. He edited the Baptist Annual Register, 1790-1802, An Arrangement of the Psalms, Hymns, etc., of Dr. Watts, and A Selection of Hymns, 1757, 10th ed., enlarged, 1800. His writings, as a compiler than as a composer. His Selection of Hymns included many originals by Beddoes, S. Stenmetz, Ryland, Turner, Francis, and others, and brought to public notice many lyres previously in print, but little known. Frequently reprinted, and consulted by almost every subsequent compiler, its direct and indirect influences have been innumerable. It ranks as one of the half-dozen hymn-books of most historical importance in the English language.

RISLER, Jeremiah, Moravian; b. at Mühlhausen, Upper Alsatia, Nov. 9, 1792; d. at Berthelsdorf, Saxony, Aug. 23, 1811. He was graduated at Basel; from 1744 to 1760 a Reformed minister at Lübeck and St. Petersburg, but from 1760 to his death a Moravian; from 1762 a bishop; and from 1786 a member of the Unity's Elders' Conference. He was an eloquent preacher, and faithful bishop. He made a French translation of Zinzendorf's Discourses, and of the Hymnal (1786), wrote La sainte doctrine (1799), Leben von A. G. Spangenberg (Barby u. Leipzig, 1794), and Erzählungen aus der Brüdergeschicte, 8 vols. Astarte planted the pomegranate upon Cyprus; hence the close connection between the name "pomegranate" and the god. See Baudissin: Studien; P. Scholtz: Götzendiät.
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RITUALISM.

This popular catchword is used to describe the second stage of that movement in the English Church which in its earlier condition had been named Tractarianism. The name first appears, probably, in connection with the riots at St. George's-in-the-East in 1859 (cf. quotation from East London Observer of May, 1859, quoted in Letter to Bishop of London, by Bryan King, 1860).

The revival of interest in Catholic dogma, effected by the Oxford writers of the Tracts for the Times, was naturally succeeded by a revival of interest in Catholic observances. This practical revival carried the movement into novel circumstances and situations; for the earlier detection and exhibition of that sacerdotal structure of the church which had been secured to it by struggles of another day had its parallel in the outward expression, of necessity, in the intellectual, academic region. The claim asserted, first had to make good its doctrinal status: it had to begin by working its way into the mind and the imagination. The Tractarian writers recognized this necessary order: they anxiously held aloof from precipitating those effects, which they, nevertheless, distinctly anticipated from this teaching. "We the old Tractarians," wrote Dr. Pusey in the Daily Express, May 21, 1877, "deliberately abstained from inquiring in externals." "We understood the jurist to distract men's minds by questions about novating in externals." "We understood the May 21, 1877, "deliberately abstained from in tarians," wrote Dr. Pusey in the Daily Express, effects, which they, nevertheless, distinctly anti cipated from this teaching. " We the old Trac trarian writers recognized this necessary order: it was a garden once more, rich with juicy life, mixed itself in with the doctrinal movement and warm with color. This literary warmth of life's interests were recognized with the glad welcome of a recovered joy. A touch of the force and reality of imagination in the shaping of things was running counter to Puritan bareness. The force and reality of imagination in the shaping of life's interests were recognized with the glad welcome of a recovered joy. A touch of kindliness repeopled the earth with fancies and visions and dreams. This world was no longer a naked factory, housing the machinery of a precise and unyielding dogma; nor was it the bare and square hall in which reason and warm with color. This literary warmth mixed itself in with the doctrinal movement towards the enrichment of the churches. The emotions were making new demands upon outward things: they required more satisfaction. They had been taught by the novelists to turn to the past, whether of cavaliers with plumes and chivalry, or of the middle ages with wild castles and belted knights, and praying monks and cloistered nuns. All this world of strange mystery and artistic charm had become alive again to them, and the revival made them discontented with the
RITUALISM.

2051

RITUALISM.

Proxy flatness of common life. The churches were responding to a real and wide need when they offered a refuge and a relief to the distressed imagination. Everywhere began the Gothic revival. The restoration of the disgraced and destitute parish churches, which had become practically necessary, was taken up by men full of admiration for the architecture which had first built them. They were passionately set on bringing them back as far as possible into their original condition. The architects thus were, indirectly, ardent workers on the side of the ecclesiastical revival. They eagerly studied liturgical correctness in restoring the beauty of the chancels, in placing the altar at its proper height and distance, in arranging the screen and the stalls, the altar-rails and credence-table. This combination of ecclesiastical and architectural sentiment was greatly furthered by the Cambridge Ecclesiastical Society; which did much to foster antiquarian exactness, and to promote active efforts at restoration. (Beresford Hope's 'Worship in the Church of England'.) This architectural movement, which dated from the great building of the new church, built at Littlemore amid much ferment and anxiety, culminated in the vast achievements of Gilbert Scott and George Street, whose handiwork has been left in restored churches throughout the length and breadth of England. This general restoration of order and fairness into the public services, which ran level with the renewal of church fabrics, roused much popular hostility, which made itself known in riotous disturbances, as at Exeter, etc., chiefly directed against the use of altar-furniture. This question that arose was, or to prescribe still the second year of Edward VI. as the standard, without a hint of any qualification? Round this main issue a swarm of complicated historical, legal, and liturgical arguments arose; and who was to decide among them? Here started up a new difficulty. The jurisdictional relations between Church and State were the result of a most long and intricate history, which at the Reformation had finally assumed this general form. The old matter of the keeping of the church, the old question of altar-furniture, the old business of rubrics, remained entire, - consisting of the Bishop's Courts of First Instance, in which the bishop's chancellor adjudicated; and the Archbishop's Court of Appeal, in which the dean of arches gave judgment, as the embodiment of the archbishop. But from this, again, there was to be an appeal to the king; and for hearing such appeals a composite court had been erected by Henry VIII., the Court of Delegates, the exact jurisdiction of which had never been clearly defined. This had continued, rarely used, dimly considered, until, without anybody's notice, a great legal reform, carried out by Lord Brougham, was discovered to have transferred, without intending it, all the power of this Court of Delegates to a certain Committee of Privy Council, composed and defined for other general purposes. When suddenly there was need of a final adjudication on anxious and agitating spiritual questions, it was this Committee of Privy Council which the rival parties found themselves facing. It dealt with the question of baptism, in the case of Mr. Gorham (1850); and Bishop Blomfield of London had in consequence, speaking in the House of Lords, protested against the nature and character of the committee as a court of final appeal in ecclesiastical questions. No change, however, had been effected; and in March, 1857, the question of ritual was brought before it, on appeal, in the case of "Westerton v. Liddell," in which case the ritualistic practices of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, had been condemned by the Consistory Court of London and in the Court of Arches. Amidst great excitement, the committee pronounced that the Rubric permitted generally the use of those articles which were prescribed under the first Prayer-Book, and therefore sanctioned the use of credence-table, altar-cross, altar-lights, colored altar-cloths, etc. From that moment the Ritualists have acted steadily in the belief that this legal decision was but affirming that which is the plain, historical sense of the words in the Rubric, and have pressed, often with rashness, sometimes with insolence, for the revival of all the ritual which had been rejected, in accomplishing this, they have been aided, advised, and sustained by the elaborate organization of the

bles and cope, albs and tunicles, with other details of altar-furniture. The question that arose was to how far this Rubric, when re-enacted in the Act of Uniformity, was intended by the divines of the Restoration to retain its full original sense. In its earlier form it was prescribed "until the queen should take further order." Was that "further order" ever taken? and, if so, does the later condition of the Rubric, in omitting any reference to this "further order," assume that order, or ignore it? If it ignored it, why was it never acted upon? For certainly these ornaments have never been in full use. But, if it assumed it, how was it possible not to define what the "order" was, or to prescribe still the second year of Edward VI. as the standard, without a hint of any qualification? Round this main issue a swarm of complicated historical, legal, and liturgical arguments arose; and who was to decide among them? Here started up a new difficulty. The juridical relations between Church and State were the result of a most long and intricate history, which at the Reformation had finally assumed this general form. The old matter of the keeping of the church, the old question of altar-furniture, the old business of rubrics, remained entire, - consisting of the Bishop's Courts of First Instance, in which the bishop's chancellor adjudicated; and the Archbishop's Court of Appeal, in which the dean of arches gave judgment, as the embodiment of the archbishop. But from this, again, there was to be an appeal to the king; and for hearing such appeals a composite court had been erected by Henry VIII., the Court of Delegates, the exact jurisdiction of which had never been clearly defined. This had continued, rarely used, dimly considered, until, without anybody's notice, a great legal reform, carried out by Lord Brougham, was discovered to have transferred, without intending it, all the power of this Court of Delegates to a certain Committee of Privy Council, composed and defined for other general purposes. When suddenly there was need of a final adjudication on anxious and agitating spiritual questions, it was this Committee of Privy Council which the rival parties found themselves facing. It dealt with the question of baptism, in the case of Mr. Gorham (1850); and Bishop Blomfield of London had in consequence, speaking in the House of Lords, protested against the nature and character of the committee as a court of final appeal in ecclesiastical questions. No change, however, had been effected; and in March, 1857, the question of ritual was brought before it, on appeal, in the case of "Westerton v. Liddell," in which case the ritualistic practices of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, had been condemned by the Consistory Court of London and in the Court of Arches. Amidst great excitement, the committee pronounced that the Rubric permitted generally the use of those articles which were prescribed under the first Prayer-Book, and therefore sanctioned the use of credence-table, altar-cross, altar-lights, colored altar-cloths, etc. From that moment the Ritualists have acted steadily in the belief that this legal decision was but affirming that which is the plain, historical sense of the words in the Rubric, and have pressed, often with rashness, sometimes with insolence, for the revival of all the ritual which had been rejected, in accomplishing this, they have been aided, advised, and sustained by the elaborate organization of the
English Church Union, numbering now over twenty thousand members, formed for the defence and protection of the Church, while carrying on the dubious and advanced ritual. This support evidenced itself in the “Declaration” of over four thousand clergy, headed by the Deans of St. Paul’s, York, Durham, Manchester, etc. (1861). The condition of things had become intolerable; and in 1881 a royal commission was issued to consider the report of the bishops of Charles II.; (2) in defiance of the bishops, whose paternal authority was generally exercised to suppress, by any pressure in their power, any sharp conflict with this common custom; (3) in defiance of the long unbroken usage, which had never attempted anything beyond that practical minimum under Elizabeth and Charles II.; (4) in defiance of the Court of Final Appeal, which in a series of fluctuating, doubtful, and conflicting judgments, had created a deep distrust in its capacity to decide judicially questions so rife with agitated feelings and popular prejudices. This distrust strongly roused by the Mackonochie judgment (1869) and the Purchas judgment (1871), in which it was supposed, in spite of obvious paradox, that every thing not mentioned in the Prayer-Book was disallowed and illegal—culminated in the Ridsdale judgment (1877), in which it was declared that the “further order” allowed the Queen had been taken in the House of Lords by the Archbishops Parker, and that the divines of Charles II. therefore, when they permitted the ritual of the second year of Edward VI., really intended only so much of it as was required in the Elizabethan advertisements. This startling decision the main block of High-Church clergy found it impossible to respect or accept; and this repudiation of its verdict brought to a head the protest that had been made ever since the Gorham judgment against the validity of the court itself as an ecclesiastical tribunal. This last problem had been made critical by the famous Public-Worship Regulation Act (1874), introduced in the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in disregard of the protests of the Lower House of Convocation, and declared in the House of Commons to be a “bill to put down ritualism” by Mr. Disraeli, then prime-minister, who, in spite of Mr. Gladstone’s impetuous opposition, carried it, amid intense excitement, in an almost unanimous House. This bill swept away all the process in the diocesan courts: it allowed any three aggrieved parishioners to lodge a complaint, which, unless stayed by the bishop’s veto, was carried before an officer nominated normally by the two archbishops to succeed to the primate’s duty of annulling any ring put by the Rubric. From him the appeal would be, as before, to the Privity Council. Thus the scanty fragments of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which, under existing conditions might be supposed to balance the civil character of the Court of Appeal, were all but wholly abolished. The right of the bishops was met by absolute resistance, ending, after being challenged at every turn by technical objections, in the imprisonment of four priests. In this collision with the courts, the Ritualists had the steady support of the mass of High-Church clergy, who had withdrawn from the Church and State. The days of ritual fever and ritual wilfulness are passing. The chaos which the absence
of all reliable law produced had made wilfulness and arbitrary extravagance inevitable. Men indulged their own ritualistic fancies, without consideration and without reality. But they have themselves learned the weariness of disorder and the folly of anarchic revolt. The evangelization indulged their own ritualistic fancies, without consideration and without reality. But they have and arbitrary extravagance inevitable. Men in themselves learned the weariness of disorder and of all reliable law produced had made wilfulness and arbitrary extravagance inevitable. Men indulged their own ritualistic fancies, without consideration and without reality. But they have themselves learned the weariness of disorder and the folly of anarchic revolt. The evangelization indulged their own ritualistic fancies, without consideration and without reality. But they have and arbitrary extravagance inevitable. Men in themselves learned the weariness of disorder and of all reliable law produced had made wilfulness and arbitrary extravagance inevitable. Men indulged their own ritualistic fancies, without consideration and without reality. But they have themselves learned the weariness of disorder and the folly of anarchic revolt. The evangelization indulged their own ritualistic fancies, without consideration and without reality. But they have and arbitrary extravagance inevitable. Men in themselves learned the weariness of disorder and the folly of anarchic revolt.
some memorial of his ministry should be desired by his people; and so, though he never wrote his sermons before delivery, a volume of posthumous discourses was made up from the written reports of him which he had sent to a friend after they had been preached. While these were published, the character at once seemed to be a great freshness of thought, independence of judgment, and fervor of heart; and the volume ran through many editions. A second collection of discourses was soon called for: this was succeeded by a third, and that again by a fourth, comprising Expository Lectures on the Epistles of the Corinthians. These were followed by a collection of Lectures and Addresses on Literary and Social Topics, and, so late as 1881, by The Human Race and Other Sermons, preached at Cheltenham, Oxford, and Brighton.

Robertson was greatest in the analysis of character and motive. His biographical sermons are among the best of that class which our language contains: those on Jacob, Elijah, David, and John the Baptist, deserve to be ranked beside those of Butler and Newman on Balaam, and are worthy of the deepest study. His experimental discourses are almost equally admirable; and some of his practical, like that on the parable of the Sower, are exceedingly powerful. But his sermons, it is invidious to inquire. His letters, useful, and widened his influence. Had he begun his career as biblical scholar and teacher. From 1828 to 1829 he was instructor in the Hebrew language and literature at Andover Theological Seminary, meanwhile busily occupied with literary labors. He assisted Professor Stuart in the second edition of his Hebrew Grammar (Andover, 1829, 1st ed., 1819), and in his translation of Winer's Grammar of the New-Testament Greek (1825), and alone translated Wahl's Clavis philologica Novi Testamenti (1825). In 1826 he went to Europe, and studied at Gottingen, Halle, and Berlin, making the acquaintance, and winning the praises, of Gesenius, Tholuck, and Roderig i. It is in, and not to determine, and, in the presence of his better sermons, it is invidious to inquire. His letters, so many of which are given in his biography, are as suggestive as his discourses; and the memoir, as a whole, is full of stimulus to all, but especially to those who are looking forward to the offices of the ministry. In his life he was often tempted to despair, as if he was spending his strength for nought; but his death has multiplied his usefulness, and widened his influence. Had he lived till now, it is questionable if he would have told on men in England and America to any thing like the extent that he is telling to-day.

LIT.—STOFFORD A. BROOKE, M.A.: Life and Letters of Frederick W. Robertson, M.A.: Sermons, first, second, third, fourth, and fifth series. WILLIAM M. TAYLOR.

ROBERTSON, James Craigie, Church of England, b. at Aberdeen, 1818; d. at Canterbury, July 9, 1882. He was graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1834; was vicar of Beckesbourne, near Canterbury, from 1846 to 1859, when he was appointed canon of Canterbury. From 1864 to 1874 he was professor of ecclesiastical history, Kings College, London. His historical works take high rank. He wrote, How shall we conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England? London, 1848, 2d ed., 1869: History of the Christian Church to the Reformation, 1553-73, 4 vols., new ed., 1873-75, 8 vols.; Sketches of Church History, 1855-78, 2 parts; Biography of Thomas Becket, 1856; Plain Lectures on the Growth of the Papal Power, 1876; edited Heylyn's History of the Reformation, 2 vols., for the Ecclesiastical Society, 1849; BAGRAVne's Alexander VII. and his Cardinals, 1868; and Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, 8 vols., in the Master of the Rolla series, Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain, 1875-82.

ROBINSON, Edward, D.D., LL.D., an eminent biblical scholar, and pioneer of modern Palestine exploration; b. at Southington, Conn., April 10, 1794; d. in New-York City, Tuesday, Jan. 27, 1863. He was graduated first in his class at Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y., 1816, and after studying law at Hudson, N.Y., in 1817 returned there as tutor in mathematics and Greek. He held the position only a year. On Sept. 3, 1818, he married Miss Eliza Kirkland, daughter of the Oneida missionary, who, however, died the next year. From his marriage until 1821 he worked on his wife's farm, but also pursued his studies. In the autumn of 1821 he went to Andover to superintend the printing of his edition of part of the Iliad (bk. 1-xix., xxvii., xxix.), which appeared in 1822, and while there, under Professor Moses Stuart's influence, began his career as biblical scholar and teacher. From 1828 to 1829 he was instructor in the Hebrew language and literature at Andover Theological Seminary, meanwhile busily occupied with literary labors. He assisted Professor Stuart in the second edition of his Hebrew Grammar (Andover, 1829, 1st ed., 1819), and in his translation of Winer's Grammar of the New-Testament Greek (1825), and alone translated Wahl's Clavis philologica Novi Testamenti (1825). In 1826 he went to Europe, and studied at Gottingen, Halle, and Berlin, making the acquaintance, and winning the praises, of Gesenius, Tholuck, and Roderig i. It is in, and not to determine, and, in the presence of his better sermons, it is invidious to inquire. His letters, so many of which are given in his biography, are as suggestive as his discourses; and the memoir, as a whole, is full of stimulus to all, but especially to those who are looking forward to the offices of the ministry. In his life he was often tempted to despair, as if he was spending his strength for nought; but his death has multiplied his usefulness, and widened his influence. Had he lived till now, it is questionable if he would have told on men in England and America to any thing like the extent that he is telling to-day.
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ROBINSON, Edward, D.D., LL.D., an eminent biblical scholar, and pioneer of modern Palestine exploration; b. at Southington, Conn., April 10, 1794; d. in New-York City, Tuesday, Jan. 27, 1863. He was graduated first in his class at Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y., 1816, and after studying law at Hudson, N.Y., in 1817 returned there as tutor in mathematics and Greek. He held the position only a year. On Sept. 3, 1818, he married Miss Eliza Kirkland, daughter of the Oneida missionary, who, however, died the next year. From his marriage until 1821 he worked on his wife's farm, but also pursued his studies. In the autumn of 1821 he went to Andover to superintend the printing of his edition of part of the Iliad (bk. 1-xix., xxvii., xxix.), which appeared in 1822, and while there, under Professor Moses Stuart's influence, began his career as biblical scholar and teacher. From 1828 to 1829 he was instructor in the Hebrew language and literature at Andover Theological Seminary, meanwhile busily occupied with literary labors. He assisted Professor Stuart in the second edition of his Hebrew Grammar (Andover, 1829, 1st ed., 1819), and in his translation of Winer's Grammar of the New-Testament Greek (1825), and alone translated Wahl's Clavis philologica Novi Testamenti (1825). In 1826 he went to Europe, and studied at Gottingen, Halle, and Berlin, making the acquaintance, and winning the praises, of Gesenius, Tholuck, and Roderig i. It is in, and not to determine, and, in the presence of his better sermons, it is invidious to inquire. His letters, so many of which are given in his biography, are as suggestive as his discourses; and the memoir, as a whole, is full of stimulus to all, but especially to those who are looking forward to the offices of the ministry. In his life he was often tempted to despair, as if he was spending his strength for nought; but his death has multiplied his usefulness, and widened his influence. Had he lived till now, it is questionable if he would have told on men in England and America to any thing like the extent that he is telling to-day.

LIT.—STOFFORD A. BROOKE, M.A.: Life and Letters of Frederick W. Robertson, M.A.: Sermons, first, second, third, fourth, and fifth series. WILLIAM M. TAYLOR.
the Gospels (far superior to the earlier editions); in 1836, a translation of Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon (5th edition, the last in which Robinson made any changes, 1854) and the independent Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament (revised ed., 1831). In 1837 he was called to be professor of biblical literature in the (Presbyterian) Union Theological Seminary, New-York City. He accepted, on condition that he be permitted first to spend some years (at his own expense) in studying the geography of the Holy Land on the spot. Permission being given, he sailed July 17, 1837, and in conjunction with Rev. Dr. E. Smith, an accomplished Arabic scholar, and faithful missionary of the American Board in Syria, thoroughly explored all the important places in Palestine and Syria. In October, 1838, he returned to Berlin; and there for two years he worked upon his Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount Sinai, and Arabia Petraea. This truly great work, which at once established the author's reputation as a geographer and biblical student of the first rank, appeared simultaneously in London, Boston, and in a German translation carefully revised by Dr. Robinson in Halle by Professor Rodiger, 1841, 3 vols. In recognition of his eminent services, he received in 1842 the Patron's Gold Medal from the Royal Geographical Society of London, and the degree of D.D. from the university of Halle, while in 1844 Yale College gave him that of LL.D. In 1852 he visited Palestine again, and published the results of this second visit in 1856, in the second edition of his Biblical Researches, and in a supplemental volume,—Later Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Regions: the third edition of the whole work appeared in 1867, 3 vols. Dr. Robinson regarded the work as a mere preparation for a complete physical, historical, and topographical geography of the Holy Land. But repeated attacks of illness undermined his constitution, and an incurable disease of the eyes obliged him in 1862 to lay down his pen. After his death in 1865, the first part, the Physical Geography of the Holy Land, which was all he had prepared, was published in English (London and Boston) and in a German translation by his wife (Berlin).

Meanwhile he had occupied himself with preparing an independent Greek Harmony of the Gospels (1843), which was far superior to any thing of the kind, and in 1846 an English Harmony. He also revised his other works for new editions, wrote numerous articles and essays, and lectured regularly in the seminary.

In May, 1862, he made his fifth and last visit to Europe, saw many old friends, but failed to receive any permanent benefit to his eyesight. In November he returned, and resumed his lectures; but at the Christmas holidays he was forced to cease, and after a brief illness died, Jan. 27, 1863.

Dr. Robinson was a man of athletic form and imposing figure, though somewhat bent in later years; of strong, sound good sense; reserved, though when in congenial company often very entertaining and humorous. He was thorough and indefatigable in his investigations, very sceptical of all monastic legends, very reverent to God's revelation. Outwardly cold, his heart was warm, and his sympathies tender. He is the most distinguished biblical theologian whom America has produced,—indeed, one of the most distinguished of the century. Of all his valuable works his Biblical Researches did most to perpetuate his memory. "The first real impulse, because the first successful impulse, towards the scientific examination of the Holy Land is due to the American traveller, Dr. Robinson." Ritter praised his "union of the acutest observation of topographic and local conditions with much preparatory study, particularly the erudite study of the Bible, and of philological and historical criticism" (Die Erdkunde von Asien, viii., div. ii. 73). Dean Stanley said, "Dr. Robinson was the first person who ever saw Palestine with his eyes open to what he ought to see" (Addresses in the United States, p. 26). The original manuscript of Dr. Robinson's Biblical Researches and a part of his library are in possession of the Union Theological Seminary.

For further information, see the memorial addresses of his colleagues, Drs. Hitchcock and Henry B. Smith, in Life, Writings, and Character of Edward Robinson (1863); Dean Stanley: Addresses in the United States, 1879, pp. 23-34; and the author's articles in Herzog, xiii. 13-16, and in McClintock and Strong, ix. 50-58. PHILIP SCHAFF.

ROBINSON, John, M.A. It is not certain where the subject of this sketch was born, probably in or near Gainsborough; but whether in Lincolnshire or Nottinghamshire we have no means of deciding: this we learn, however, that the event happened in 1575 or 1576. At the age of seventeen (in 1582) he was admitted to Corpus Christi (Benet's) College, Cambridge, which was then much inclined to Puritanism, where he remained for seven years. Having taken his degree, he was elected a fellow of his college in 1598-99, and went to Norwich, or some place in its neighborhood, about 1600, where, according to Ainsworth, "the cure and charge of . . . souls was . . . committed to him," and where he labored as a preacher about four years. Whilst here, those doubts which eventually ripened into convictions agitated his mind, and his Puritan practices led to his suspension from the ministry by the bishop of the diocese; after which, being denied the right of preaching in some leased building, and having failed to secure the master-ship of the hospital at Norwich (probably that which Harrison had held some years before),—for which failure Bishop Hall afterwards taunted him,—he left Norwich in 1604, resolved on separation. The resolution was a painful one; and with reference to it he said, "Had not the truth been in my heart 'as a burning fire shut up in my bones' (Jer. xx. 9), I had never broken those bonds of flesh and blood wherein I was so strictly tied, but had suffered the light of God to have been put out in mine own unthankful heart by other men's darkness." He doubtless knew of the existence of a company of Separatists, under John Smyth at Gainsborough, to whom he went, taking Cambridge on his way, where he consulted with Paul Baynes, Lawrence Chadderton, and others, as to the course he contemplated; and now he resigned his fellowship. When he arrived at Gainsborough, he was welcomed into the com-
pany of many who afterwards chose him for their pastor, and who now are known as the "Pilgrim Fathers." This Gainsborough society, for political reasons, divided, and became two distinct churches. Urged by the persecutions they endured, the original body, under Smyth, emigrated to Amsterdam in 1609; the wanderers consolidated at Bremer, and ordinarily met at Mr. Brewster's house; but, in consequence of continued persecution, these also resolved to emigrate, and went over to Holland in 1607 and 1608. They first went to Amsterdam, but only temporarily; and then (in February, 1609) Robinson and about a hundred of his friends applied to the burgomasters of Leyden, requesting permission to reside in their town. This permission was granted, and here the exiles remained for eleven years before the first Pilgrims left. In 1611 they purchased a building in the Ocksteeg, which they enlarged, and adapted it to their purposes, and made it their headquarters: and hence Robinson resided. In 1615 he became a member of the university of Leyden, where he honorably disputed with Episcopius on the points of Arminianism, and where he was greatly respected. The church increased under his ministry, but they still were strangers in a foreign land. They felt this, and longed for a dwelling-place where they might feel themselves at home: and, as their native land refused them a peaceful habitation, they turned their thoughts to America; there they thought they might find a home, and spread the gospel, and communion with them, and could welcome their godly friends to the fellowship of his own church. His life and works were published in England in three volumes by the Rev. R. Ashton, London, 1851. Further information respecting him is contained in Dr. Dexter's The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years, New York, 1860. 

ROBINSON, Robert, an able and erratical preacher of various opinions, but mostly connected with the Baptists; was b. at Swaffham in Norfolk, Jan. 8, 1735; and d. while on a visit to Dr. Priestley, at Birmingham, June 8, 1790. From 1761 he was pastor of a society at Cambridge. He translated Saurin's Sermons (1775-84, 5 vols.), and published some of his own, besides a History of Baptism, which appeared posthumously 1790, and other works. He wrote two very popular hymns, "Come, thou Fount" (1758), and "Mighty God, while angels bless thee" (1774).
He studied at Halle, where he became docent, 1826; extraordinary, 1830, and in 1835 ordinary professor of Oriental languages. In 1836 he went to Berlin in the same capacity. He was one of the first editors of the "Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft." His principal work is a continuation of Gesenius' "Novus Testamentus philologicus criticus lingua hebraea et chaldaea Vetus Testamenti Editio ii.," of which he edited the third volume, y-n (1842), and appended indexes, additions, and corrections (1855). He also edited Gesenius' "Hebrew Grammar" (14th to 21st ed.).

His independent works embrace De origine et indole arabicae librorum V. T. historiae interpretationis libri duo, Halle, 1838.

ROGATIONS. were religious processions, in which prayer was made for some special blessing. Soon after the age of persecution was over, the church manifested a tendency for public and festal processions (Sozomen, viii. 8). The ideas of prayer and penance were associated at an early date with them, and Rufinus ("Hist. Eccl., ii. 33") speaks of such a procession passing through the streets, in which the Emperor Theodosius took part, dressed in a penitential garment. These processions, and the prayers themselves, were also called "Litanies." For further information, see LITANY.

ROGERS, Ebenezer Platt, D.D., Reformed (Dutch); b. in New-York City, Dec. 18, 1817; d. at Montclair, N.J., Oct. 29, 1881. After a partial course at Yale College and Princeton Seminary, he was licensed in 1840, and settled pastor of the Congregational Church of Chicopee Falls, Mass., 1840-43; of the Edwards Congregational Church of Northampton, Mass., 1843-46; of the Presbytery Church of Augusta, Ga., 1847-53; of the Seventh Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Penn., 1853-56; of the North Reformed Dutch Church of Albany, N.Y., 1856-62; and of the South Reformed Dutch Church of New-York City, 1862-February, 1851. He was beloved as pastor and friend; a genial man, useful and honored in his different spheres of labor. Of his works embrace De origine et indole arabicae librorum V. T. historiae interpretationis libri duo, Halle, 1838.

ROGERS, Ebenezer Platt, D.D., Reformed (Dutch); b. in New-York City, Dec. 18, 1817; d. at Montclair, N.J., Oct. 29, 1881. After a partial course at Yale College and Princeton Seminary, he was licensed in 1840, and settled pastor of the Congregational Church of Chicopee Falls, Mass., 1840-43; of the Edwards Congregational Church of Northampton, Mass., 1843-46; of the Presbytery Church of Augusta, Ga., 1847-53; of the Seventh Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Penn., 1853-56; of the North Reformed Dutch Church of Albany, N.Y., 1856-62; and of the South Reformed Dutch Church of New-York City, 1862-February, 1851. He was beloved as pastor and friend; a genial man, useful and honored in his different spheres of labor. Of his independent works embrace De origine et indole arabicae librorum V. T. historiae interpretationis libri duo, Halle, 1838; Chrestom. Syr. c. Gloss., 1838.
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ROGERS, Ebenezer Platt, D.D., Reformed (Dutch); b. in New-York City, Dec. 18, 1817; d. at Montclair, N.J., Oct. 29, 1881. After a partial course at Yale College and Princeton Seminary, he was licensed in 1840, and settled pastor of the Congregational Church of Chicopee Falls, Mass., 1840-43; of the Edwards Congregational Church of Northampton, Mass., 1843-46; of the Presbytery Church of Augusta, Ga., 1847-53; of the Seventh Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Penn., 1853-56; of the North Reformed Dutch Church of Albany, N.Y., 1856-62; and of the South Reformed Dutch Church of New-York City, 1862-February, 1851. He was beloved as pastor and friend; a genial man, useful and honored in his different spheres of labor. Of his independent works embrace De origine et indole arabicae librorum V. T. historiae interpretationis libri duo, Halle, 1838; Chrestom. Syr. c. Gloss., 1838.

ROHRSCHACH, Johann-Friedrich, b. at Rossbach, July 30, 1777; d. at Weimar, June 15, 1848. He studied theology at Leipzig, and was appointed preacher at the university church there in 1802, pastor of Ostrau in 1804, and court-preacher at Weimar in 1820. He is one of the most prominent representatives of the so-called rationalismus vulgarius, and gave a full exposition of his views in his "Briehe über den Rationalismus, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1819. Afterwards he maintained a continuous opposition to orthodoxy and against the speculative ideas, in his periodicals, "Predigerliteratur (1810-14), Neue und Neueste Predigerliteratur (1815-19), and Kritische Predigerbibliothek (1820-48). But his controversy with Hase ("Antihumanismus"); and his attack on Schleiermacher immediately after the death of the latter, made it apparent that he was unable to understand the higher forms of religious life. Among his other works are "Palästina (1816, 8th ed., 1845), Luthers Leben und Wirken (1818, 2d ed., 1829), Die gute Sache des Protestantismus (1842); and a great number of sermons.

ROKYSKA, John, a Bohemian priest, who was the central figure in the ecclesiastical history of Bohemia, 1430-70. He first became prominent in 1427 by denouncing, in a sermon, the policy of Sigismund Korybut, who was attempting to bring about a reconciliation between Bohemia and the Pope. This led to the expulsion of Korybut, and the downfall of the moderate party for a time. Bohemia again resisted the arms of Europe with success; but the success was bought by exhaustion, which led it to listen to the overtures of the Council of Basel. In the conferences held at Basel, Rokycana was...
the chief controversialist on the Hussite side, and showed a conciliatory spirit. In the negotiations which followed, and which ended in the acceptance of the Compacts by the Bohemians, Rokycana took a chief part. His policy was that Bohemia should accept reunion with Rome on the basis of the Compacts, but, as head of the church, should secure its religious liberties. Before the Compacts were signed (1435), the Bohemians secretly elected Rokycana archbishop of Prague, with two suffragans. After the signing of the Compacts, Sigismund was received as king of Bohemia; but he did not recognize Rokycana as archbishop without the consent of the Council of Basel. The Catholic re-action in Bohemia was so strong, that in 1437 Rokycana was driven to flee from Prague, but resumed his office of archbishop when the influence of George Podiebrad became supreme, in 1444. From that time till his death he was closely associated with the policy of Podiebrad. He died in 1471, — two months before his master, King George, — at the age of seventy-four. The character and motives of Rokycana were much disputed during his lifetime, and have been so since. Like all men who try a policy of moderation, he encountered the hostility of the extreme parties. His plan of organizing a national church in Bohemia, led to his own elevation to the office of archbishop, and the question of his confirmation in his office was the question that stood foremost in the disputes with the Pope. Really Rokycana summed up in his own person, positions the aspirations of the more sagacious of the Bohemian statesmen. It is easy to accuse such a man of vanity, obstinacy, and self-seeking. His policy was proved by events to be impossible, and his position was scarcely tenable. He was driven to alternate between cowardice and rashness. He and King George failed, but their success would have been momentous for the future of Europe. They played a difficult game, but they played it against overwhelming odds with prudence and moderation.

WALTER. — See under Podiebrad. For the earlier part of Rokycana's career, the materials are to be found in Palacky: Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hussitenkriegs, Prag, 1872-73, 2 vols., and Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium Sacculi X V I, vol. I, Vienna, 1857. M. CREIGHTON.

ROMAINE, William, a noted English divine of the evangelical class, b. at Hartlepool, Durham, Sept. 23, 1714; d. rector of St. Ann's, Blackfriars, London, July 26, 1795. He was ordained in 1736, and as early as 1739 was bold enough to attack Warburton's Divine Legation in a sermon preached before the university of Oxford, where he had received his education. He was scarcely a match for so redoubtable an antagonist, though he was not wanting in scholarship. A Hutchinsonian in science and learning, he was, nevertheless, chosen professor of astronomy in Gresham College; but an Oxford sermon on The Lord our Righteousness, of an extremely Calvinistic type, excluded him forever afterwards from the university pulpit. However, popularity with the London citizens made up for his ejection in the midland seat of learning; and for many years he gathered crowded congregations at St. Andrew's Wardrobe, as well as St. Ann's, Blackfriars. He stood forth as the main pillar of Evangelization, which, in the last half of the eighteenth century, was reviving in the Church of England after the re-action against Puritanism consequent upon the Restoration a hundred years before. His place, therefore, in the history of theological literature in England; national organization of the Church of its church, should secure its religious liberties. The Catholic re-action in Bohemia was so strong, that in 1437 Rokycana was driven to flee from Prague, but resumed his office of archbishop when the influence of George Podiebrad became supreme, in 1444. From that time till his death he was closely associated with the policy of Podiebrad. He died in 1471, — two months before his master, King George, — at the age of seventy-four. The character and motives of Rokycana were much disputed during his lifetime, and have been so since. Like all men who try a policy of moderation, he encountered the hostility of the extreme parties. His plan of organizing a national church in Bohemia, led to his own elevation to the office of archbishop, and the question of his confirmation in his office was the question that stood foremost in the disputes with the Pope. Really Rokycana summed up in his own person, positions the aspirations of the more sagacious of the Bohemian statesmen. It is easy to accuse such a man of vanity, obstinacy, and self-seeking. His policy was proved by events to be impossible, and his position was scarcely tenable. He was driven to alternate between cowardice and rashness. He and King George failed, but their success would have been momentous for the future of Europe. They played a difficult game, but they played it against overwhelming odds with prudence and moderation.

WALTER. — See under Podiebrad. For the earlier part of Rokycana's career, the materials are to be found in Palacky: Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hussitenkriegs, Prag, 1872-73, 2 vols., and Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium Sacculi X V I, vol. I, Vienna, 1857. M. CREIGHTON.
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body of Christians. She stretches in unbroken succession back to the palmy days of heathen Rome, has outlived all the governments of Europe, and is likely to live when Macaulay's New Zealander, "in the midst of a vast solitude, shall take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

I. Doctrine. — The Roman-Catholic system of doctrine is contained in the ecumenical creeds (the Apostles', the Nicene with the Filioque, and the Athanasian), in the dogmatic decisions of the ecumenical councils (twenty in number, from 325 to 1870), the bulls of the popes, and especially in the Tridentine and Vatican standards. The principal authorities are the canons and decrees of the Council of Trent (1563), the Profession of the Tridentine Faith, commonly called the "Credo of Pius IV." (1564), the Roman Catechism (1568), the decree of the immaculate conception (1854), and the Vatican decrees on the Catholic faith and the infallibility of the Pope (1870). The best summary of the leading articles of the Roman faith is contained in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which is binding upon all Catholics, and must be confessed by all converts. It consists of the Nicene Creed and eleven articles. To these must now be added the two additional Vatican dogmas of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary and the infallibility of the Pope. The Roman Catholic system of doctrine was prepared as to matter by the Fathers (especially Irenæus, Cyprian, Augustine, Jerome, Leo I., Gregory I.), logically analyzed and defined and defended by the medie- val schoolmen (Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus), vindicated, in opposition to Protestantism, by Bellarmine, Bossuet, and Möhler, and completed in the Vatican dogma of papal infallibility, which excludes all possibility of doctrinal reformation. A question once settled by infallible authority is settled forever, and cannot be reopened. But the same authority may add new dogmas, such as the assumption of the Virgin Mary, which heretofore has been only a "pious opinion" of a large number of Catholics, as the immaculate conception was before 1854. See Tridentine Profession of Faith.

II. Government and Discipline. — The Roman Church has reared up the grandest governmental fabric known in history. It is an absolute spiritual monarchy, culminating in the Pope, who claims to be the successor of Peter, and the vicar of Christ on earth, and hence the supreme and infallible head of the church. The people are excluded from all participation even in temporal matters; they must obey the priest; the priests must obey the bishop; and the bishop, the Pope, to whom they are bound by the most solemn oath. This system is the growth of ages, and has only reached its maturity in the Vatican Council (1870). The claim of the Bishop of Rome to universal dominion over the Christian Church, so prestigiously professed by the clergy of the Catholic faith, goes back to the days of Leo I. (440-461), and was renewed from time to time by Nicholas I., Gregory VII., Innocent III., and Boniface VIII. But this claim was always resisted by the Greek Church, which claimed equal rights for the Eastern patriarchs, and by the German emperors and other princes, who were jealous of their sovereignty. The conflict between the Pope and the Emperor, between priestcraft and statecraft, runs through the whole middle age, and has been recently revived under a new aspect by the Papal Syllabus of 1864, which re-asserted the most extravagant claims of the medieval Papacy, and provoked the so-called Culturrkampf in Germany and France. But the stream of history cannot be turned backward.

The Pope is aided in the exercise of his functions by a college of cardinals (mostly Italians), whose number varies. At present it includes six cardinal-bishops, forty-five cardinal-priests, and fourteen cardinal-deacons. Archbishop McCloskey of New York is the first American cardinal, elected in 1875. The Pope was at first chosen by the Roman clergy and people; but since the time of Gregory VII. he is elected by the cardinals, who meet in conclave on the eleventh day of the vacancy, and elect either by quasi-inspiration unanimously, or by compromise, or by scrutinium, two-thirds of the votes being required. The Pope with the cardinals together form the consistory. The various departments of administration are assigned to Congregations, each of which must be confessed by all converts. It consists of the Nicene Creed and eleven articles. To these must now be added the two additional Vatican dogmas of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary and the infallibility of the Pope. The Roman Catholic system of doctrine was prepared as to matter by the Fathers (especially Irenæus, Cyprian, Augustine, Jerome, Leo I., Gregory I.), logically analyzed and defined and defended by the medie- val schoolmen (Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus), vindicated, in opposition to Protestantism, by Bellarmine, Bossuet, and Möhler, and completed in the Vatican dogma of papal infallibility, which excludes all possibility of doctrinal reformation. A question once settled by infallible authority is settled forever, and cannot be reopened. But the same authority may add new dogmas, such as the assumption of the Virgin Mary, which heretofore has been only a "pious opinion" of a large number of Catholics, as the immaculate conception was before 1854. See Tridentine Profession of Faith.

III. Worship and Ceremonies. — They are embodied in the Roman Missal, the Roman Breviary, and other liturgical books for public and private devotion. The Roman Church accompanies its members from the cradle to the grave, receiving them into life by baptism, dismissing them into the other world by extreme unction, and consecrating all their important acts by the sacramental mysteries and blessings. The worship is a most elaborate system of ritualism, which addresses itself chiefly to the eye and the ear, and draws all the fine arts into its service. Gothic cathedrals, altars, crucifixes, Madonnas, pictures, statues, and relics of saints, rich decorations, solemn processions, operatic music, combine to lend it great attractions for the common people and for cultured persons of prevailing aesthetic tastes, especially among the Latin races. But while the external splendor dazzles the senses, and satisfies the imagination, the mind and heart, which crave more substantial spiritual food, are often left to starve. Converts from Rome usually swing to the opposite extreme of utmost simplicity. Every day of the calendar is devoted to the memory of one or more saints. The greatest festivals are Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, the feast of the Immaculate Conception, the Annunciation (March 25), Purification (Feb. 2), Assumption of the Virgin Mary. But the weekly sabbath is not near as well observed in Roman-Catholic countries as in Great Britain and the United States. Catholic worship is the same all over the world, even in
language; the Latin being its sacred organ, and the vernacular being only used for sermons, which are subordinate. Its throne is the altar, not the pulpit (which holds a humble and temporary position). It centres in the mass, and this is regarded as a real though unbloody repetition or continuation of the atoning sacrifice of Christ on the cross. At the moment when the officiating priest pronounces the words, "This is my body," the elements of the atoning sacrifice of Christ on the cross. At the moment when the officiating priest pronounces the words, "This is my body," the elements of the atoning sacrifice of Christ are offered to God the Father for the sins of the living and the dead in purgatory. The Reformers saw in the mass a relapse into Judaism, a refined form of idolatry, and a virtual denial of the one sacrifice of Christ, who, "by one offering hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14). But Catholics deny the charge, and, reverently regard the mass as a dramatic commemoration and renewed application of the great mystery of redemption, and the daily food of the devout believer. On the Roman-Catholic worship, see the standard editions of the Missale Romanum, the Breviarium Romanum, and the Pontificale Romanum, also GEORGE LEWIS: The Bible, the Missal, and the Breviary, or Ritualism Self-illustrated in the Liturgical Books of Rome (Edinburgh, 1855, 2 vols.); and JOHN, MARQUES OF BUTE: The Roman Breviary translated out of Latin into English (Edinburgh, 1878, 2 vols.).

IV. HISTORY.—The earliest record of a Christian Church in Rome we have in Paul's Epistle to the Romans (A.D. 58). Though not founded by Peter or Paul, who came to Rome after the year 62, it may possibly be traced to those "strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes," who witnessed the Pentecostal miracle on the birthday of the Christian Church (Acts ii. 10). At all events, it is the oldest church in the West, and acquired great distinction by the martyrdom of St. Peter and Paul. The Vatican Hill, where the chief of the apostles was crucified, became the Calvary, and Rome the Jerusalem of Latin Christendom. The Roman martyrdom of Paul is universally conceded. The sojourn of Peter in Rome has been doubted by eminent Protestant scholars, and it can certainly not be proven from the New Testament (unless "Babylon" in 1 Pet. v. 13 be understood figuratively of Rome); but it is so generally attested by the early Fathers, Greek as well as Latin, that it must be admitted as a historical fact, though he probably did not reach Rome before A.D. 65, as there is no mention made of him in the Epistle to the Romans, nor in Paul's Epistles of the Roman captivity, written between 61 and 63. The metropolitan position of the city, whose very name means "power," and which for so many centuries had been the mistress of the world, together with the widespread belief that Christ (Matt. xvi. 18) had instituted a perpetual primacy of the Church in the person of Peter and his successors, which usually stands away in a corner, the bishops of Rome; here the scholastic theology, but, in opposition to it, also the growth of the Papal hierarchy, though in constant conflict with the secular power, especially the German Empire; here the closer resemblance of the Greek and Latin churches, notwithstanding their rivalry and antagonism. But, alongside with these Romanizing tendencies, we find also, in the school of St. Augustine, the evangelical doctrines of sin and grace, which were next to the Bible, the chief propelling force of the Reformation. We may distinguish three stages in the development of Roman Catholicism. (1) The age of ancient Graeco-Latin Catholicism, from the second to the eighth century, before the final rupture of the Greek and Latin communions. This is the common inheritance of all churches. It is the age of the Fathers, of ecclesiastical councils, and of Christian emperors. Many of the leading features of Roman Catholicism, as distinct from Protestantism, are already found in the second and third centuries, and have their roots in the Judaizing tendencies combated by St. Paul. The spirit of traditionalism, sacerdotalism, prelacy, ceremonialism, asceticism, monasticism, was powerfully at work in the East and the West, in the Nicene and post-Nicene ages, and produced most of those doctrines, rites, and institutions which are to this day held in common by the Greek and Roman churches. There are few dogmas and usages of Romanism which may not be traced in embryo to the Greek and Latin Fathers: hence the separation of the Greek and Roman churches, notwithstanding their rivalry and antagonism. But, alongside with these Romanizing tendencies, we find also, in the school of St. Augustine, the evangelical doctrines of sin and grace, which were next to the Bible, the chief propelling force of the Reformation. Wiclif in England, Hus in Bohemia, Wessel in Germany, Savonarola in Italy, the Waldenses, the Bohemian Brethren, the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, and the revival of letters, prepared the way for the great movement of the sixteenth century. It is the missionary age of Catholicism among the Latin and Teutonic races in Europe. Here we have the conversion of the barbarians in the north and west of Europe, under the fostering care of the bishops of Rome; here the growth of the Papal hierarchy, though in constant conflict with the secular power, especially the German Empire; here the scholastic theology, but, in opposition to it, also the growth of the Papal hierarchy, though in constant conflict with the secular power, especially the German Empire; here the scholastic theology, but, in opposition to it, also the growth of mysticism, and a more liberal biblical theology; here an imposing theocracy, binding all the nations of Europe together, yet with strong elements of opposition in its own communion, urging forward toward a reformation in head and members. The middle ages cradled the Protestant Reformation as well as the Papal counter-Reformation. Wiclif in England, Hus in Bohemia, Wessel in Germany, Savonarola in Italy, the Waldenses, the Bohemian Brethren, the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, and the revival of letters, prepared the way for the great movement of the sixteenth century, which emancipated Christendom from the spiritual bondage of Rome. (2) The age of Medieval Latin Catholicism, as distinct and separated from the Greek, extends from Gregory I., or from Charlemagne, to the Reformation of the sixteenth century. It is the missionary age of Catholicism among the Latin and Teutonic races in Europe. Here we have the conversion of the barbarians in the north and west of Europe, under the fostering care of the bishops of Rome; here the growth of the Papal hierarchy, though in constant conflict with the secular power, especially the German Empire; here the scholastic theology, but, in opposition to it, also the growth of mysticism, and a more liberal biblical theology; here an imposing theocracy, binding all the nations of Europe together, yet with strong elements of opposition in its own communion, urging forward toward a reformation in head and members. The middle ages cradled the Protestant Reformation as well as the Papal counter-Reformation. Wiclif in England, Hus in Bohemia, Wessel in Germany, Savonarola in Italy, the Waldenses, the Bohemian Brethren, the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, and the revival of letters, prepared the way for the great movement of the sixteenth century, which emancipated Christendom from the spiritual bondage of Rome. (3) The age of modern Romanism, dating from the Reformation, or, rather, from the Council of Trent (1563). This is Roman Catholicism, in opposition, not only to the Greek Church, but also to the development of the Papal hierarchy, which emancipated Christendom from the spiritual bondage of Rome. No Alexander VI., who was a monster of wickedness, nor Julius II., who preferred the sword to the staff, nor Leo X., who had more faith in classical literature and art than in the faith of the fábula de Christo, could now be elected to the chair of St. Peter. No such scandal as the Papal...
schism, with two or three rival popes cursing and excommunicating each other, giving rise to a divided church since the sixteenth century. On the other hand, the Papacy has given formal sanction to those scholastic theories and ecclesiastical traditions against which the Reformers protested. It expressly condemned their doctrines; and, by claiming to be infallible, it made itself doctrinally irrefutable.

In modern Romanism we must again distinguish two periods, which are divided by the reign of Pope Pius IX.

(a) Trinitarian Romanism is directed against the principles of the Protestant Reformation, and fixed the dogmas of the rule of faith (scripture and tradition), original sin, justification by faith and works, the seven sacraments, the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, invocation of saints, the veneration of relics, and indulgences. The "Old Catholics," who seceded in 1870, and were excommunicated, took their stand first on the Council of Trent, and charged the latter with apostasy and corruption; although in fact, and as viewed from the Protestant stand-point, the one is only a legitimate, logical development of the other.

(b) Tridentine Romanism is directed against modern infidelity (rationalism), and against liberal Catholicism (Gallicanism) within the Roman Church itself. It created, or rather brought to fruition, two new dogmas and two corresponding heresies,—concerning the Virgin Mary, and the power and infallibility of the Roman pontiff. These questions were left unsettled by the Council of Trent, and charged the latter with apostasy and corruption; although in fact, and as viewed from the Protestant stand-point, the one is only a legitimate, logical development of the other.

The reign of Pius IX. was very eventful in the history of the Papacy: it marked the height of its pretensions and the logical completion of its doctrinal system, but also the loss of its temporal power. On the very day after the passage of the Papal infallibility dogma (July 18, 1870), Napoleon III., the chief political and military supporter of the Pope, declared war against Protestant Prussia (July 19), withdrew his troops from Rome, and occasioned the utter defeat of Imperial France, the rise of the new German Empire with a Protestant head, and the downfall of the temporal power of the Papacy. Victor Emmanuel, supported by the chief political and military power of the Papacy, made it the capital of free and united Italy, and confined the Pope to the Vatican and to a purely ecclesiastical jurisdiction (Sept. 20, 1870). History has never seen a more sudden and remarkable revolution of the Papacy.

Pope Pius IX. involved himself in difficulties with Italy, Spain, Germany, France, and Russia, and excited the sympathies of the masses, first as an exile, and then as a prisoner in the Vatican. Yet his reign was longer than that of any Pope, and exceeded the traditional twenty-five years of Peter. The policy of his successor, Leo XIII., is wiser and more conciliatory.

The history of the Roman Church during the present century shows the remarkable fact, that she has lost on her own ground, especially in Italy and Spain, but gained large accessions on foreign soil, especially in England, by the secession of Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Manning, and several hundred Anglican clergymen and noblemen, since 1845, who sought rest in absolute submission to an infallible authority. On the other hand, this gain has been more than neutralized by the Old-Catholic secession in Germany and Switzerland, under the lead of Dr. Dollinger, Reinkens, and von Schulte, and other eminent Catholic scholars, whose learning and conscience did not permit them to submit to the Vatican decrees of 1870.

For particulars, see Papacy, Pope, Jesuits, Gallicanism, Ultramontanism, Immaculate Conception, Infallibility, Trent, Tridentine Consequence, Vatican Council, etc.

LIT.—The standard writers in explanation and defence of the doctrinal system of Romanism are Bellarmine (Disputationes de Controversia Christiana, fidei advers., huius temporis hereticis, 1560, 3 vols. folio, and often since), Bossuet (Exposition de la doctrine de l'Eglise catholique, 1571), Mohler (Symbolik, 8th ed., 1872), Ferrone (Prelectiones theologicae, 36th ed., 1881), Klek, Dieringer, Friedhof, Wiseman. The chief historical works by Roman Catholics are the Annales of Baronius, the Church Histories of Rohrbacher, Mohler (edited by Game), Alzog, Kraus, Hefele (Concilien, 1-12, down to the Council of Constance, a very valuable work), Döllinger (before his secession in 1870), Cardinal Hergenröther (Kirchengeschichte, in 3 vols., 2d ed., 1880). Of Spanish works, the able defence of Romanism by Balmes is more known and read in England than by a translation. Protestantism and Catholicism compared in their Effects on Civilization, 1851. In recent times the Roman Church has found its most zealous advocates among converts such as Dr. Hurter (the historian of Innocent III.), Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Manning, Dr. Orates Brownson (1844-76), who carried the weapons of Protestant learning and culture with them. The fullest repository of Roman-Catholic theological learning may be found in Abbé Migne: Nouvelle Encyclopédie Théologique, Paris, 1850 sqq., 52 vols. (a series of dictionaries on all branches of sacred literature), and in Wetzer and Welte: Kirchenlexikon oder Encyklopädie kathol. Theologie, in 12 vols. (Freiburg, 1847-58), which is now coming out in a revised form, begun by Cardinal Hergenröther, and continued by Dr. Kaulen, Freiburg-im-B., 1882 sqq. See also Berington and Kirk: The Faith of Catholics, on Certain Points of Controversy, contrived in 1749, and attacked by the Fathers, London, 1846, 3 vols.; 3d ed. by James Waterworth. Protestant works on and against the Roman

ROMAN-CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. This church is in its government divided into dioceses, under archbishops and bishops, and the sees of Texas, New Mexico, and California have been subject to Mexican sees. As Catholics increased in the United States by natural growth and immigration, sees were erected in 1868 at New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Bardstown. After the cession of Louisiana against to the United States in 1803, three sees were established at St. Louis and New Orleans; and, while Oregon was a disputed territory, a vicariate apostolic, and, soon after, an episcopal see, was founded (1846), dependent on Canada. In the territory subsequently acquired from Mexico, a bishopric existed, that of the two Californias, the bishop residing in Northern California. The other portions were soon placed under American bishops. These original dioceses have been, as the growth of the country required, subdivided, till there were in 1888 twelve archbishoprics, fifty-two bishoprics, nine vicariates apostolic, and one prefecture apostolic.

Each archbishopric, with the dioceses of the suffragan bishoprics, forms an ecclesiastical province. On the vacancy of a see by death, resignation, or removal, the archbishop and bishops of the province select three priests, whose names are sent to Rome; and the Pope, in his apostolic constitutions connected with the religious orders, in which members of those bodies pursued their theological course. The most important seminaries are, St. Mary's, Baltimore, founded in 1791, and directed by the Sulpitians; Mount St. Mary's Theological Seminary, Emmitsburg, Md.; St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N.Y.; the Seminary of St. Francis of Sales, near Milwaukee; St. Vincent's Theological Seminary, Cape Girardeau, Mo.; and the Seminary of Our Lady of the Angels, Niagara Falls, directed by the Lazarists. Of those connected with the regular orders, the most important are the House of Studies at Woodstock, Md., for scholastics of the Society of Jesus; the House of Studies at Ithaca, Md., for the Redemptorists; St. Vincent's Abbey, Westmoreland County, Penn., for the Benedictines; and St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, N.Y., for the Franciscans. There are also in Europe the American College at Rome, and the American College at Louvain, where candidates for the priesthood are prepared for duty in this country. The Missionary College of All Hallows, Drumcondra, Ireland, prepares young men for the priesthood to serve in other countries, and among them are thirty-one seminaries under the direction of the bishops, and also several similar institutions connected with the religious orders, in which members of those bodies pursued their theological course. The most important seminaries are, St. Mary's, Baltimore, founded in 1791, and directed by the Sulpitians; Mount St. Mary's Theological Seminary, Emmitsburg, Md.; St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N.Y.; the Seminary of St. Francis of Sales, near Milwaukee; St. Vincent's Theological Seminary, Cape Girardeau, Mo.; and the Seminary of Our Lady of the Angels, Niagara Falls, directed by the Lazarists. Of those connected with the regular orders, the most important are the House of Studies at Woodstock, Md., for scholastics of the Society of Jesus; the House of Studies at Ithaca, Md., for the Redemptorists; St. Vincent's Abbey, Westmoreland County, Penn., for the Benedictines; and St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, N.Y., for the Franciscans. There are also in Europe the American College at Rome, and the American College at Louvain, where candidates for the priesthood are prepared for duty in this country. The Missionary College of All Hallows, Drumcondra, Ireland, prepares young men for the priesthood to serve in other countries, and among them are thirty-one seminaries under the direction of the bishops, and also several similar institutions connected with the religious orders, in which members of those bodies pursued their theological course. The most important seminaries are, St. Mary's, Baltimore, founded in 1791, and directed by the Sulpitians; Mount St. Mary's Theological Seminary, Emmitsburg, Md.; St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N.Y.; the Seminary of St. Francis of Sales, near Milwaukee; St. Vincent's Theological Seminary, Cape Girardeau, Mo.; and the Seminary of Our Lady of the Angels, Niagara Falls, directed by the Lazarists. Of those connected with the regular orders, the most important are the House of Studies at Woodstock, Md., for scholastics of the Society of Jesus; the House of Studies at Ithaca, Md., for the Redemptorists; St. Vincent's Abbey, Westmoreland County, Penn., for the Benedictines; and St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, N.Y., for the Franciscans. There are also in Europe the American College at Rome, and the American College at Louvain, where candidates for the priesthood are prepared for duty in this country. The Missionary College of All Hallows, Drumcondra, Ireland, prepares young men for the priesthood to serve in other countries, and among them are thirty-one seminaries under the direction of the bishops, and also several similar institutions connected with the religious orders, in which members of those bodies pursued their theological course. The most important seminaries are, St. Mary's, Baltimore, founded in 1791, and directed by the Sulpitians; Mount St. Mary's Theological Seminary, Emmitsburg, Md.; St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N.Y.; the Seminary of St. Francis of Sales, near Milwaukee; St. Vincent's Theological Seminary, Cape Girardeau, Mo.; and the Seminary of Our Lady of the Angels, Niagara Falls, directed by the Lazarists. Of those connected with the regular orders, the most important are the House of Studies at Woodstock, Md., for scholastics of the Society of Jesus; the House of Studies at Ithaca, Md., for the Redemptorists; St. Vincent's Abbey, Westmoreland County, Penn., for the Benedictines; and St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, N.Y., for the Franciscans. There are also in Europe the American College at Rome, and the American College at Louvain, where candidates for the priesthood are prepared for duty in this country. The Missionary College of All Hallows, Drumcondra, Ireland, prepares young men for the priesthood to serve in other countries, and among them are thirty-one seminaries under the direction of the bishops, and also several similar institutions connected with the religious orders, in which members of those bodies pursued their theological course. The most important seminaries are, St. Mary's, Baltimore, founded in 1791, and directed by the Sulpitians; Mount St. Mary's Theological Seminary, Emmitsburg, Md.; St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N.Y.; the Seminary of St. Francis of Sales, near Milwaukee; St. Vincent's Theological Seminary, Cape Girardeau, Mo.; and the Seminary of Our Lady of the Angels, Niagara Falls, directed by the Lazarists. Of those connected with the regular orders, the most important are the House of Studies at Woodstock, Md., for scholastics of the Society of Jesus; the House of Studies at Ithaca, Md., for the Redemptorists; St. Vincent's Abbey, Westmoreland County, Penn., for the Benedictines; and St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, N.Y., for the Franciscans. There are also in Europe the American College at Rome, and the American College at Louvain, where candidates for the priesthood are prepared for duty in this country. The Missionary College of All Hallows, Drumcondra, Ireland, prepares young men for the priesthood to serve in other countries, and among them are thirty-one seminaries under the direction of the bishops, and also several similar institutions connected with the religious orders, in which members of those bodies pursued their theological course. The most important seminaries are, St. Mary's, Baltimore, founded in 1791, and directed by the Sulpitians; Mount St. Mary's Theological Seminary, Emmitsburg, Md.; St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N.Y.; the Seminary of St. Francis of Sales, near Milwaukee; St. Vincent's Theological Seminary, Cape Girardeau, Mo.; and the Seminary of Our Lady of the Angels, Niagara Falls, directed by the Lazarists. Of those connected with the regular orders, the most important are the House of Studies at Woodstock, Md., for scholastics of the Society of Jesus; the House of Studies at Ithaca, Md., for the Redemptorists; St. Vincent's Abbey, Westmoreland County, Penn., for the Benedictines; and St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, N.Y., for the Franciscans. There are also in Europe the American College at Rome, and the American College at Louvain, where candidates for the priesthood are prepared for duty in this country. The Missionary College of All Hallows, Drumcondra, Ireland, prepares young men for the priesthood to serve in other countries, and among them are thirty-one seminaries under the direction of the bishops, and also several similar institutions connected with the religious orders, in which members of those bodies pursued their theological course.
Indian missions, and attended the white settlements along the northern frontier and in the valley of the Mississippi. The Jesuit fathers at present conduct colleges at Georgetown (D.C.), Baltimore, New-York City, Fordham (N.Y.), Jersey City, Worchester (Mass.), Cincinnati, Detroit, St. Louis, Mobile, New Orleans, and 17 other cities. The Lazarists, or Priestsof the Mission, are engaged mainly in parochial work. The Passionists are devoted more especially to the giving of missions. The Lazarists, or Priestsof the Mission, are engaged chiefly in the direction of seminaries and colleges; Priests of the Holy Cross, in directing colleges, seminaries, and parochial work; the Benedictines, who have several abbeys, with colleges, schools, and churches in all parts of the country.

Churches and their Tenure. — The churches are in some cases held by the bishop or archbishop as trustee; in other States, by a board of trustees. As there is no membership in the Catholic churches, in the sense that the term is used in Protestant bodies, the application of the general laws made for the latter threw the choice of trustees into the hands of those who contributed least to the maintenance of the churches, and who seldom joined in the ordinances of the church. This led to vesting the title in the bishop as trustee, but the plan created other difficulties. In many parts the title to the church is now vested in a board consisting of the bishop, the pastor of the church, and two lay-trustees. The churches, colleges, colleges, and houses of the religious orders, are generally held by them under acts of incorporation.

The churches have been built almost exclusively by voluntary contributions, and are, as a rule, encumbered by mortgage-debts; the congregations being unable to meet the whole cost, and none of the churches possessing funded property. Large bequests, devises, and donations to churches or church-work, are as rare among Catholics in the United States as they are common among Protestants. A system grew up in churches, of accepting deposits, and paying interest, as a means of avoiding mortgages; but, as matters were rarely managed with the judgment of business-men, the result has often been financial ruin, as at St. Peter's Church, New York, Cincinnati, and Lawrence, Mass.

Education. — Prior to the Revolution, any distinctively Catholic schools were almost impossible; an academy for boys in Maryland, which was covertly maintained for several years, being almost the only example. Schools in connection with the churches were established as soon as Catholics were free; and, until public schools began to be established by State authority, the schools maintained by the different denominations were almost the only schools accessible to the children of the poorer classes. The Catholics have since been compelled to retain and extend their parochial system, as the State schools, in their general tone, influence, and text-books, are so decidedly Protestant as to make them a powerful means in alienating the young from Catholicity. The number of Catholic parochial schools in the United States is estimated at 2,500, and the number of pupils at nearly half a million. In these, religious instruction is given, with the usual branches taught in schools; and text-books are used free from matter offensive to Catholics. These books, in their educational form and mechanical execution, have been greatly improved within the last twenty years. Parish schools are, to a great extent, taught by members of religious orders and communities which make instruction their special work. Of these the chief are the Brothers of the Christian Schools, Brothers of the Holy Cross, Brothers of Mary, Xaverian Brothers, Franciscan Brothers, for boys' schools; Ursulines, Benedictines, Presentation Nuns, Sisters of Charity, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Sisters of St. Joseph, Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of St. Dominic, Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of the Immaculate Heart, for girls. For higher education, there are academies under some of the orders of Brothers; and, for young ladies, under the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, Ursuline Nuns, Sisters of Notre Dame, of the Holy Child, St. Dominic, St. Joseph, etc. The number of these academies was given in 1883 as 579. The colleges and universities for young men numbered 51; that at Georgetown, D.C., being the oldest. None of these institutions are endowed, or possess founded professorships. They are, with a few exceptions, owned and directed by religious orders,— Jesuits, Benedictines, Augustinians, Franciscans, Lazarists, Priests of the Holy Cross, Brothers of the Christian Schools. There is no Catholic college in the United States with a lay faculty, and only a few with a faculty of secular priests. Sunday schools are generally maintained in the cities, and where there is a resident pastor; but, as religious instruction is given in the parochial and other schools during the week, the Sunday-school system does not hold the same importance as among Protestant bodies.

The Catholic Press. — The necessity of diffusing religious intelligence among Catholics, and of meeting charges against the church, led to the establishment of Catholic newspapers. Of these the United-States Catholic Miscellany, founded by Bishop England of Charleston, was one of the first and ablest. There are in 1883 many published in various parts of the country, in English, German, French, Spanish, and Portuguese; the Freeman's Journal, published in New York, under the editorship of J. A. McMaster, being the most able and influential. There are several monthly publications of a literary and devotional character, such as the Word, the Freeman's Review, and one review, The American Catholic Quarterly, which fills the place long occupied by Brownson's Quarterly Review. For the diffusion of books among Catholics, attempts were twice made to establish publishing societies; but the Metropolis Press and the Catholic Publication Society
both failed to maintain themselves, and fell into private hands. The publication of Catholic books is left to individual publishers. The Sisters of Charity meet almost all wants, directing orphan and foundling asylums, homes for neglected children, reformatories for the vicious, industrial and parochial schools, general hospitals, insane-asylums, homes for the aged, and visiting the sick; the Sisters of Mercy visit the sick and prisons, and have houses for unemployed servant-girls; the Little Sisters of the Poor are devoted to the care of the aged; the Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, to hospital-work; the Bon Secours Sisters, to the nursing of the sick at their homes. The total number of charitable institutions reported for 1853 was 480. Almost without exception, these depend on voluntary contributions; none being endowed, and bequests of the wealthy being comparatively rare. Asylums for the treatment of insanity and the care of deaf-mutes have been established by sisterhoods in several places.

Charitable Institutions.— The relief of the poor and afflicted calls for the services of a number of religious communities of women, devoted to genuine or useful work. The Sisters of Charity meet almost all wants, directing orphan and foundling asylums, homes for neglected children, reformatories for the vicious, industrial and parochial schools, general hospitals, insane-asylums, homes for the aged, and visiting the sick; the Sisters of Mercy visit the sick and prisons, and have houses for unemployed servant-girls; the Little Sisters of the Poor are devoted to the care of the aged; the Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, to hospital-work; the Bon Secours Sisters, to the nursing of the sick at their homes. The total number of charitable institutions reported for 1853 was 480. Almost without exception, these depend on voluntary contributions; none being endowed, and bequests of the wealthy being comparatively rare. Asylums for the treatment of insanity and the care of deaf-mutes have been established by sisterhoods in several places.

Government.— The Canon law of the church, as modified by special grants or customs in France, was established in the churches under the French rule in New York, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin, and, as modified in Spain, was established in Florida and Louisiana and the former Mexican territory, with the regulations adopted by synods at Quebec and Santiago de Cuba, and by provincial councils at Santo Domingo and Mexico; but as, in all parts except New Mexico, the old population merged in the expansion of Catholics from the original territory of the republic, the early ecclesiastical law was well known at the present time. The United States is regarded as a missionary country, and the affairs of the Catholic Church here are conducted at Rome through the Congregation de Propaganda Fide. No parishes have been canonically instituted, as in Canada and Mexico; and consequently there are, except in a few instances, actually no parish priests properly so called. The priests are ordained sub titulo missionis, and bound to obedience to their bishop, and have, when assigned to quasi parishes, no canonical immobility. The church here tends to the establishment of canon law and the cout sale of Bibles, as is possible in this country and at this time. At present, however, the position of the priest is not so clearly defined as to prevent frequent appeals to Rome, and occasional suits in the State courts.

The first legislation in the Catholic Church in the United States was the synod of Baltimore, held by Bishop Carroll in 1791; and its regulations, with rules adopted by the bishops in 1810, were the only specific laws till the assembling of the first Provincial Council of Baltimore, convened in 1829, under the sanction of Pope Leo XII., by Archbishop Whitfield. The decrees of this council and of others held at Baltimore in 1833, 1837, 1840, 1843, and 1849, were approved by the popes, and became law in the church east of the Mississippi, and were accepted generally west of the river. In 1846 Oregon City was made a metropolitan see with two suffragans; and in 1847 St. Louis became the head of a province embracing the dioceses of Dubuque, Nashville, St. Paul, Chicago, and Milwaukee. In 1850 New York was made an archiepiscopal see, and the bishops of Boston, Hartford, Albany, and Buffalo, were made suffragans to it; Cincinnati was also made a metropolitan see, having Louisville, Detroit, Vincennes, and Cleveland as suffragans. In 1853 San Francisco became a metropolitan, with Monterey as a suffragan see; and in 1875 Boston was made an archiepiscopal see, with the bishops of Portland, Burlington, Springfield, Providence, and Hartford as suffragans; Philadelphia, with Pittsburgh, Harrisburg, Erie, Lancaster, and Wilmingtion as suffragans; Milwaukee, with Green Bay, La Crosse, Marquette, and St. Paul as suffragans; Santa Fé was also made an archiepiscop- pal see in 1875; and in 1880 Chicago, with Alton and Peoria as suffragans. In most of these new provinces, councils were also held by authority of the Holy See.— in Oregon in 1848; in New York, 1864, 1861, 1883;1 in Cincinnati in 1855, 1868,

[1 The fourth council of the Province of New York was held in New-York City, from Sept. 25 (Sunday) to Sept. 30, 1863. The opening and closing ceremonies in the cathedral were impressive. The language of the council was Latin, and in this language on the last day the decrees of the council were read (the bishops severally assigning). They were placed on the gospel side of the altar, signed by the cardinal, all the bishops (in the order of seniority), by Monsignor Freire, and by Father Farley, and then sent to Rome. The decrees related to morals and discipline, especially to marriage, in protest to lax views and practices, and to godless education; but the proceedings leading to them were secret. After the decrees were signed, an address was read, and the council dismissed with the solemn Papal benediction from the cardinal. The following "Acclamations" were sung at the conclusion of the services:

ARCHIDIACONS.— Sanctissime et Indivisus Triunfati, sempiternae laus ac gratiarum accla dium! CHORUS.— Gloria Tibi, Trinitas sancta, una Deus, et omnis sanctus, et nunc, et in perpetuum, et in saecula, et in saecula saeculorum! ARCH.— Beatissimo Papa, Jesus Christus, et Sponsa, et Mater, etc, etc. DCMD.*

CHOR.— Benedicta in regibus, et in potentibus, et in omnibus omni terra! AYCE.— Beatus Leon, Papa XIII, fidel doctor insalubri, multi annis, perennis felicitas!
1861, and 1882; in St. Louis in 1855, 1858; in New Orleans in 1856, 1860; in San Francisco in 1874 and 1882, in all of which, decrees were passed binding in those provinces, as those of Baltimore, continued in 1855, 1858, and 1869, were in that regard.

In the case of the Catholic population of the United States is the population of New Mexico, of Spanish and Indian origin. The white population is essentially descended from the first settlers, who occupied the country about 1580, and who, though expelled about a century after, soon returned. The original Spanish population of Florida all retired in the last century when the Colony passed into the hands of England. During the British sway, a number of Minorcans and Greeks were introduced by Mr. Turnbull, whose descendants form an important part of the Catholic population of that State.

By the archbishops and bishops of the whole church, as those of Baltimore, and discipline of the whole church in this country, plenary councils were held at Baltimore in 1862 and 1866, in which many decrees were adopted by the archbishops and bishops of the whole country. The decrees of these councils concern in their dogmatic part with the established doctrines of the church, and in matters of discipline are gradually bringing the economy of the church in this country into harmony with the discipline in other and older portions of the church.

The oldest Catholic body of population in the United States is the population of New Mexico, of Spanish and Indian origin. The white population is essentially descended from the first settlers, who occupied the country about 1580, and who, though expelled about a century after, soon returned. The original Spanish population of Florida all retired in the last century when the Colony passed into the hands of England. During the British sway, a number of Minorcans and Greeks were introduced by Mr. Turnbull, whose descendants form an important part of the Catholic population of that State.

The French settlements at Vincennes, Kaskasia, Cahokia, influenced by Rev. Mr. Gibault, welcomed Gen. Clark during the Revolutionary War; and their descendants form part of the Catholic population of the West and South. Detroit was long retained by England; and its French population underwent few changes, and their descendants still form a considerable part of the Catholic population.

The nucleus in the English Colonies was the body of colonists who came over in 1633 with Leonard Calvert. Many of the settlers were Protestants; and Calvert at once put up a church for their use; but the leading settlers, who occupied the country about 1580, and who, though expelled about a century after, soon returned. The original Spanish population of Florida all retired in the last century when the Colony passed into the hands of England. During the British sway, a number of Minorcans and Greeks were introduced by Mr. Turnbull, whose descendants form an important part of the Catholic population of that State.

In New York a number of Minors and Greeks were introduced by Mr. Turnbull, whose descendants form an important part of the Catholic population of that State.
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the growth was steady. Churches were begun in New York and Boston, and then at other cities near the coast, from Boston to Savannah. In consequence of the trouble caused by the outbreak of the Revolution in France, a community of Carmelite nuns came to Maryland; the English Dominicans, expelled from Bornheim, sent a part of their community to Kentucky; the Sulpicians began a seminary; and a number of learned and religious persons, especially priests, went to the United States, who did much to maintain a spirit of religion among the older and more recently arrived Catholics. Conversions to the Catholic religion became more frequent. Gov. Lee of Maryland, Rev. John Thayer of Boston, Rev. Mr. Kewley of New York, the Rev. Mr. Barber and his family, Ironsides, Richards, Holmes, and others, showed the influence of the liberty given to Catholics. This freedom was not absolute. In some States they were still disfranchised. In New York they could not sit in the Legislature. In Massachusetts the highest court in 1800 decided that a Catholic must pay for the support of the Protestant minister; and a priest was indicted for marrying a couple out of the limits of the city where he resided, although within the district assigned to him by the bishop.

Kentucky was settled largely by Catholics from Maryland, and had priests laboring there soon after the Revolution. The church there took form under the labors of Rev. Mr. Badin, Nerinckx, and Bishop Flaget, with the English Dominicans. The French priests of Kentucky visited the old French settlements in Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan; the Rev. Gabriel Richard becoming the chief missionary in the last State. In the East the French priests Matignon and Cheverus attended the Catholics of Boston and those scattered throughout New England.

Bishop Carroll had sought a division of his diocese at the very commencement of the century; but it was not till 1810 that bishops were appointed to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Bardstown, Ky. Increasing emigration soon led to a growth of the Catholic body in the other dioceses. When the agitation for Catholic emancipation began in England and Ireland, a counter-movement led to the publication of many works attacking the Catholic doctrines, discipline, and institutions. This brought increased controversies. Many of the works were reprinted in the United States; and the controversial literature begun by Carroll, Thayer, and Fleming, was continued, and reached its height about 1836, when works like those of Thaddeus Rutzen, Orestes A. Brownson, Robert Walsh, James A. McMaster, Dr. Levi Silliman Ives, the Redemptorist Father Müller.

The first Catholic churches erected in this country, except in Spanish parts, were generally plain and inexpensive; but with the growth of the body, churches and institutions of great solidity and beauty were erected, often beyond the means of the community, and involving loads of debt under which many churches are struggling. Of the churches, the finest is St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, one of the most striking ecclesiastical buildings in America.

The Catholic population is mainly Irish; but for the last forty years the German-Catholic element has been increasing steadily; so that, especially in the West, the Germans by their immediate descendants form a large part of the Catholic body. They are said to have about one-third of the priests in the United States, and they have a large number of bishops. They maintain several Catholic papers, and have many thoroughly organized societies. In the United States, who are large bodies of Canadian French.


There are no accurate data for estimating the Catholic population in the United States. As there is no system of membership in the Catholic Church such as obtains in many Protestant denominations, every one baptized and brought up in the Catholic faith, attending divine worship more or less regularly, and from time to time approaching the sacraments, is regarded as a Catholic, unless he distinctly disavows it by formally connecting himself with some other church. A Catholic Directory is published annually, made up of reports from the different archbishops and bishops, with estimates of population; but these are not always based on a census, or on the number of baptisms, which may be taken as that of live births. The population given for 1888 by this periodical is 6,832,954. The system adopted in the United-States census gives a much smaller population; but the census figures are based on the seating capacity of the churches, and in the Catholic churches in the cities and large towns this gives a number much below the real one. In these churches there are on Sundays three or four successive masses, each attended by a different congregation; and that capacity of 1,500 will and often does accommodate 6,000. Thus in Hartford, in April, 1881, an actual count showed 12,481 attending five Catholic churches, and 12,000 attending forty Protestant churches on the same day. Similar enumerations elsewhere gave similar results, showing that a Catholic congress in a city of ten or twelve churches, will often times the seating-capacity of the church. The Catholic population is mainly in the North-
ern and newly settled Western States, and is comparatively small in the States which till recent times have been inhabited chiefly by people from Louisiana, where the original population was exclusively Catholic. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Louisiana have about one-third of the population Catholic, according to Catholic estimates; New York, Wisconsin, and California, one-fourth; Maryland, Minnesota, Colorado, and Dakota, one-fifth; Illinois, New Jersey, Idaho, and Washington Territory, one-sixth; Pennsylvania, one-seventh; Michigan and Kentucky, one-eighth; Ohio and Nebraska, one-ninth; Maine and New Hampshire, one-tenth; but in Virginia the Catholics are one in forty to the population; in Georgia, one to sixty; in Tennessee, one to fifty; in Alabama and Mississippi, one to eighty; in South Carolina and Arkansas, one to one hundred; and in North Carolina, where there is the smallest proportion of Catholics, one to nine hundred.

**Progress of Catholic Church in United States.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Priests</th>
<th>Churches</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1,085,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>2,262,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4,973</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6,646</td>
<td>6,941</td>
<td>6,882,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Catholic body includes many of foreign nationality. The German and Irish Catholics, with their immediate families born here, each constitutes probably about one-fourth of the whole; most of the other half being American-born, with a smaller proportion of other nationalities.

**Missions.** — No missionary society exists among the Catholics of the United States for home or foreign missions; nor is there any tract society for the breaking up of the missions left them for more than a generation without religious guides. The Franciscans had extensive missions in California, which were also broken up by the Mexicans, and most of the Indians perished: the few survivors known as Mission Indians are still Catholics. The Benedictines under Bishop Marty are attempting work among the Sioux in Dakota, and under Abbot Robot among the tribes in Indian Territory. No organized effort has been made to reach the negroes of the South. There are many colored Catholics in Maryland and Louisiana; and the Sisters of Providence, a community of colored women, have long been in charge of Catholic schools. The Benedictines have made some efforts in Savannah, on Skidaway Island, Ga.; and some fathers of St. Joseph, and secular priests, have charge of colored churches in several places: but the work has not attained any great development. All these missions to Indians and negroes are under the bishops of the dioceses in which they are situated.

ROME AND CHRISTIANITY. 2068 ROME AND CHRISTIANITY.


ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY, THE.

A view of the relations of Christianity to the Roman Empire would embrace a consideration of three distinct epochs in Roman history: (1) That period (about three hundred years) when Christianity was brought into conflict with the old religious beliefs and policy of the empire, and was gradually converting the Roman world to the faith; (2) The period during which Christianity became the official and state religion of the empire, from the reign of Constantine to that of Charlemagne, about five hundred years; (3) That long period, commonly called the "middle age," when Western Christendom was ruled under a system called the "Holy Roman Empire," formed by a close alliance of the Popes with Charlemagne and his successors.

The religion of the Romans had its origin in the worship by each family of its own household and tutelary divinities, in whom the souls of their ancestors were supposed to be enshrined. The religion of the civitas consisted in honoring, under the name of numina, those physical forces of nature, which, unpropitiated, might, it was feared, prove dangerous to the safety of the State. The Romans were regarded by the ancients as a most religious people. The forms of family and of state religion were carefully observed by them in every event of life. The safety and protection of the State was the great object of all Roman policy, and it had for its basis religious beliefs. The cultus was entirely under the control of the civil authority. There was no priestly caste at Rome, after the manner of the Orientals. Pontiffs, augurs, and priests performed certain special functions in ascertaining the will of the gods; but they did so only under the direction of the lay authorities. Devotion, accompanied by enthusiasm or demonstrative feeling, was considered wholly out of place in the worship of the Roman divinities. Calmness, moderation, self-possession, on the part of the worshippers, were essential qualities when the favor of the gods was to be invoked. The most important peculiarity in their ritual was the exact observance of those forms, which, it was supposed, their ancestors had employed successfully in their worship. In the most religious of the Romans there was a certain superstition that the very substance and essence, not merely of religious worship, but of religious faith also. Thus, while the best characteristics of Roman life were gradually developed, religion presented itself to the minds of the people as having one sole object in view; namely, the safety and prosperity of the State, and as providing, as the only method of reaching that object, the maintenance and exact observance of the ancestral ritual.

When Rome became mistress of the world, this intensely national religious system had been a good deal weakened by Flagon, newspapers, including the Plenary and Provincial Councils in the Collectio Lacensis, and as originally issued; Synods in various Dioceses; Smith: Ecclesiastical Law; works of Archbishop Hughes, and Spalding, and Bishop England; Catholic periodicals and newspapers, including the Annals of the Propagation of the Faith. John Gilmary Shea, LL.D. (R. C. C.).
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The introduction of the worship of foreign deities, chiefly from Egypt and the East, such as Isis, Serapis, and, later, the Mithraic ritual; (2) The destructive criticism of the basis of the popular religion by philosophers and poets, who followed the example given them by the Greeks. To meet these assaults, it was said that any one was free to believe what he chose, provided he punctually observed the ancient prescribed ritual of worship. And such, strange to say, was the belief and practice of the Romans when their power was greatest, and when patriotic virtue was strongest amongst them. The fitting types of the religion they professed are Cicero, who has, of all the ancient authors, written most fully in its praise, and who believed in no gods whatever; and the supreme pontiff, Julius Cesar, who, notwithstanding he was the official head of the Roman religion, stoutly denied the immortality of the soul in the Senate House.

The new gods and the new philosophy worked a great change towards the close of the republic; and Augustus found, when he became emperor, that the practice of the old religious rites had been almost given up. Incredulity and materialism had driven the worshippers of the old gods from their temples, so many of which had fallen into ruin, that Augustus rebuilt no less than eighty-two of them in Rome alone. His policy was to found his empire upon a conservative basis. It would appear that there was still left some faith in the old forms, and he selected the religious sentiment of the people as most convenient for his purpose. At the same time the conquests of Rome had impressed him, in common with many statesmen of the time, with the belief that the religions of all countries had a similar basis, and that their diverse gods were really manifestations of the same divine power under different names. On this principle, foreign religions were tolerated in Rome and throughout the empire, always, however, under the condition, express or implied, that they did not interfere with that of the state. The apotheosis, or deification of the emperors, which began under Augustus, is, perhaps, the truest expression of the actual religious sentiment of the time. It formed the empire religion, which, in imitation of the narrow worship of the civitas, made the supremacy of the empire the great object of religious interest, devotion, and worship. Still, the observance of the rites of the old national worship was carefully kept up. Foreign religions asked for no exclusive privileges; and the only restriction which was placed on their votaries was, that they should do no act which was inconsistent with the preservation of the safety and supremacy of the Roman Empire.

Christianity had thus at the outset to meet, (1) the old Roman popular religion; (2) the devotion to foreign deities, chiefly Egyptian and Oriental, which had become fashionable among the higher classes; (3) the religion which was based upon the deification of the emperors. Of course, the hostility between its system and these forms of religion was irreconcilable. The point at which
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St. Paul and his companions in the cities of Greece were frenzied by the open neglect of the Jewish religion, as beyond their jurisdiction. It would appear that neither the belief nor the worship of the early Christians, as long as they were so obscure as not to attract public notice, subjected them to the penalties of Roman law. The cruel sufferings which they endured at Rome, under Nero (A.D. 64), seemed to have been due to a desire on the part of that tyrant to make the Jews odious by attributing the burning of Rome to one of the parties or sects of that people, as the Christians were then popularly supposed to be. At any rate, it is very certain that the Christians had nothing to do with burning the city; and the persecution of Nero, so called, was a local one, not extending beyond the limits of Rome itself. The letter of Pliny to the Emperor Trajan (A.D. 103), asking his advice as to the treatment of the Christians in Bithynia, shows that both parties seem to be dealing with a new problem, at any rate, with one which had not yet been settled by imperial legislation. Doubtless, Pliny had, by virtue of the imperium confided to him, punished severely those who had been guilty of overt acts of impiety by refusing to pay divine honors to the emperor; but he is evidently puzzled to know what he is to do with those persons, who, while their belief and worship are not in accord with the national rites, have been guilty of no outward act of disobedience to the government. Heresy was a crime the punishment for which had not then been provided for in the Roman code; and hence these two men, certainly amongst the most enlightened of their age, agree, while having absolute power, upon a policy of moderation and conciliation towards those whose religious opinions differed from those of the old Roman faith.

While the government thus forbore persecuting the Christians for heresy, still the populace in the large cities in the East, where the Christians were numerous, became, for various reasons, intensely imbittered against the new religion. The Christians naturally kept themselves more and more aloof from their fellow-subjects. They regarded the order to throw a few grains of incense upon the altar of the gods or of the emperor, not as a test of loyalty, but as an invitation to that the world would soon be consumed by fire, and that all who did not worship the Christian God were doomed to eternal punishment. Under the circumstances large towns were frenzied by the open neglect of their own religious rites, and attributing every calamity they suffered to the wrath of their offended gods, frequently shouted, "The Christians to the lions!" And the complaisant procurators, willing to do them a pleasure, too often yielded to their demands.

It is observable, that the first Roman legislation bearing directly on the position of the Christians in the empire is found in the edicts of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, by which Christianitv was not persecuted, but many Christians were rescued from the fury of the mob, and handed over for trial, for their offences against the Roman religion and Roman law, to the regular tribunals. It is also to be observed, that although the open profession of the Christian faith, and especially its propagation by means of proselytism, necessarily violated the Roman law, the offence was not an ecclesiastical crime in the modern sense. The Roman gods were guarded from insult by the Roman law, because their favor was considered essential to the safety of the State. Their claims to reverence were defended, not by the Pontifex Maximus, but by the emperor.

Under this jurisprudence, many Christians were tried, and condemned to death, under the Antonines. The martyrs of this age included some of the most illustrious early Christian confessors,—Polycarp at Smyrna, for instance; St. Justin, the Christian apologist at Rome; and a large number of disciples at Lyons, including the celebrated St. Blandina. For nearly a hundred years after the Antonines, the hand of persecution was measurably stayed. The emperors who ruled during that period knew, and cared as little for the old Roman gods as they did for the Roman Senate and people. They were mostly ignorant but successful soldiers, who had risen from the ranks, and were wholly imbued with Oriental superstitions.

In the beginning of the third century, there was a renewal, under two emperors, of the persecution of the Christians, from different motives. Severus, in order to avenge the neglected Serapis, the god of his predilection, condemned many Christian worshippers in Egypt and in Northern Africa; while Decius, hoping to propitiate the old gods, to whose neglect he ascribed the decay of the Roman power, caused many Christians at Rome, including their bishop, to be put to death. The last serious effort which was made by the government to arrest the triumphant progress of Christianity was the adoption of a new form of Paganism as the official religion,—a system in which some rude notions of the unity of God were mingled with the recognition of the power of the old gods as that of subordinate divinities, and with certain forms of sun-worship. Christianity, under this new Paganism, was, so to speak, outlawed. By the edict of Diocletian and Galerius, its churches were destroyed, and its property confiscated; and in one sense the Church suffered from this persecution to a greater degree than from all the rest. But either the number of the Christians was too great, or their faith was too strong, to be overcome by the new enemy. The dying Galerius, in 311, while he justified the measure as undertaken to secure the public welfare and the unity of the State, revoked the edict of persecution as not adapted to secure its ends, and
thus gave to the Christians permission for the free and public exercise of their religion. The Edict of Milan (312), issued in the joint names of Constantine and Licinius, has been called the "great charter of the liberties of Christianity;" but it was no more than an edict of unlimited toleration. Still, it withdrew official recognition and protection from pagans; and under its operation the old Roman religion gradually and slowly died out. Christianity was not recognized as the official religion until the reign of Theodosius, 380. Whether Constantine was a Christian is an historical problem not easy to solve. He purposely delayed baptism until he was in articulo mortis. But, whether Christian or not, vast changes took place during his reign, caused not merely by the unrestricted progress of Christianity, but by the relations which the emperor held towards its organized form, the Church. No one can read the account of the proceedings of the Council of Nicaea in 325, which condemned the Arians, from that period to this has been regarded as the basis of the faith of the universal church, without being convinced that the emperor was regarded as something more than the honorary president of that body, that he considered himself at least as Pontifex Maximus in the new religion, as his predecessors had been in the old; and thus at the very outset was forced upon the infant Church that unholy alliance with the State, which, among other things, has helped to make Christianity so conspicuous an element in all subsequent history. The modern conception of the union of Church and State has its origin under Constantine. His successors, Theodosius and Gratian, defined or ratified the definition of doctrines, and condemn heretics. Justinian evidently thought himself Pope and emperor combined; and Charlemagne, in his Capitularies, is at once the legislator of the Church and of the State.

The Christian Church received from Constantine another distinguishing mark, which it retained for nearly fifteen hundred years; namely, the principle and the practice of punishing heretics by civil penalties. It is an humiliating confession to make, that here also — which is defined to be an evident and open heresy by which a man has been condemned by the church — is an offence which has never been punished as a crime by the civil magistrate under any ecclesiastical system save the Christian. But Constantine provided by an edict that the Donatist heretics should be so punished in 316, and his example was followed by Theodosius and others; so that before the close of the fourth century no less than seventeen edicts had been promulgated, directing the magistrates to punish Christian dissenters. By these edicts they were deprived of their property, and made incapable of holding office, and they were liable to be scourged and banished. The first blood judicially shed for religious opinion is said to have been that of certain Manicheans in 385; but it is alleged that their condemnation was extorted from an usurping emperor, and that the infliction of death as a punishment was highly objected to by such saints as Martin of Tours and Ambrose of Milan.

During the fourth century the pretensions of the Christian hierarchy to power were greatly increased, and the primitive simplicity of the conduct of Christians no longer existed. The church had vast possessions; its clergy formed the larger portion of the educated classes, and held conspicuous positions at the imperial court. Christian beneficence was not only recognized as a duty, but it became the fashion, or, rather, a passion among people of rank and wealth, to lavishly give to the church, and it was required that the town worked generally harmoniously with the bishop in the administration; the bishop, indeed, becoming the most conspicuous officer in the municipia. In short, society during the fourth century, both in the East and the West, became Christianized. A revolution had begun which not only destroyed the outward forms of Paganism, but which gradually worked out its spirit from the minds of the people. Nowhere can we find a better illustration of the recognized power of the clergy than where Ambrose, archbishop of Milan, has the courage to forbid the Emperor Theodosius (390) to enter the church, much less to receive therein the sacraments, until he had undergone penance for the crime of the massacre at Thessalonica, of which he had been guilty.

To this new condition of society a good deal of the legislation of Constantine and his successors corresponds. Much of that legislation is characterized by its humane spirit, and is in such striking contrast with the old Roman ideas, that we can hardly mistake in tracing in it the direct influence of Christian doctrine and moral example: such, for instance, are the edicts forbidding the exposition of infants, and restraining excessive cruelty towards slaves, as well as those concerning adultery, divorce, unnatural crimes, etc. How much of all this was due to what may be called the "reflex action" of Christianity, and how much to the humane principles of stoicism, it is not easy to say.

As the fourth century witnessed a succession of Christian emperors, and the firm establishment of the dogmatic creed of Christianity in the empire, so the fall of Pagan and imperial Rome, and the building-up of a new and Christian Rome upon its ruins, occurred during the fifth. The rise of the church, and capture of Rome by Alaric and his Goths, in 409, opens, therefore, a new era in history. Rome then ceased to be the conqueror of the world in the old sense; but, as soon as she became Christian, she prepared to wield a far greater power over mankind than she had ever yet done. As the imperial power declined through corruption, weakness, and the assaults of the Barbarians, that of the Church, which availed herself freely of the imperial methods and organization, constantly increased. The power of civil government, especially in the West, fell into her hands naturally and necessarily, simply because the rulers, in the general confusion, were incapable of affording protection to those whom they governed. The capture of Rome by Alaric, therefore, was one of the great steps by which the popes, bishops of Rome, rose to power. The Pope at that time was doubtless the most important man in Rome; he alone, happened — not merely the attributes of supremacy, but authority very extensive in practice, although undefined. To him the panic-stricken Senate and people turned for help in time of danger;
and he (Leo I.) justified their confidence by striving, first to mitigate the anger of Alaric, and, secondly, to induce the cowardly Honorius, safe amidst the morasses of Ravenna, to send succor to the sorely pressed people of Rome. For the reason of that city, which was in the hands of his bishop. No emperor ever afterwards resided there. Meantime, in the East the union between Christianity and the imperial government became more thoroughly consolidated. The provisions of the Code of Justinian (529–565) are the best illustration how far this process had been carried; this code being a revised edition, so to speak, of the existing imperial law. It begins with a profession of belief in the Nicene Creed and in the authority of the first four General Councils. It acknowledges the supremacy of the Roman Church, commanding all the churches to be united with her. Justinian legislates, therefore, in this code, for Rome as well as for the East. The theory that the emperor is the religious as well as the civil head of the empire is maintained throughout his legislation. The church officials are as much under his jurisdiction as the civil magistrates. There are no exemptions from the ordinary operation of the civil law. The hierarchy in the Church, as in the State, is regulated by the provisions of this code; and the bishop is made an imperial officer for certain temporal affairs. There are also minute regulations in this code concerning the discipline of the monasteries. These provisions in regard to the relations of the Roman Government to Christianity in the sixth century, form, of course, but a small portion of the great Code of Justinian; but they seem to show very clearly, either that the hierarchial and sacerdotal pretensions of later ages were not then put forward, or that the imperial government wholly ignored them. Religion and civil law, Church and State, appear in the legislation of Justinian to be practically identified under the common supremacy of the emperor; and church law throughout the world is based on Roman ideas and methods, which were the outgrowth of the theory of the absolute unity of the State.

As far as we can say that the progress of Christianity was henceforth dependent upon human agencies, we may affirm that its special course and direction, so different in the eastern and in the western portions of the empire, was determined by the different relations it held to the government at Constantinople and at Rome.

The strength of Christianity as organized by the emperors of the East was very much wasted in perpetual controversies in regard to the nature of Christ. The emperors particularly participated actively in these discussions, which were regarded as matters of the highest State concern. They resulted in rending asunder the Christian organization of the East; and the Oriental sects of the Nestorians, Jacobites, Maronites, etc., were not only heretics in religion in the eyes of the authorities at Constantinople, but they were also affected to the imperial government because it did not maintain what they regarded as the orthodox creed. These religious dissensions were, no doubt, a main cause of the increasing weakness of the Byzantine government in its control of the lands forming the basin of the Mediterra-
The transaction is, that it was intended by the parties to it to divide the government of the world between them. To the new emperor and his successors, kings of the Franks, duly crowned by the Pope, was assigned universal rule in temporal affairs, as also the duty of defending the church, and of maintaining the true or Catholic faith throughout the empire. To the Pope was assigned supreme dominion in matters ecclesiastical, but a certain great but undefined power in civil affairs. It was supposed, that, under this dual system, no collision between the Christian emperor and the Christian pontiff was possible, each being necessarily moved by the same impulse. This scheme was a strange mixture of the Roman idea of universal dominion and absolute unity of government with St. Augustine's theory, that it was the chief purpose of God in creating man that there should be a visible society on earth, called "the church," by means of which the city of man should become in due time the city of God.

Under this new or revived Roman Empire the relations of the Popes with the kings of the Franks or of Germany—"Roman Emperors," as they were styled—were maintained during the middle age and up to the time of the Reformation. Practically it was a great failure; because it was found impossible for the parties to it to agree upon what special powers were reserved by it to the emperor, and what belonged to the Pope. Disputes on this subject were kept alive during the reigns of the kings of Germany of the three dynasties, the Saxon, the Franconian, and the Hohenstauffen, founded upon claims made by them by virtue of their office as emperors, as opposed to those of the Popes; and yet the system of the Holy Roman Empire, unsuited as it proved itself to be to the feudal society which had succeeded the imperial system of Charlemagne, was maintained legally and nominally in the public law of Europe until long after the Reformation.

It held its place notwithstanding the long quarrel of "the Investitures," in which the real question at issue was whether the Pope or the emperor should control the bishops (then a class by far the largest landholders in Europe) by conferring upon them with their office the estates belonging to their sees. Even the humiliating scene of the world's titular master, Henry IV., imploring in abject penitence the forgiveness of the Pope, Gregory VII., because he had previously disavowed the Pope's authority, did not disabuse men's minds of the belief that a Roman empire with an emperor and a pope at its head was part of the eternal order. Nor did the haughty sacerdotal pretensions of the popes during the middle age; nor the enforced payment of tribute to the court of Rome; nor the constant interference of the popes in the affairs of the empire, such as wars of succession and the like; nor even the purely secular ambition which led many of the popes to maintain their pretensions in Italy as against the emperor by all the weapons of the spiritual armory, and which in the end forced the emperors to abandon Italy,—nor these things suffice to disrupt the legal relations at least which had been established between the popes and Charlemagne and Otho the Great.

But the Reformation destroyed in the end this strange medieval creation. More than half of Germany was Protestant in 1848, when the Peace of Westphalia closed the wars of religion by providing for the direct sovereignty of the different princes, and abolishing that of the emperor, and granting "equal and exact" toleration to Catholics and Protestants. This really made the former empire a federation; for its affairs were ruled by a diet representing the different states, and it was inconceivable that an empire in the medieval sense could exist where the jurisdiction of the Pope was disavowed. Still, the lawyers in Germany clung obstinately to the old forms of the Roman law; and when a vacancy occurred the elections were held, and the Roman emperor duly installed in the Römer Saal at Frankfurt. This mockery was kept up until 1806, when Napoleon, having become Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine, and refusing to recognize any longer the existence of the Holy Roman Empire, Francis I., then emperor, voluntarily gave up the title, and took that of "Emperor of Austria;" and thus the Holy Roman Empire came to an end a thousand and six years after the coronation of Charlemagne, and eighteen hundred and fifty-eight years after Caesar had conquered at Pharsalia.


ROMANCE BIBLE VERSIONS. See Bible Versions.

ROMANS, Epistle to the. See Paul.

ROMANUS ascended the papal throne in 897, after the assassination of Stephen VII., but reigned only four months. See Jaffé: Regesta Pont. Rom., p. 303.

ROME has been more closely interwoven with the history of the civilization of the human race than any other city on the globe. Other single-point other cities may excel it. It has no Gotho, and it has no Acropolis; but all the single threads of ancient history were gathered in Rome, and from Rome issued all the single threads of modern history.

More especially Rome may be said to have been the centre of the history of the Christian Church. From the third to the sixteenth century it was, in spite of the schism of the Eastern Church, and in spite of a never fully suppressed opposition in the Western, the pivot on which the Christian Church rested; and from the Reformation down to the civil questions within the empire, such as wars of succession and the like, nor even the purely secular ambition which led many of the popes to maintain their pretensions in Italy as against the emperor by all the weapons of the spiritual armory, and which in the end forced the emperors to abandon Italy,—nor these things suffice to disrupt the legal relations at least which had been established between the popes and Charlemagne and Otho the Great.

But the Reformation destroyed in the end this
the papal idea of transforming Christianity into a kind of Thibetan Lamaism developed, imperial Rome, with its temples, palaces, theatres, and baths, disappeared, and on its ruins, and from its materials, papal Rome was constructed, with its churches and monasteries. The connection between the city and its rulers was now as intimate as that between body and soul; nevertheless, it must not be overlooked, that the city actually sank lowest at the very moment when the Papacy rose highest. When the popes removed to Avignon, Rome was nothing more than a number of short stretches of grass, brushwood, and ruins, in which the robbers lay in ambush for the pilgrims who wandered from church to church, or from monastery to monastery; and it was not so much the return of the popes as the revival of letters which this time saved the city, and once more made it the centre of civilization. During the whole period of the Renaissance, Rome was indeed the true hearth of science and art, of learning and taste, until in the eighteenth century it met with a rival, which finally outshone it, namely, Paris. In the middle of the nineteenth century the city again changed character. It became a political centre, and, after some convulsions, the capital of the kingdom of Italy; and by degrees, as royal Rome unfolds itself with its schools, factories, hotels, and commodious citizens' dwellings, papal Rome is pressed into the shadow, and becomes a memory.

On Sept. 16, 1870, the French troops were withdrawn from Civita Vecchia; and on Sept. 20, Rome surrendered to the king of Italy, after a short resistance by the papal mercenaries. A provisional government was established, and a popular vote was decreed on the question of annexation. As 40,795 votes were in the affirmative, and only 48 in the negative,—an eloquent characterization of the papal government,—a royal decree of Oct. 9 formally annexed the Roman territory, and on July 2, 1871, the king of Italy took up his residence in the city. Meanwhile the Italian Parliament had passed the so-called "law of guaranty" (May 13, 1871), allowing the Pope to live in the Vatican as a sovereign, not subject to the laws of the land, and granting him an annual appanage of 3,225,000 livres. The Pope protested against all these proceedings, excommunicated every one who had taken part in the establishment of the kingdom of Italy, refused to accept the appanage granted, and complained loudly that he was kept a prisoner in the Vatican. But his protests had no effect, and his complaints found no sympathy. The syllabus and the decrees of the Vatican Council proved utterly unable to prevent the floods of modern civilization from pushing their waves against the very walls of the Vatican. A new police-force, a new board of health, a better illumination of the streets, a new press-law, a new school-law, etc., transformed the city in an incredibly short time, as if it had been touched with a magic wand. Out of a population of between 200,000 and 300,000 inhabitants, 14,385 pupils in 1873 in the new elementary schools established under the control of the State. In the same year the new Protestant Church of St. Paul-within-the-Walls was dedicated, and the first female seminary was opened. There are now about twelve Protestant congregations and chapels in the city, representing the leading denominations, but mostly supported by English and American friends.

In spite of these changes, and many others of the same tendency, Rome has not as yet lost its character of being a pre-eminently ecclesiastical city. Of its human population the majority is connected with the confraternity of conventual institutions, some have been suppressed by the Italian Government, and their buildings employed for other purposes. But its three hundred and sixty churches are still standing; and they are by no means deserted, or in any way bereft of their splendors. Besides the churches of St. Peter, St. John Lateran, and St. Maria Rotonda (Pantheon), which are separately spoken of in this work, we may mention the Church of St. Paul, situated outside the city, on the road to Ostia, and on the spot, where, according to tradition, the apostle suffered martyrdom. The original building was one of the oldest and most magnificent churches in Rome, but was burned down on July 17, 1823. The falling roof, which was of wood, completely spoiled the columns and walls, with their costly mosaics and pictures. The new building, however, for whose construction the viceroy of Egypt presented the Pope with several shiploads of the finest alabaster, is a grand and no less magnificent structure. The Church of Sta. Maria Maggiore, situated on the Esquiline Hill, is one of the five patriarchal churches of Rome. It was built by Pope Liberius (352-366), and is probably the oldest Mary-church in Christendom. It is a basilica; and its flat wooden ceiling, excellently carved, and profusely gilded, is supported by forty-two magnificent columns. From the balcony on its front the Pope blesses the multitude on Aug. 15, the feast of the Ascension of Mary. The Church of St. Laurentius, situated outside the gate of the Tiburtine Road, was originally built by Constantine the Great, and consists really of two structures, connected with each other by a chapel over the tomb of the saint. The Church of St. Peter in Montorio, situated in the Trastevere, was built by Ferdiand and Isabella of Spain, on the spot, where, according to tradition, St. Peter suffered martyrdom. The Church of Sta. Maria in Araceli, situated on the Capitoline Hill, was built before the tenth century, and occupies the site of the ancient temple of Juno Moneta. It is, however, not so much the great number of churches in Rome which give the city its specifically ecclesiastical character as the life which is developed in the churches, and which, so to speak, is continued in the streets and in the houses.


RÖNSDORF SECT. See Eller.

ROOD is the Anglo-Saxon word for "cross," "cruciis."
ROOS, Magnus Friedrich, b. at Sulz-on-the-Neckar, Sept. 6, 1727; d. at Anhausen, March 19, 1803. He studied theology at Tubingen, and was appointed vicar in Stuttgart 1755, diaconus at Goppingen 1757, and curate at Beibenhausen 1757, and pastor of Anhausen 1784. A pupil of Bengel, and inclining towards pietism, he exercised a great influence, not only by his writings, but also by his powerful and impressive personality. His principal works are, Einleitung in die biblischen Geschichten, 1774 (last edition, 1780); Christliche Glaubenslehre, a popular representation of the system of Christian doctrines, 1786 (last edition, 1800); Christliches Hausbuch, Kreuzschule, 1799 (last edition, 1864); Soldatengespräche, Etwas für Seefahrer, etc.

H. BECK.

ROSA OF LIMA, the principal saint of Peru; b. at Lima in 1586; d. there in 1617, in consequence of the ascetic practices she performed in imitation of Catharine of Siena. She was canonized in 1671. See Act. Sanct., Aug. 26.

ROSA OF VITERBO, d. in her native city of Viterbo in 1282, about eighteen years old; preached repentance in the streets with the cross in her hand. See Act. Sanct., Sept. 4.

ROSALES, St., the principal saint of Sicily, lived in the twelfth century as a hermit on Mount Quisquina, where her remains were found in a cave in 1624. She died between 1160 and 1180. See Act. Sanct., Sept. 20.

ROSEARY, The, consists of a string of larger and smaller beads, and is used by the Roman Catholics when they say their Pater-nosters and Ave-Marias, in order to ascertain the number done. The custom of repeating the Lord's Prayer over and over again a great number of times in succession arose among the first Christian hermits and monks. (See SOZOMEN: Hist. Eccl., vi. 29.) But the origin of the rosary is, nevertheless, of a much later date. It was first used by the Dominican monks, though it is not certain that it was introduced by St. Dominic himself. As it is used both by the Mohammedans and the Brahmins, it is generally believed to have been brought to Europe by the crusaders. There are various forms of rosaries: that generally used has fifty-five beads; namely, five decades of Ave-Maria beads, and five Pater-noster beads. The meaning of the name rosarium, properly a "garden of roses," is variously explained by Roman-Catholic writers, but most properly from the phrase rosa mystica, often applied as a predicate to the Virgin.

The Confraternity of the Rosary — Confraternitas de Rosario, B. M. V. — was founded at Cologne in 1475, by Jacob Sprenger, grand-inquisitor of Germany, and received from Sixtus IV. absolution for a hundred days, and from Innocent VIII. absolution for three hundred and sixty thousand years. The victory of Lepanto, Oct. 7, 1571, was solemnly celebrated in its commemoration. It is the duty of each member to count his prayers, and once a year to commend them to a particular saint. [See J. F. MAYER: De Rosario, Greifswald, 1720; EDWIN ARNOLD: Pearls of the Faith (poems on the Mohammedan rosary, the hundred names of Allah), London, 1862.]

G. E. STEITZ.

ROSECELIN (ROZELIN, or RUCCELIN), often spoken of in the history of Christian doctrines as trinitarian, and in the history of philosophy as nominalist, but nevertheless very imperfectly known. He seems to have been born in the diocese of Soissons, and to have been educated at Rheims. He was a canon at Compiegne, where his peculiar conception of the Trinity first startled his pupils, and attracted public attention. In harmony with his philosophic nominalism, he could conceive of God as existing only under the form of an individual, and consequently the Trinity became to him three gods. One of his pupils, Johannes, afterwards cardinal-bishop of Fosseoli, addressed himself to Anselm, at that time abbot of Bec; and Anselm answered, promising to write a complete refutation. (See BALUZIUS: Miscell., iv. p. 478, and Ep. Anselmi, ii. 35.) A synod was convened at Soissons in 1092; and as Rosecelin used to quote both Lanfranc and Anselm in favor of his views, the latter sent an exposition of his ideas to the synod, and Rosecelin was compelled to recant. Anselm then finished his De fide trinitatis, which is a refutation of Rosecelin; and the latter, as he, in spite of his recantation, continued to teach his old views, was deposed. He went to England, and attacked Anselm, now archbishop of Canterbury. See the several works on the history of Christian doctrines, 1786 (last edition, 1839-47, 12 vols.), written in part the comments of Christian Ad

ROSE, Henry John, Church of England; b. at Uckfield, 1801; d. at Bedford, Jan. 31, 1873. He graduated at St. John's College, Cambridge, 1821; fellow, 1824; Hulsean lecturer, 1833 ("The Law of Moses viewed in connection with the History and Character of the Jews"); rector of Houghton Conquest, Bedfordshire, 1857; archdeacon of Bedford, 1866. He edited the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana (London, 1817-45, 2d ed. of part, 1849-58) from 1839, from which he reprinted, with additions, his History of the Christian Church from 1700 to 1858, 1858. He also edited the first volume of the New Biographical Dictionary (1838-47, 12 vols.), wrote in part the comments upon Daniel for the Bible (Speaker's) Commentary (London and New York, 1870), and was a member of the English Old Testament company of revisers.

ROSE, Hugh James, brother of the preceding; b. at Uckfield, 1795; d. in Florence, Italy, Dec. 22, 1838. He was graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1817; vicar of Horsham, 1822-30; prebendary of Chichester, 1827-38; Christian advocate in the university of Cambridge, 1829-33;
ROSENBERG, Johann Georg, a native of Heilbronn, a sparrow-maker by trade; was seized with religious enthusiasm by reading the writings of Johann Adam Rabe of Erlangen; gave up his trade, and wandered through Germany, from Tübingen to Hamburg, 1703-06, preaching, and holding prayer-meetings, but generally persecuted by the clergy and the police. From Germany he went to Holland, and there the track of him has become lost. He published Glaubens-Bekenntniss, 1708, Wunder-Bekrönung, 1704, Wunder-Führung Gottes, etc. L. HELLER.

ROSENCRANS, Richard, b. at Posen, Jan. 28, 1799; d. at Heidelberg, Aug. 20, 1867. He was educated at Breslau, the headquarters of the opposition to Napoleon; but he nevertheless began his theological studies in 1817 at Heidelberg, "the Prussian temper being repugnant to him." In 1819 he went to Berlin, but neither Schleiermacher nor Neander made any great impression on him. By Baron von Kottwitz he was introduced to the Berlin circle of pietists; and that influence continued predominant with him, even during his stay at Wittenberg (1820-22), where he finished his studies. He was also intimately associated with Tholuck. In 1823 he was appointed chaplain to the Prussian embassy in Rome. There he became intimate with Chevalier de Bunse, and the somewhat vague boundary of his piety began to give way to the free development of his own speculative genius. In 1828 he returned to Wittenberg as director of the theological seminary. He lectured chiefly on church history, and his lectures have been published by Weingarten.
(Wittenberg, 1857-76, 2 vols.); but he was thirty-eight years old when he published his first independent work, a commentary on Rom. v. 12-21 (Wittenberg, 1857), a masterpiece of acute and penetrating exegesis. In 1856 he was made professor of theology at Heidelberg; and there he spent the rest of his life, with the exception of a short period (1849-54), during which he lectured at Bonn. At Heidelberg he lived in a quiet and almost retired fashion; though he took an active, and at times even a decisive, part in the development of the somewhat entangled church affairs of Baden, and though he exercised a profound and wide-spread influence, both as professor and as author. Personally he was distinguished by purity, simplicity, and modesty, and by the completeness and perfect harmony of his character: no element, moral, intellectual, or aesthetic, was lacking; and none was unduly developed. His authorship bears the same stamp. No Christian idea, no phase of Christian life, is forgotten in the theological system he elaborated; and none is made a party question. His two principal works are, Anfänge der christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung (1857), and Theologische Ethik (1845-48, 3 vols., 2d ed., thoroughly revised, 1867-72, in 5 vols.). They supplement one another. The first is based on the idea that the Church is destined to be wholly absorbed by the State as soon as it has reached its merely pedagogical goal, — to make religion penetrate into every fibre of human life; the second, on the idea that religion and morals are absolutely identical, so that no Christian dogma is fully realized until it finds its way out in human action, and no act of man is really moral, unless illuminated from within by the light of the Christian dogma. The development of these ideas is often very bold, and sometimes a little singular; but through the whole wafts the spirit of true Christian humility and love. The following noble confession of his humble belief is worth quoting: "The ground of all my thinking, I can truly say, is the simple faith of Christians, independent of dogmas, or any system of theology, which for 1800 years has overcome the world. It is my last certitude to oppose constantly and determinedly every other pretended knowledge which asserts itself against this faith. I know no other firm ground on which I could anchor my whole being, and particularly my speculations, except that historical phenomenon, Jesus Christ. He is to me the unimpeachable Holy of Holies of Humanity, the highest Being known to man, and a sun-rising in history whose light by which we see the world" (1st ed. Ethik, pref., p. xvi.). His Ethik is the greatest work of German speculative theology next to Schleiermacher's Der Christliche Glaube. Next in importance is his Zur Dogmatik, 1853, and his lectures on Dogmatik, imperfectly edited from his manuscripts by Schenkel, Heidelberg, 1870, 2 vols. Rothe also published some sermons and minor treatises. His Sermons for the Christian Year appeared in English, Edinburgh, 1877. His life was written by Nippold, Wittenb., 1873-75, 2 vols.

ROUMANIA comprises 4,595,219 inhabitants belonging to the Greek Church, 115,420 to the Church of Rome, 8,603 to the Armenian Church, and 7,790 to the Evangelical Church, also 403,651 Jews, and 25,033 Mohammedans. The Greek Church is the State Church, organized on strictly hierarchical principles. The higher clergy, from the archbishops of Bucharest and Jassy to the protopopes, are paid by the State. The lower clergy, the priests and deacons, are men of means, richer than the noblemen, and must have the support of their parishes, or support themselves by agriculture. They are educated in eight State seminaries; but nothing more is demanded from them than reading the formularies, and performing the ceremonies. Evangelical congregations have been formed in Jassy, Bucharest, Galatz, etc., in connection with, and under the protection of, the Prussian State Church. J. Samuelson: Roumania, Past and Present, London, 1882. G. DörschlAG.

ROUSSEAU, Jean Jacques, b. at Geneva, June 28, 1712; d. at St. Remo, March 2, 1778. He grew up in an unhappy home. His mother died at his birth. His father, a watchmaker by trade, was a fool; and the son passed his time in idleness, reading romances. But there were powers in him which early showed themselves. When he was eight years old, Plutarch filled his soul with enthusiasm. Apprenticed to an engraver on copper, he was ill treated, and found no better consolation than idle day-dreams in the woods. At last he ran away. He sought refuge with a Roman-Catholic priest in Conflignon, in the neighborhood of Geneva; and the priest brought him to Madame de Warens.
at Annecy, a recent convert to Romanism, and a lady of disgusting immorality covered over with a thin film of external respectability. By them he was placed in a monastery in Turin, where he was converted to Calvinism. Ten years later he deserted from it and then let loose. Sixteen years old, he became valet in one house, where he stole, and then in another, whence he was dismissed for laziness. He returned to Madame de Warens, and was placed in a seminary, where he learned some music, and then for many years he was cast about in a rather adventurous manner, chiefly living as the lover of Madame de Warens. But at the same time he studied mathematics, Latin, music, etc. He read Locke, Leibnitz, Malebranche, Descartes, etc.; and when in his twenty-ninth year, in 1741, he found himself superseded by somebody else in the service of Madame de Warens, and went to Paris, he was not altogether unprepared for a literary career.

In Paris he formed a connection with Thérèse Levasseur, a bar-maid from Orleans, a woman who never could learn the names of the months, nor distinguish between the common coins. He afterwards married her for love, made her his wife; but the five children she had borne to him he carried to the foundling-hospital. He made his living by copying music,—he also wrote two operas (Les Muses galantes, 1742, and Le devin de village, 1752) which were successfully brought on the stage, and some letters on French music, which, though they gave much offence, have some critical value,—and he continued the business even after he had become a famous author. He did so as a speculation, and the speculation succeeded. Everybody wanted to see him, and to have some music copied by him; and high persons did not fail to leave some golden present in the hands of Madame Levasseur. In 1750 he published his first essay, Le progrès des sciences et des arts, a-til contribué à corrompre ou à épurer les maurs, by which he won the prize of the academy of Dijon. Concerning the principles, the fundamental relation between nature and civilization, he was in utter confusion; but the passion with which he threw himself on the side of nature, the vigor of his argumentation, the keenness of his observations, and the inexhaustible wealth of his eloquence, made his book irresistible, and the more so because it struck a latent but powerful current of sympathy in the public. For a century, people's knowledge of nature had been increasing almost day by day; for a century the artificiality of society had been growing almost beyond endurance: hence the success of Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, of Thomson's The Seasons, of Gessner's Ida, etc.; and hence the success of Rousseau. In 1753 followed his Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes, which set another shrill string vibrating,—the difference between rich and poor; and shortly after he returned to Geneva, re-entered the reformed Church, and recovered his lost citizenship.

In 1760 appeared La nouvelle Héloïse, and in 1762, Le contrat social, and Emile,—the three principal works of Rousseau. In the history of fiction La nouvelle Héloïse denotes a turning-point. It is the dawn of the romantic school: it inaugurates a new kind of characters, of which the unspoiled child of nature, "the beautiful soul" Julie, is the chief type. If Le contrat social and Emile, which followed rapidly one upon the other, are put in relation to each other, are considered under one view they form an incoherence, an in-contradiction. In Emile, the State, the Church, every institution the history of the race has developed, is sacrificed in order to produce the perfect man such as nature meant him to be: in Le contrat social, every element of true humanity, even religious freedom, is sacrificed in order to produce the perfect citizen such as the State demands him. But each by itself exercised a tremendous influence. Le contrat social, with its false premise, that the State rests upon a contract between the ruler and the ruled, became one of the watchwords of the French Revolution, and made all the thrones of Europe tremble. Still deeper and more immediate was the effect of Emile, ou de l'Education. The education it advocates culminates in desir. Of a divine revelation, of Christianity, the author knows nothing; but the opposition which he offers to the surrounding atheism and materialism is vigorous; the contempt with which he places over against the training in use, and the old scholasticism and merely mechanical methods, denotes a decisive progress. The book was burned, however, both in Paris and Geneva.

As his genius developed, his character broke down. The sensitiveness which formed part of Rousseau's nature grew into a disease, and the vanity and suspicion which necessarily resulted from the unprincipled life he led made it at last impossible for him to converse in a free and noble way with his fellowmen. He was seized by melancholy and misanthropy. He fancied that he was the victim of a widespread conspiracy. He left Geneva in 1756, driven away by Voltaire, who had settled at Ferney, and who hated him cordially. He went back to Paris, and lived for six years in the solitudes of Montmorency. But in 1762 the Parliament of Paris condemned Emile as a "godless" book, and an order of arrest was issued against the author. Rousseau fled, he did not know exactly whither. On an invitation from Hume, he went to England; but he soon fancied he had found out that Hume was one of his worst enemies. In 1767 he returned to Paris, not sane any more. He died very suddenly, suspected of having taken poison. But, in spite of the mental disturbances from which he suffered, he wrote in the last years of his life his Confessions,—one of his most brilliant achievements. It involuntarily reminds the reader of Augustine's Confessions, though there is one very striking difference. Rousseau is as candid as Augustine in acknowledging his faults, and confessing his shortcomings; he does not spare himself, but goes into the most disgusting details: but his candor does not make the same impression of truth and uprightness that Augustine's does. Somehow his confessions of faults and crimes always end in a kind of self-glorification. To the last years of his life belongs also a treatise on the origin of religion, which was found in 1858. When com-
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pared with the Profession de Foi du Viceaire Savoyard, in Émilie, it shows a decided approach towards Christianity.


Roussel, Gérard (Gerardus Rufus), the confessors of Marguerite of Navarre; was b. at Vaquerie, near Amiens, and joined, while studying theology in Paris, that circle of young reformers which formed around Lefebvre d’Étaples. When the persecution began in 1521, he fled to Meaux, where he found refuge with Bishop Briçonnet. Soon, however, he was driven away from Meaux too; and he then stayed for some time in Strassburg, in the house of Capito. In 1526 he was allowed to return to France, and was made confessor to the Queen of Navarre, who in 1530 made him abbot of Clairac, and in 1536 bishop of Oléron. He belonged to the kind of reformers who tried to find a middle course between the church of the Pope and the church of Calvin. He continued to work for the Reformation, but without separating from the Church of Rome. He used the French language in the mass, he administered the Lord’s Supper under both species, and he wrote for his clergy an exposition of the Apostles’ Creed, the Decalogue, and the Lord’s Prayer, in which he adopted all the essential ideas of the Reformation. The exposition was condemned by the Sorbonne as heretic in 1550; but Roussel died before the verdict was formally issued. See, further, C. Schmidt: Gérard Roussel, Strassburg, 1845.

South, Martin Joseph, D.D., Church of England; b. at South Elmham, Suffolk, Oct. 18, 1755; d. at Oxford, Dec. 22, 1854. He was elected fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, July, 1776, and president, April 11, 1791. He published the valuable Reliquiae sacrae (fragments of the lost Christian authors of the second and third centuries, one of the most important and useful works upon patristic literature, revealing the finest English scholarship), Oxford, 1814–18, 14 vols., 2d ed., 1846, supplementary vol., 1848, and Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum opuscula, 1852, 2 vols., 3d ed., 1868; and edited Burnet’s History of his Own Time, 1823, 6 vols.

Row, Thomas, minister at Hadleigh, Suffolk, is the most voluminous English hymnist after C. Wesley. His two volumes, published in 1817 and 1822, contain no less than 1,072 effusions, notable only for their number. F. M. Bird.

Rowe, Mrs. Elizabeth, born Singer, a poetess of high rank, was termed by Dr. Watts “one of the spirituallgiants of the lastcentury.” Her works, including some ornate hymns formerly in occasional use, appeared 1739, in 2 vols. F. M. Bird.

Rowlands, Daniel, a powerful Welsh preacher; was b. at Pant-y-beudy, near Llanegeth, Wales, about 1718; d. at Llanegeth, Oct. 16, 1790. Of his youth and early manhood nothing is known, except that he studied at the grammar-school of Hereford. Ordained at London, 1738, he went whither he travelled in 18 vols. quarto. rowland's Sermons were translated into English in 1774. See the Biographies by John Owen (London, 1840) and J. Morgan and Ryeland Christian Leaders of the Last Century, London, 1869.

Royaards, Hermann Jan, b. at Utrecht, Oct. 3, 1794; d. there Jan. 2, 1854. He studied theology in his native city, and was appointed professor in 1823. He devoted himself chiefly to church history and canon law; and his works, Geschiehtenis van het Christendom in Nederland (Utrecht, 1849–53, 2 vols.) and Hedendaagsk kerkregt in Nederland (Utrecht, 1894–97, 2 vols.), exercised considerable influence on the study of those departments.

J. J. Van Oosterzee.

Rubrics (Latin rubrica, from ruber, “red,” because they were originally written in red ink) are in the ecclesiastical sense the directions in service-books which show how the various parts of the Liturgy should be performed. It is no longer customary to print or write them in red ink, but such directions are distinguished by a different type from the body of the text. The word was borrowed by the church from the law, in which it was applied to the titles or headings of chapters in certain law-books.

Ruchat, Abraham, b. at Grandcour in the canton of Vaud, Sept. 15, 1768; d. at Lauzanne, Sept. 29, 1790. He studied at Bern, Berlin, and Leyden, and was appointed professor of belles-lettres in 1721, and of theology in 1733, at Lauzanne. His fame rests upon his excellent Abrégé de l’histoire ecclésiastique du pays-de-Vaud (1707) and Histoire de la reform. de la Suisse (1725–38, 6 vols.). The seventh volume was not printed until a hundred years later, in the edition by Vulliemin, 1835, which contains Ruchat’s biography and a complete list of his writings.

Haenbach.

Rückert, Leopold Immanuel, b. at Gross-Hennersdorf, near Herrnhut, in Upper Lusatia, 1777; d. at Jena, April 8, 1817. He was, like Schleiermacher, b. at Lichtenberg, and entered the school of Niesky, and studied theology and philosophy at Leipzig. In 1825 he was appointed teacher at the gymnasia of Zittau, and in 1844 professor of theology at Jena. From early youth the great goal of his life was to become a uni-
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vercity teacher; and his first book, Der akademische Lehrer (Leipzig, 1824), followed in 1829 by his Offene Mittheilungen an Studirnde, is a representation of his ideas of university-teaching. But he had to fight hard, and to achieve a considerable literary fame, before he reached his goal. In 1825 he published his Christliche Philosophie; in 1831, his Reminiscenzen; and in 1831, 2 vols., and then his commentaries on Galatians (1833), Ephesians (1834), and Corinthians (1836, 1837, 2 vols.), all characterized by a certain naive boldness, but distinguished by scholarship and plente. As a professor at Jena, he published his second great systematic work, Theologie (Leipzig, 1851, 2 vols.), a peculiar combination of dogmatics and ethics, also Das Abendmahl (Leipzig, 1856), Der Rationalismus (1859), and several minor treatises and devotional tracts. G. FRANZ.

RUDELBACH, Andreas Gottlob, b. in Copenhagen, Sept. 29, 1792; d. at Slagelse, in the Danish Island of Seeland, March 3, 1862. He studied theology at the university of his native city, and was in 1829 appointed superintendent at Glauchau-in-Saxony; which position he resigned in 1845. From 1846 to 1849 he lectured in the university of Copenhagen, and in 1848 he was appointed pastor at Slagelse. His literary activity was chiefly in German. Besides several collections of sermons and devotional tracts, he published Hieronymus Savonarola, Hamburg, 1835; Reformation, Lutherism, and Union (his principal work), Leipzig, 1839; Einleitung in die Augustinsche Konfession, Leipzig, 1841; Über die Bedeutung des apostolischen Symbolums, Leipzig, 1844. Together with Guericoe he founded in 1889 the Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie und Kirche, which he continued to edit till his death. He was one of the most prominent champions of strict Lutheran orthodoxy against the Prussian union of the two confessions. He also left an unfinished autobiography. G. FRANZ.

RUDINGER (RUDIGER), Ersom, b. at Bamberg, May 19, 1823; d. at Nuremberg, Dec. 2, 1881. He studied at Leipzig, and was appointed rector of the seminary and professor at Wittenberg in 1857. But in 1874 he was compelled to leave Wittenberg; it having become known that he rejected the bodily presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, and otherwise deviated from Lutheran orthodoxy. He fled to Berlin, and finally settled at Nuremberg, where his heterodoxy seems to have given no offence. He was a prolific writer. His most interesting works are Libri psalmorum paraphrasis Latina, De origine ubi quis est, etc. HERZOG.

RUET, Francisco de Paula, b. in Barcelona, Oct. 28, 1826; d. in Madrid, Nov. 18, 1878; one of the most prominent prelates of Spain in the present century. As a young man he went on the stage, and was a singer at Turin, where he was converted by a sermon of Luigi de Sanctis, and entered the Church of the Waldenses. In 1855 he returned to Spain, and began to preach in Barcelona. Repeatedly thrown into the most prominent disputes of the day, and losing his see for a time by a decision of the Inquisition, he was, however, restored by the Pape to his prelate's office; and finally settled at St. Germain-des-Pres as the pupil, and soon as the friend and co-worker, of Mabillon. His first great work was the Acta primorum Martirum, Paris, 1689 (2d ed., Amsterdam, 1713; 3d, with his biography, Verona, 1781); then followed his Historia perfida the mi Yary authority; but finally he was summoned before the episcopal court, convicted of heresy, and condemned to death at the stake, which punishment was commuted into exile for life. He went to Gibraltar, and formed an evangelical congregation there. Afterwards he preached, also, with great success, to his countrymen in Algeria; and after the revolution of 1868 he was able to open a chapel in Madrid, and celebrate evangelical service in the very capital. FRITZ FLIEDNER.

RUFINUS, Tyrianius (Turranarius, Toranus), b. at Aquileia; entered to the Romans, 2d ed., 1839, in 2 vols.; and then his commentaries on Galatians (1833), Ephesians (1834), and Corinthians (1836, 1837, 2 vols.), all characterized by a certain naive boldness, but distinguished by scholarship and plente. As a professor at Jena, he published his second great systematic work, Theologie (Leipzig, 1851, 2 vols.), a peculiar combination of dogmatics and ethics, also Das Abendmahl (Leipzig, 1856), Der Rationalismus (1859), and several minor treatises and devotional tracts. G. FRANZ.

His principal importance Rufinus has as interpreter of Greek theology. He translated many of Origen's exegetical works, and we owe to him our knowledge of the important work, De principiis. He also translated the church history of Eusebius (leaving out the tenth book, and adding two books of his own, thus carrying the narrative down to the death of Theodosius the Great), the Recognitions Clementis, the Instituta Monarchorum Basil, the Sententia of Sixtus, an unknown Pagan philosopher, whom he mistook for the Roman bishop and martyr, Sixtus (Xystus). Whether he wrote the famous Hist. Monarchorum sine de vitis patronum, or whether he simply translated it from a Greek original, is doubtful: the latter, however, seems the more probable. Finally, he wrote an Expositio Symboli Apostolici, of historical rather than doctrinal interest, and two books, De benedictionibus duodecim patriarcharum. Collected editions of his works have been given out by De la Barre (Paris, 1580), Vallarsi (Verona, 1775), and Migne: Patr. Lat., xxxi.

LIT. — JUST. FONTANINUS: Hist. litt. Aquileij, Rome, 1742 (the two books treating of Rufinus have been reprinted by Vallarsi and Migne); M. DE RUBIES: Diss. duce, Venes, 1754; MARZUTTI: De Tyr. Raf., Padua, 1885; A. EBERT: Geschichte d. christl. lat. Litteratur, Leipzig, 1874, pp. 308-318. W. MOLLER.

RUINART, Thierry, b. at Rheims, June 10, 1657; d. in the monastery of Hautvillers, in the vicinity of his native city, Sept. 27, 1729. In 1674 he entered the Congregation of St. Maur, and in 1682 he settled at St. Germain-des-Prés as the pupil, and soon as the friend and co-worker, of Mabillon. His first great work was the Acta primorum Martirum, Paris, 1689 (2d ed., Amsterdam, 1713; 3d, with his biography, Verona, 1781); then followed his Historia perfida the mi Yary authority; but finally he was summoned before the episcopal court, convicted of heresy, and condemned to death at the stake, which punishment was commuted into exile for life. He went to

25—III
**RULE OF FAITH.**

1. The Rule of Faith is a fundamental doctrine in the Christian faith, established by the First Vatican Council in 1870. It states that the Pope, in his capacity as the successor of Peter, possesses the faculty of doctrine, and that the Church is bound to accept and传教大公会议的教义。}

2. One of the most prominent theological writers of the twelfth century is Rupert of Deutz, one of the most prolific theological writers of the twelfth century; a contemporary of St. Bernard, and, like him, a mystic. His chief works, however, are not only polemical, but also exegetical. — Tractatus in Evangelium Johannis, Commentaria de operibus sanctae Trinitatis (his principal work, in forty-two books), Commentaries on the Major Prophets, and several treatises on the translation of Leibnitz’s System of Theology (London, 1850), and Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti (1858, new ed., 1868). See Cooper: New Biographical Dictionary (Supplement, 1883).

3. The prevailing religion of the Russian Empire is the Orthodox Oriental, or Greek Church. More than three-fourths of the entire population belong to it, and it is established by law in the following terms: “The ruling faith in the Russian Empire is the Christian Orthodox Eastern Catholic declaration of belief. Religious liberty is not only assured to Christians of other denominations, but also to Jews, Mohammedans, and Pagans; so that all people living in Russia may worship God according to the laws and faith of their ancestors.” This religious liberty, however, is qualified by the following conditions. No Christian can change his religion for any other than the Russian Church, nor can a non-Christian embrace any other form of Christianity; and any apostasy from the State Church is punished by severe penalties, such as banishment from the empire.

4. Next to the Christian inhabitants of Russia, the Mohammedans are the most numerous, and their numbers are constantly increasing by territorial extension in Central Asia. They number at present no less than 7,500,000, of whom 2,364,000 are in European Russia, 3,000,000 in Central Asia, 2,000,000 in the Caucasus, 61,000 in Siberia, and 426 in Poland. Their clergy consists of about 20,000 muftis, mollas, and teachers. The number of Russian Jews in 1878 was stated to be 1,944,378; in Poland, 815,433; in Caucasus, 22,732; in Siberia, 11,941; in Central Asia, 3,396; but this number has been since decreased by emigration to America. The number of pagans in European Russia is 258,125; in Siberia, 245. The territory and population in Asia are equal in territorial extent to the British Empire, and twice as large as any other country in the world. Its area is estimated at 8,500,000 square miles, and it has a population of 77,000,000 souls. The territory is almost entirely unexplored, and its government is an autocracy, there being no constitutional limits to the power of the Czar.

5. The prevailing religion of the Russian Empire is the Orthodox Oriental, or Greek Church. More than three-fourths of the entire population belong to it, and it is established by law in the following terms: “The ruling faith in the Russian Empire is the Christian Orthodox Eastern Catholic declaration of belief. Religious liberty is not only assured to Christians of other denominations, but also to Jews, Mohammedans, and Pagans; so that all people living in Russia may worship God according to the laws and faith of their ancestors.” This religious liberty, however, is qualified by the following conditions. No Christian can change his religion for any other than the Russian Church, nor can a non-Christian embrace any other form of Christianity; and any apostasy from the State Church is punished by severe penalties, such as banishment from the empire.

6. The prevailing religion of the Russian Empire is the Orthodox Oriental, or Greek Church. More than three-fourths of the entire population belong to it, and it is established by law in the following terms: “The ruling faith in the Russian Empire is the Christian Orthodox Eastern Catholic declaration of belief. Religious liberty is not only assured to Christians of other denominations, but also to Jews, Mohammedans, and Pagans; so that all people living in Russia may worship God according to the laws and faith of their ancestors.” This religious liberty, however, is qualified by the following conditions. No Christian can change his religion for any other than the Russian Church, nor can a non-Christian embrace any other form of Christianity; and any apostasy from the State Church is punished by severe penalties, such as banishment from the empire.

7. Next to the Christian inhabitants of Russia, the Mohammedans are the most numerous, and their numbers are constantly increasing by territorial extension in Central Asia. They number at present no less than 7,500,000, of whom 2,364,000 are in European Russia, 3,000,000 in Central Asia, 2,000,000 in the Caucasus, 61,000 in Siberia, and 426 in Poland. Their clergy consists of about 20,000 muftis, mollas, and teachers. The number of Russian Jews in 1878 was stated to be 1,944,378; in Poland, 815,433; in Caucasus, 22,732; in Siberia, 11,941; in Central Asia, 3,396; but this number has been since decreased by emigration to America. The number of pagans in European Russia is 258,125; in Siberia, 245. The territory and population in Asia are equal in territorial extent to the British Empire, and twice as large as any other country in the world. Its area is estimated at 8,500,000 square miles, and it has a population of 77,000,000 souls. The territory is almost entirely unexplored, and its government is an autocracy, there being no constitutional limits to the power of the Czar.
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Out of a total population of 5,210,000 in Russian Poland, no less than 4,567,000 are Roman Catholics, while only 34,135 are Orthodox Russians. Outside of Poland, Russia in Europe had (in 1878) a Roman-Catholic population of 2,698,000; in Caucasus, 28,616; in Siberia, 24,016; in Central Asia, 131,579. The Russian Church had formerly a large population belonging to the United Greek Church, but nearly all of these have now been reconciled to the Russian Church. The United Armenians number about 33,000.

As the acquisition of Poland added a large Roman-Catholic population to Russia, so the annexation of the Baltic provinces and Finland gave many Lutherans to the empire of the Czar. They enjoy entire liberty of ecclesiastical government, and worship under the superintendence of the minister of the interior, but are not allowed to interfere in any way with the national church. The total number of Russians is 2,400,000 in Russia proper, 300,000 in Poland, and 12,000 in Asia.

The Reformed Church numbers about 200,000, one-half of whom reside in Lithuania. The Moravians have about 250 chapels, and a membership of 50,000. In 1878 there were about 15,000 Mennonites, but many have since emigrated to the United States. There are also some German Baptist missions.

The catholics of Etchmiadzin, the head of the ancient Gregorian-Armenian Church, has been since 1828 a subject of Russia. The Armenian Church and its clergy enjoy all the privileges conceded to foreign creeds. The subjects of the catholics number 38,720 in European Russia, 595,310 in Caucasus, 15 in Siberia, and 1 in Central Asia.

The condition of the State Church demands our careful consideration. Its origin dates back to the tenth century of the Christian era. According to an ancient tradition, the gospel was first preached in Scythia by Andrew the apostle; but no record has been left by which this tradition can be verified. But in the year 988 the grand duke Wladimir, with all his court and ministers, received baptism in the river Dnieper. The administration of the newly established church was for a long time in the hands of the Patriarch of Constantinople; but after the conquest of that city by the Turks, in 1453, the grand duke Theodore applied to the Patriarch of Constantinople for the establishment of a patriarchal see in Moscow. The request was granted, and the patriarchate of Moscow founded in 1588. The most eminent of these Russian patriarchs was Nikon (1652-57), who introduced many reforms into the service-books. But these reforms encountered much opposition, and led to the separation of sects, called Stuari, or "Old Believers," which continue to exist to the present day. (See Russian Sects.)

Peter the Great, about the year 1700, effected other changes, the most important of which was the abolition of the patriarchate of Moscow, and the substitution for it of what is called the Holy Governing Synod as the supreme authority, subject only to the will of the Czar. This body consists of twelve members.

The Russian Church is divided into fifty-eight eparchies, or dioceses, each of which is under a bishop. The bishops are of three classes. Those of the first class are called metropolitans, of whom there are but three in Russia, viz., Kiev, Moscow, and Petersburg. The second class are called archbishops, and the third are simply bishops. Besides these, there are some vicars, or suffragan bishops, who are assistants. The inferior clergy are divided into the white or secular priests, and into the black clergy, or monks. The number of the secular clergy, including all grades, is estimated at nearly 100,000. In 1878 the number of monks was 10,512, and of nuns, 14,574 in 147 nunneries.

The creed of the Russian Church is that of the oecumenical Council of Nicaea (325), with the additions made to it by the First Council of Constantinople (381). In common with all branches of the Greek Church, the Russians reject the Filioque, and teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, and from the Father and the Son. They also receive baptism in trine immersion, dipping it three times into the font. The Russian Church, however, acknowledges the validity of baptism by pouring water, in which respect it differs from the church in Greece. Forty days after the birth of the child, it is brought to the church with its mother, for the purification of the mother, and reception of the child. The sacrament of the holy chrism (or confirmation, as it is called in the West) is administered by priests, with fragrant oils consecrated by the bishop in the river Dnieper. The administration of the holy chrism is usually attended by the priest and the child, sometimes immediately after the baptism, sometimes in the church. The priest anoints the child or adult convert with the oil above referred to, saying at the same time the words of the appointed service for chrism. The Holy Eucharist is called in the Oriental Church the Divine Liturgy. Leavened bread is used, and wine mingled with water; and communion is given in both kinds. The priest receives each element separately; but the other communicants receive the consecrated bread dipped in the wine, administered with a golden spoon. The adult communicants receive the sacraments standing, but even young children and infants are communicated. It is customary in Russia to receive the communion once a year,—in the season of Lent, immediately before Easter.

Auricular confession and absolution are administered, as in the Catholic Church; but the confessions are somewhat more publicly made in the church,—in the sight, but not the hearing, of others; and the penitents are questioned more generally on the Ten Commandments. The Russian Church recognizes three orders in...
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the clergy as of divine appointment, viz., bishops, priests, and deacons; but it has other ecclesiastical grades above and below those, as metropolitans, archbishops, proto-presbyters, archimandrites, proto-deacons, sub-deacons, psalmists, singers, and sextons. Ordinations are administered by bishops only.

Matrimony is attended by great festivity, and some curious and interesting ceremonies, the most important of which is the crowning of the newly wedded pair. During the service, two crowns, which are often made of silver or of gold, are held over the heads of the bridegroom and the bride, by friends appointed for that purpose. The crown being a symbol of triumph and joy, this custom is intended to signify the triumph of Christian virtue, and joy at the entrance of a new life. Bishops and monks are forbidden to marry; and marriage is allowed but once to secular priests and deacons before their ordination. The laity are allowed, when deprived by death of their partners, to marry thrice; but four marriages are strictly forbidden. It must be added that divorces are not infrequent in Russia.

The raskol movement, by which the Russian Church became divided into two divisions, the Old and the New Believers, was first established by Peter the Great. The Old Believers, who insisted on retaining the rites and ceremonies of the Russian Church as they existed in the time of St. Cyril and Methodius, were in opposition to the New Believers, who adopted certain points modified by the revision; namely, they used only the unrevised service-books; they crossed themselves with two fingers and not with three; they repeated hallelujah only twice; they used seven and not five altar-breads in the Eucharistic service; they dropped the procession of the holy cross; during divine services they turned from left to right, “according to the sun,” and not from right to left; they attended only their own
RUSSIAN SECTS.

The Raskolniks are divided into two classes; namely, Popovtzi, or those who have priests (popes), and Bezpopovtzi (without popes), who have no regular and constant priests. Popovtzi as yet hold those views characteristic of the Old Belief. However, a large number of them have realized that there is no dogmatic difference between them and the New Believers: therefore they treat both the State and the Church of Russia in a friendly spirit. They are known under the name of Edinovertzi (those of one belief, that is, of the same belief). The late Czar, Alexander II., granted them liberty of religious service. Their old churches were opened, and new ones built. The archbishop of the Edinoveri resides at Moscow. The Popovtzi recognize the priestly hierarchy: they have priests and bishops of their own. Some of them fanaticity de- denounce both the Czar and the Church, and for that reason are regarded as dangerous, and treated as such; for instance, the Dosiehans (the followers of Dosieh). The Bezpopovtzi hold that every Christian is a priest, and therefore there is no need of a special priestly order. In support of their view they cite Rev. i. 6: "And [Christ] hath made us kings and priests unto God." However, in their religious meetings they appoint some one from among themselves, one more learned in Holy Scriptures, to act as a spiritual teacher; but such a person has no special authority, and does not need to be ordained. They believe that we are living in the reign of Antichrist: but they explain that under "Antichrist" must be understood the impious spirit of our time; under "evils," the present society; and under "birth," digression from the Christian truth. They believe that the authorities of to-day are the Antichrist's servants, and therefore they consider it a great sin to pray for them. They affirm that the churches are unnecessary to Christians; for St. Paul said, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. iii. 16). They have abolished almost the entire ritual of the Greek-Eastern Church, partly by command of the Bible (as they understand it), and partly in accordance with their own idea of the Antichrist's reign.

And so does that beet sects hold- ing very radical views. Thus some (E. Blokhin) do not recognize the authority of the Bible, but yet believe they are guided simply by "inspiration from above:" they do not adore the holy images, nor keep any religious meetings. Others (M. Herasimoff) say that they do not adore the Bible which is printed with ink, but that one which is laid down in their heart and conscience. Among the Bezpopovtzi the following sects are particularly known:

The Stranniki ("the Travellers") or Begoo- ni ("the Runners") do not stay in one place more than a few days. They do not revere the cross, but call it simply a piece of wood. They affirm that all God's promises concerning the church are already fulfilled; that now we are living in the "future age" and in the "new heaven;" that the resurrection of the dead has already taken place, or rather that it takes place each time that one leaves the sinful life, and begins to walk in the ways of truth and piety.

There are many Bezpopovtzi who object to being called the "Old Believers." "Only Hebrews are old believers," they say; "and we are the Spiritual Christians." To this group belong the Dook- horbz, the Molokanze, the Oshecze, the Byst- ke, the Khlotz, and the Skoptz.

The Dookhorbz are those denying the existence of spirit, or rather spiritual beings and spiri- tual life. They hold that there is no personal God, that he is inseparable from the society of pious men. "God is the good man:" that is their maxim. They do not believe in a life after death: therefore they deny the existence both of paradise and hell. They do not recognize the authority of the Bible, but believe in the "Book, which is traditions of their own. However, those traditions are nothing but different Bible-pasages which sustain their own views. They consider Christ to be only equal to any good man of our day. They often quote, and explain in their not believe in a "Spirit: and that they worship him must worship him in spirit and truth" (John iv. 24). "Spirit in us," they say: "therefore we are gods, and therefore we have to adore living good men."
RUSSIAN SECTS.

They reverently bow before each other, be it man, woman, or child. They discard all the rites of the Greek Church. They deny the authority of the Czar on the ground, that, being God's people, they do not belong to this world, and therefore they are not subject to the rule of worldly authorities. They even cheerfully allow the use of military service, and do not pray for the Czar.

The Molokaneh ("Milk-eaters") call themselves "the truly spiritual Christians." They believe only in the New Testament, but explain it in their own way. They affirm that baptism with water is invalid; purification from sins by pure water is invalid: purification from sins by pure life and good deeds, that is a true baptism. They object to all external rites, crossing, prayers, temples, etc. They consider themselves free from all state laws, on the ground, that, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. iii. 17).

The Obsche ("Communists") are a branch of the Molokaneh, and differ from them only in holding property in common. In each commune there are twelve elected apostles, who direct works and the distribution of goods.

The sect of Stundists is of recent origin: it became known only in 1860. The Stundists strive to get rid of the authority both of the State and the Church. They hold that everybody is free to understand the Bible in his or her way. So far they have come to these conclusions,—the priestly hierarchy is invalid; there is no sense in adoration of the cross and the holy image; of the seven sacraments, only baptism and communion are to be retained.

Of all the sects of the Raskolniks, only Khlisti and Skoptzi are despised by Russian people at large. The Khlisti ("Self-lashers"), though they do not recognize the church-rites, practise many rites of their own kind. They are ascetics, and the married life is regarded by them as the greatest sin. They wage a constant war against human nature; and for that reason they continually lash themselves, both in private and in religious meetings. They believe that among them sometimes appears the Lord Sabaoth in the person of one of their brothers, and that Christ and the Virgin have come to renew, or even to build, new chapels or houses of prayer. In giving his permission, the minister is empowered, in agreement with the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, to give permission to the Raskolniks to open, or to repair, or to renew, or to build, new chapels or houses of prayer. In giving his permission, the minister shall be guided by local circumstances, and particularly by the character of the teaching of the different sects. The Raskolniks are allowed to perform the religious service according to their own rites in their chapels, and also in private houses. It is forbidden to open their convents, and all religious processions in public are also forbidden. The chapels of the Raskolniks must not have the shape of the Orthodox churches, and must not have bells outside. The propagation of the Raskolnik teaching among the Orthodox is strictly forbidden. The Raskolnik religious teachers have no special rights which are granted to the Orthodox clergymen.

The literature on the Raskolniks is very voluminous. The best works on the subject are as follows: Schapoff: Russian Raskol of the Old Belief; Kortmaroff: series of the articles in The Vestnik Europa; Metropolitan Makary: History of Russian Church, vol. xiii. (Patriarch Nikon); Kelisoff: Official Investigation of the Raskol; P. Melnikoff: Letters on the Raskol; Andreeff: Raskol and its Significance; Ignaty: History of the Raskol; Esipoff: Trials of the Raskolniks in XVIII. Century; N. Popoff: Raskol of To-day; Prior Parthen: Spiritual Sword against the Raskolniks; J. Popoff: Materials for History of the Raskol; Nilsky: On Antichrist, against the Raskolniks; V. Popoff: Secrets of the Raskolniks; O. Novitzky: The Dookhobori; Archimandrite Israel: Review of the Sects of the Raskolniks; I. Dobrovorsky: God's People; V. Farmakovsky: Anti-State Elements in the Raskol. There are also many books written by Raskolniks themselves; for instance, Archpriest A. Zabramov: The Bezpopovtsy; P. Lubopotny: Catalogue of the Works by Men of Old Belief; By-Laws of the Theodosians, 1828; Brother Paul: The Czar's Way; Antichrist according to the Bible; Principles of Christ's Church on the Keys. All these books are pub-
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RUYSBROECK.
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RUTH. This book relates an episode among the Israelites in the days of the Judges — the story of the marriage of Ruth the Moabitess to her kinsman, Boaz, and so, how another heathen ancestor was introduced into the pedigree of David and of Jesus Christ. The grace and beauty of the story are universally praised. But by it we get a glimpse into the domestic life of the period. The very simplicity of the book, which constitutes its charm, is also the best proof of its truthfulness. What forger would invent such a tale, in which, to the royal house of David, a foreign and idolatrous ancestor was attributed? Numerous attempts have been made to rob the book of its historical character. It has been considered as written in advocacy of Levirate marriage, so that the eft between Israel and the Gentiles might be bridged (Bertholdt and Benyon); but Boaz was not Mahlon's brother, but only his kinsman; hence his action was purely voluntary. Reuss considers it as invented by a North-Palestinian, after the fall of Ephraim under Assyria, as a political romance, prophesying the re-union of Ephraim to Judah, because Naomi the Ephraimite recognized the child of Ruth, the progenitor of Judah's royal line, as her heir. But there is really no reason for considering it as other than an old, true, but long-time unwritten, traditional history of the Davidic family. At what time in the Judges period the incidents occurred cannot be definitely determined, but at least a hundred years before David (Ruth iv. 18). The book itself, as its Aramaicisms and late grammatical forms show, was written many years afterwards, probably not until after the exile. The late date is therefore the reason why the book appears in the Jewish Hagiographa. It is true the LXX. put it with the Judges; and Josephus testifies to the Jewish custom of his day, of reckoning these two books as one (Contra Apion, i. 8). But the supposition that Ruth was originally a part of Judges, and, as some say, constituted its third appendix (Bertham, Aubert), lacks evidence, and is rendered improbable by the independence of the story. It is complete in itself.

LIT. — See the general commentaries; \{the homiletical and practical treatment by Thomas Fuller (1600), George Lawson (1600), Stephen H. Tyng, Sen., The Rich Kinsman (1656); also C. H. H. Wright: The Book of Ruth in Hebrew and Chaldee, Lond., 1864; R. W. Bush: Popular Introduction to ..., Ruth, Lond., 1888. The Haggadic commentary upon Ruth is given by Wünsche: Bib. Rabbi., Leip., 1883. v. Orelli. \}
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RUYSBROECK, or RUSBROEK, doctor ecstaticus, the most prominent of the Dutch mystics; b. in the village of Ruysbroek, between Brussels and Hall, in 1293; was educated in Brussels, but never learned so much Latin that he could write it, though he seems to have been acquainted with the writings of the Areopagite, as also with the earlier German mystics. He was for a long time vicar of the Church of St. Gudula in Brussels, but retired in 1333 to the Augustine monastery Gröndal, in the forest of Soigny, near Brussels, and died there in 1361. His four principal works are Die Zierde der geistlichen Hochzeit, Der Spiegel der Seligkeit, Von dem funkelnden Stein, and Samuel: his other writings are only more or less interesting repetitions. They were originally written in Dutch, but soon translated into Latin (Rubrochii Opera, Colog.; b. about 1600; 2nd edit. by G. Arnold, Offenbach, 1701), and French. There is a collected edition of Ruysbroeck's works, by J. David, Ghent, 1857; 8, 6 vols. Arnswaldt edited his principal works, Hanover, 1848. In opposition to Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, but in agreement with the German mystics, he broke with the speculation of Ruysbroeck describes a movement from God to man, and then back to God, not always clearing the banks of pantheism. The
Details are often very acute, subtle, and charming by their beauty and freshness, but often also very obscure and overloaded. Ullmann: [Reformers before the Reformation]; Böhringer: Die deutschen Mystiker, pp. 462 sqq. C. Schmidt.

Ryerson, Adolphus Egerton, D.D., LL.D., Methodist; b. in Charlotteville, Norfolk County, Canada, March 24, 1803; d. in Toronto, Feb. 19, 1882. His father was a native of New Jersey. His parents were in easy circumstances, yet Egerton spent his early years in healthful labor on the farm. He was endowed with a healthy, vigorous constitution, and great intellectual power. His thirst for knowledge was most intense, and his reading was extensive and varied. In early life he connected himself with the Methodist Church; and on Easter Sunday, 1826, he began his work as a preacher in that body. He soon became famous as one of the most eloquent, effective, and promising preachers in the connection. He early began to write for the periodicals of the day; and some of his articles having attracted attention, and provoked discussion, he was chosen editor of the Christian Guardian by the Conference in 1829,—an office which he filled with eminent ability and fearlessness during a period of great interest in Canadian history. In 1833 he was sent by the Conference as a delegate to the Wesleyan body in England, where his rare gifts and persuasive eloquence were at once recognized. He was repeatedly intrusted with similar missions; and so ably and skilfully did he conduct the matters committed to him, that he secured the confidence and approval of the leading men on both sides of the Atlantic. In 1841 he was elected the first president of Victoria University; where for three years, both as principal and professor, he won the confidence and affection of the students, and did much to establish the rising institution. In 1844 he was appointed by the governor-general, Sir Charles Metcalfe, chief superintendent of education for Upper Canada. Into this new arena he entered with a resolute determination to succeed; and he spared no pains, effort, or sacrifice to fit himself thoroughly for the onerous duties to which he had been appointed.

He steadfastly prosecuted his work with a firm, inflexible will, unrelaxing tenacity of purpose, an amazing fertility of expedient, an exhaustless amount of information, a most wonderful skill in adaptation, a matchless ability in unfolding and vindicating his plans, a rare adroitness in meeting and removing difficulties, great moderation in success, and indomitable perseverance under discouragement, calm patience when misapprehended, unflinching courage when opposed, until he achieved the consummation of his wishes,—the establishment of a system of education second to none in its efficiency, and adaptation to the circumstances of the people. He proved to be just the man for the place, and the work he accomplished is his enduring monument.

He was frequently elected secretary of the conference, and in 1874 was its president. His brethren conferred on him every honor at their disposal. In 1841 he received the degree of D.D., and in 1861 that of LL.D. He wrote extensively on all subjects connected with public affairs, specially on questions relating to civil and religious liberty and education. He was an able, vigorous, and successful controversialist. He issued numerous pamphlets, wrote many elaborate reports, and published several works,—a treatise on moral science, Epochs of Canadian Methodism, 1882; in 1880 The History of the United Empire Loyalists, in two large volumes. William Ormiston.

Ryland, John, D.D., a distinguished Baptist minister; was b. at Warwick, Jan. 29, 1753; d. at Bristol, May 25, 1825; pastor at Northampton, 1781; pastor at Bristol, and president of the Baptist college there, from 1794 to his death. He published some sermons, and one or two other books. His Hymns and Verses, numbering nearly a hundred, were collected by D. Sedgwick, 1862. Some of them have been extensively used, and at least two retain a place in most of the collections. A Memoir by Dr. Hoby is prefixed to Sedgwick's edition. F. M. Bird.
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